




UNEP

UNITED NATIONS  
ENVIRONMENT  
PROGRAMME

PROGRAMME  
PERFORMANCE  
REPORT 2012-2013



2012-2013







UNITED NATIONS  
ENVIRONMENT  
PROGRAMME


## PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE REPORT 2012–2013



Climate change



Disasters  
and conflicts



Ecosystem  
management



Environmental  
governance



Harmful substances  
and hazardous waste



Resource efficiency

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD .....	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	9
PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW .....	13
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>SUB PROGRAMME OVERALL PERFORMANCE.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<i>Climate Change .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Disasters and Conflicts.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Ecosystem Management.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Environmental Governance .....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste .....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Resource Efficiency and Sustainable Consumption and Production .....</i>	<i>35</i>
<b>BUDGET PERFORMANCE .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<i>Analysis of Donor Contributions.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Expenditure Analysis.....</i>	<i>41</i>
<b>IMPROVING PROSPECTS FOR RESULTS .....</b>	<b>43</b>
PERFORMANCE: CLIMATE CHANGE .....	46
PERFORMANCE: DISASTERS AND CONFLICTS .....	62
PERFORMANCE: ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT .....	72
PERFORMANCE: ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE .....	82
PERFORMANCE: HARMFUL SUBSTANCES AND HAZARDOUS WASTE.....	98
PERFORMANCE: RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION .....	110
ABBREVIATIONS .....	123
ANNEX 1 .....	124
ANNEX 2 .....	130
ANNEX 3 .....	131

## Tables

TABLE 01: CLIMATE CHANGE RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS.....	20
TABLE 02: DISASTERS AND CONFLICTS RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	23
TABLE 03: ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	26
TABLE 04: ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	29
TABLE 05: HARMFUL SUBSTANCES AND HAZARDOUS WASTE RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	33
TABLE 06: RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND SCP RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	37
TABLE 07: CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT FUND 2009-2013 .....	39
TABLE 08: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOP 15 DONORS TO THE ENVIRONMENT FUND 2009-2013.MILLIONS) .....	40
TABLE 09: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOP 15 DONORS TO OVERALL FUNDING OF UNEP’S POW (ENVIRONMENT FUND, TRUST FUNDS AND EARMARKED CONTRIBUTIONS) FOR 2009-2013 (IN USD THOUSANDS) .....	40
TABLE 10: EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	44

## Figures

FIGURE 01: Overall Performance.....	9
FIGURE 02: Status of achievement of expected accomplishments in programme of work.....	10
FIGURE 03: Overview financial graph .....	11
FIGURE 04: Overview of post and non-post costs.....	11
FIGURE 05: UNEPs Results Framework .....	14
FIGURE 06: Key numbers of 2012-2013 .....	16
FIGURE 07: Led petrol phase-out: Global Status 2002 .....	17
FIGURE 08: Led petrol phase-out: Global Status 2013 .....	17
FIGURE 09: Progress to phasing out inefficient lighting .....	18
FIGURE 10: Countries in which UNEP provides support on REDD+ .....	21
FIGURE 11: Countries with UN related development planning processes (UNDAF) .....	29
FIGURE 12: Progress of led petrol phase out in Sub-Saharan Africa .....	32
FIGURE 13: Countries applying UNEP guidance for mercury assessment.....	35
FIGURE 14: The financial overview of UNEPs POW for 2012-2013by source of funding.....	38
FIGURE 15: Analysis of 2012-2013 budgets and income by fund category .....	38
FIGURE 16: Analysis of 2012-2013 Environment Fund contributions by region (as percentage and USD millions) .....	40
FIGURE 17: Budget Performance for overall Programme of Work.....	43
FIGURE 18: Status of Global Fuel Economy Initiative .....	49
FIGURE 19: Climate Change subprogramme budget performance .....	50
FIGURE 20: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the climate change subprogramme.....	50
FIGURE 21: UNEP Adaptation Project Portfolio 2012 – 2013 .....	51
FIGURE 22: UNEP interventions related to disasters and conflicts 2010-2013 .....	64
FIGURE 23: Disasters and Conflicts subprogramme budget performance .....	65
FIGURE 24: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Disasters and Conflicts subprogramme .....	65
FIGURE 25: UNEP Ecosystem Management Project Portfolio 2012-2013 .....	74
FIGURE 26: Ecosystem Management subprogramme budget performance.....	75
FIGURE 27: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Ecosystem Management subprogramme.....	75
FIGURE 28: Poverty and Environment Initiative Project Countries 2012-2013 .....	84
FIGURE 29: Environmental Governance subprogramme budget performance .....	85
FIGURE 30: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Environmental Governance subprogramme .....	85
FIGURE 31: Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste subprogramme budget performance .....	101
FIGURE 32: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste subprogramme .....	101
FIGURE 33: Tracking changes in DDT levels in humans.....	108
FIGURE 34: Resource Efficiency subprogramme budget performance.....	113
FIGURE 35: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Resource Efficiency subprogramme.....	113
FIGURE 36: Green Economy & Sustainable Consumption and Production policy related results achieved 2012-2013	115



***Achim Steiner***

---

***UN Under-Secretary-General and  
Executive Director, UNEP***

## FOREWORD

2012-2013 marked an historic opportunity for governments and organizations to benefit from UNEP to achieve better development outcomes by integrating the environmental dimension in their sustainable development strategies. The UN Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012 and General Assembly resolutions in 2012 and 2013 signaled a commitment from governments worldwide to enable UNEP take on a strong leadership role in this respect as the authority for the environment in the United Nations system.


This **Programme Performance Report** validates the fundamental strength of UNEP to take on such a leadership role with proven results and prospects for catalyzing meaningful and sustained change leveraged through our extensive network of partners. Responding to the demand from member states, it is different from previous reports on UNEP's performance. First, it reflects more clearly to what extent the organization is bringing about change and its value for money. Second, it enables us to learn where our services are most effective and where we need to improve our strategy or modus operandi.

Key issues from this reporting process are:

- Overall, we fully achieved 64 per cent of our expected accomplishments within the two-year time frame of our Programme of Work, 30 per cent partially achieved but with progress still underway and 6 per cent not achieved. 85 per cent of indicator targets that were achieved were over-exceeded.
- Some of the performance indicators require more dedicated time and resources to track and analyze, a priority for the next reporting period
- We learned that our performance measurement cannot be restricted to the biennium alone as some results are only visible after a sustained engagement of ten or more years
- Strategies for upscaling through partnerships, especially within the UN system, must be in place right from the start—a priority for further improving our delivery
- We will need to refine our reporting process so that we can routinely monitor progress from sustained engagement on a number of issues. Our reporting does not yet capture all parameters where long-term monitoring is necessary and this will be a priority as we further improve our results reporting

This report is structured to provide an overview of our performance against the Programme of Work for the biennium 2012-2013, signaling the complete implementation of our Medium-Term Strategy for the period 2010-2013. The first section shows overall results having spent some USD 438 million over the biennium 2012-2013, albeit with some results becoming visible only after many years of sustained work. We also provide a synopsis of what we have done, and what further we plan to do, to increase our prospects for results. The report then goes into details for every priority area in the Programme of Work 2012-2013, showing what results we achieved and with what resources.

With continued demand for our products and services, our outlook remains focused on the changes we can catalyze, leveraging the strengths of key partners, and the benefits our support delivers to our constituency.







## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


The 2012-2013 biennium completed the implementation of the first Medium-Term Strategy of UNEP for the period 2010-2013. For the first time in the history of the organization, results-based management principles were fully applied throughout the programme cycle, from planning to monitoring and evaluating our implementation. UNEP’s performance against Expected Accomplishments in the Programme of Work for the biennium 2012-2013 shows

- 64 per cent achieved on schedule. 85 per cent of indicator targets that were achieved were over-exceeded.
- 30 per cent partially achieved with work still underway in some cases. Financial (and human) resources are not always available at the beginning of the biennium as funds are mobilized during the biennium in which results are to be achieved, sometimes affecting the pace of the organization’s delivery and expenditure rates.
- 6 per cent not achieved, owing to indicators that were not possible to measure and were substituted with alternative performance measurements


While UNEP performed reasonably well, some targets against indicators were too low, some over optimistic, and a few were not sufficient in determining whether useful results were achieved. These lessons have been learned and factored into the organization’s new programme of work.

This performance was based on the utilization of USD 438 million, the total expenditure on the Programme of Work registered as at December 2013 for the biennium. Expenditure against the overall planned budget of USD 480 million was 91 per cent.

**FIGURE 01: Overall Performance**



**FIGURE 02: Status of achievement of expected accomplishments in Programme of Work**




UNEP’s performance showcases the following:


- The organization’s transition to results-based management is enabling the organization to better plan for, and monitor progress towards, results
- Engagement through partnerships over many years is leveraging tangible results, many of which already measurable
- The organization’s efforts to strengthen coordination across the UN system is bearing results with several areas (biodiversity, land degradation, green economy) already achieving agreement on ways to move forward in coordinated ways, and environment being further mainstreamed through UN country teams in over 55 countries
- In spite of a challenging overall fiscal environment, UNEP’s efforts to widen the resource base is showing some initial results, both in terms of overall support and emergence of new countries as major contributors

UNEP’s income exceeded the planned 2012-2013 budget by 25 per cent, certainly as a result of the enhanced role for UNEP and its governing body agreed by member states in Rio in 2012, but possibly also as a recognition of UNEP’s capacity to deliver results. Significant amounts of these financial resources are earmarked for UNEP work in 2014 and beyond.

**FIGURE 03: Overview of financial graph**



**FIGURE 04: Overview of post and non-post costs**



Lessons learned, which serve as priorities for improved delivery in the future, include:

- Strategies for upscaling through partnerships, especially within the UN system, must as much as possible, be in place in the early planning stages
- Project and programme design, including appropriate indicators and benchmarks, are key to the institution’s capacity to account for results. Further efforts are required in this area
- There is a need to measure progress that UNEP leverages through all its partnerships. Agreements need to be sought with partners to ensure that from the multiplier effect of partnership with UNEP, including within the UN system, results can be tracked and more accurately measured
- There are areas of work where we need to monitor change over a longer-term horizon than a single biennium or even the four-year medium term strategy. UNEP must identify these parameters for many key areas of engagement, aligned with the strategic orientations that member states provide. At the same time, monitoring instruments need to be nimble enough to allow for adaptive management and swift decision-making for improved delivery
- The shift to results based management is as much a transformation of the institution’s internal culture as it is a management issue. UNEP will intensify training of its staff in collaboration with other UN institutions
- UNEP’s efforts to widen and secure the resource base for the achievement of the programme of work, by UNEP directly or by its partners, need to be sustained. Securing income to the Environment Fund or otherwise softly earmarked funding is indispensable if UNEP is to maintain its ability to deliver in accordance with the priorities collectively agreed by its membership

## OVERVIEW

UNEP's Global Environment Outlook<sup>1</sup> shows that environmental degradation continues worldwide. The activities of seven billion people today have intensified the stress on the Earth System to absorb wastes and neutralize adverse effects on the environment. While the Earth System provides the basis for all human societies—clean air, safe water, healthy food, energy and natural resources that provide the raw materials for goods and services—critical thresholds across the globe, including in specific localities, have been exceeded or are close to being exceeded. The degradation and depletion of key natural resources has already constrained conventional development in some parts of the world, negatively affecting human well-being and efforts to alleviate poverty.

**Climate change** presents the global community with one of the most serious challenges to achieving development goals. The potential impacts are unlikely to be avoided based on current emission reduction pledges. Despite attempts to develop low-carbon economies in a number of countries, atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases continue to increase to levels likely to push global temperatures beyond the internationally agreed limit of 2°C above the pre-industrial average temperature. The stepping stone of the 2020 target can still be achieved by strengthening current pledges and by further action, including scaling up international cooperation in areas such as energy efficiency, fossil fuel subsidy reform and renewable energy.

Application of current low-carbon technologies and existing policy options would reduce the risks posed by climate change. Ultimately, however, a transformation in the way energy is produced and the efficiency with which energy and other resources are used (coupled with a shift in consumption and production patterns and investment in innovation) will be required to achieve long-term climate goals. Renewable energy supplied an estimated 19 per cent of global energy consumption. Despite an overall decline in clean energy investments in 2013, global solar installations increased by 20 per cent in that year.

Since the start of the new millennium, over 40 major **conflicts** and some 2500 **disasters** have affected billions of people around the world. These crises have destroyed infrastructure, displaced entire populations and threatened ecosystems that support the lives of many people. The impacts are borne disproportionately by the most vulnerable sectors of society, affecting their livelihoods and compounding poverty.

The current trends in the state of our **ecosystems** are undermining our ability to tackle poverty, improve the health, prosperity and security of our populations, and address climate change. This ability will be greatly strengthened if we correctly value the role of biodiversity in supporting the shared priorities of the international community. Continued loss of, and changes to, biodiversity can not be seen as an issue separate from the core concerns of society. Substantial biodiversity loss and the degradation and over-exploitation of habitats, have already affected the provision of many fisheries. The number of eutrophic coastal areas has increased dramatically since 1990 – at least Hundreds of these areas are experiencing the effects of eutrophication, while only a small percentage can be classified as recovering.

Current trends in economic development are based on unsustainable economic growth, which have been achieved at the expense of equity, natural resources and ecosystem health. Many terrestrial ecosystems are being severely degraded because of lack of proper long-term policies that address land use decisions. There is a failure to recognize non-economic ecosystem functions that limit productivity and long-term ecosystem sustainability. For example, short-term financial pressures have encouraged the irrigation and subsequent salinization of vast dryland areas, making them very costly to rehabilitate. Deforestation and forest degradation produce financially

---

1 [Http://www.unep.org/geo/pdfs/geo5/GEO5\\_report\\_full\\_en.pdf](http://www.unep.org/geo/pdfs/geo5/GEO5_report_full_en.pdf)

attractive short-term profits, but recent estimates based on alternative accounting methods suggest that they cost the global economy between USD 2.5 and USD 4.5 trillion per year – more than total estimated global losses due to the 2008 economic crisis.

While the rate of forest loss is slowing, it remains alarmingly high. Approximately 13 million hectares of forest per year was lost between 2000 and 2010. Heightened interest in carbon sequestration has inspired new incentives and financing for ecosystem protection. REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation in developing countries) – has emerged as an important component of a global strategy to reduce emissions while generating financial flows from North to South.

Global use of natural resource materials increased by over 40 per cent between 1992 and 2005, from about 42 thousand million to nearly 60 thousand million tonnes. On a per capita basis, the increase was 27 per cent. With respect to the four major material groups (biomass, fossil fuels, ores and industrial minerals, and construction minerals) there has been an increase in extraction of construction minerals of almost 80 per cent, followed by ores and industrial minerals at close to 60 per cent. Absolute decoupling of the environmental pressures associated with resource consumption from economic growth is needed in economies worldwide. This will be easier to achieve to the extent that **resource use** becomes more efficient.

Food insecurity and land degradation will intensify unless increasing pressures and competing demands on land are wisely managed. Meeting this challenge requires the adoption of new economic paradigms that explicitly factor in the environment. Options towards a green economy constitute one such approach, which includes the following principles: valuation of natural resources and environmental assets; pricing policies and regulatory mechanisms that translate these values into market and non-market incentives; and measures of economic welfare growth that are responsive to the use, degradation and loss of ecosystem goods and services.

Improving efficiency along the whole food chain by increasing crop yields through research and extension, and reducing food waste and spoilage by improving transport, storage and distribution infrastructure in developing countries (as well as changing behaviour in wealthier societies where much food waste occurs) are also crucial to improving food security.

Up to 90 per cent of wastewater in developing countries flow untreated into rivers, lakes and highly productive coastal zones, threatening health, food security and access to safe drinking and bathing water. The cumulative impacts of excessive, illegal or unregulated wastewater discharges particularly affect coastal areas, which contain some of the world's most productive yet fragile ecosystems. The pace of increasing demands on terrestrial, freshwater and ocean resources needs to be matched by improved **governance**. The open oceans are a major global commons and require effective international cooperation and governance. Most human and environmental water problems result from inadequate governance involving policy, institutional, financial and/or stakeholder issues. Integrated management approaches for addressing these constraints require time and resources in order to be successful. They also require enhanced integration of policies and institutions between sectors and governance levels, implementation and enforcement of relevant agreements and goals, improved monitoring and resolution of transboundary issues. Good governance, including stakeholder and private sector participation and gender considerations, is critical to increasing societal and environmental resilience and sustainability.

Global **chemical** pollution is a serious threat to sustainable development and livelihoods. Continuous growth trends and the changes in the global production, trade and use of chemicals point towards an increasing chemical intensification of the economy. More than 140,000 chemical products are now commercially available and some


14

of these chemicals have posed risks to the environment and human health because of their misuse or intrinsic hazardous properties. Currently, more than 90 per cent of water and fish samples from aquatic environments are contaminated by pesticides. Estimates indicate that about 3 per cent of exposed agricultural workers suffer from an episode of acute pesticide poisoning every year. Pollution with persistent organic pollutants (POPs) is widespread. Efforts are undertaken to address these globally.

UNEP’s strategy for addressing these trends has been to capitalize on areas where it can bring added value to helping address these major global environmental problems. During the 2012-2013 biennium, UNEP delivered its work within six priority areas (see Figure 05):

- Climate Change
- Disasters and Conflicts
- Ecosystem Management
- Environmental Governance
- Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste
- Resource Efficiency and Sustainable Consumption and Production

FIGURE 05: UNEPs Results Framework



## RESULTS

Looking at the biennium as a whole, UNEP worked to establish **alliances and partnerships** with major players in the field such as in the **Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)**—which now has 72 partners and a working capital of USD 46 million—in order to deliver measurable results against UNEP’s Medium-Term Strategy and Programme of Work. UNEP’s strategy was to use assessments and analyses, based on solid science, to inform policy and decision-making. After years of international negotiations, the world’s governments established the Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (**IPBES**)—as the leading intergovernmental body for **assessing** the state of the planet’s biodiversity, its ecosystems and the essential services they provide to society. With the IPBES workplan now approved, assessments on pollination and food production, land degradation and invasive species will provide policymakers with the tools to tackle these challenges.

UNEP was to use its **convening power** to help countries better understand the scale of environmental problems and arrive at **consensus** on major issues. One such example was the adoption of the **Minamata Convention on Mercury** in 2013, which enables governments and other stakeholders to systematically address problems associated with environmental and human impacts of this heavy metal. A **ten-year framework of actions on sustainable consumption and production** agreed to by governments at the Rio Conference in 2013 allows governments and other stakeholders to decide upon, and subsequently take action on priority issues to improve the sustainability of consumption and production of resources.

Our strategy was also to scale up the use of tools and methods that we pilot test, not through growing our own financial base but by working with key partners from the start to help institutionalize such tools and methods into their own programmes. Leveraging the strengths of key actors in the field makes possible a significantly higher development impact than UNEP could achieve on its own (see Figure 06). Over the biennium 2012-2013, three topics of environmental concern—**biodiversity, drylands and green economy**—were mainstreamed into sectoral programmes in the **UN system** using the **Environmental Management Group (EMG)** as the vehicle for UN engagement. UNEP provides secretariat support to the EMG. The aim has been to leverage major change by working through the UN system. For example, a biodiversity mapping tool is being used to enable the UN system to track its support to countries with respect to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity.

Concerning drylands, a UN-wide action plan has been established to enable coordinated actions of the UN on drylands. An overview of green economy knowledge products and tools produced by UN agencies and others is being used to support a coordinated response by the UN system on green economy as a tool for sustainable development and poverty eradication. The UN High Level Committee on Management agreed to implement the **sustainable management** systems programme prepared by the EMG. A programme on peer-reviewing of the environmental profiles of the UN system was prepared. UNEP and two other UN agencies—the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO)—benefited from this peer-review. Greenhouse gas emission inventories are now available for 63 UN entities, with over 30 having drafted emission reduction strategies.

Some key results show the effectiveness of UNEP’s approach of working through **partnerships**. By the end of 2013, UNEP successfully **mobilized finance** investments of approximately **USD 432 million in clean energy**. National **REDD+** ‘readiness’ efforts, with support by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) are underway in 48 partner countries spanning 56 per cent of tropical forest across Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America. **17 countries** have developed **national REDD+ programmes**

FIGURE 06: Key numbers of 2012-2013



\* 1146 with the staff from the MEAs


**and strategies** that would enable investment in forests. In a notable **post-conflict situation in Sudan**, UNEP not only improved environmental management at particular sites but saw the **integration of environmental considerations into seven UN and international strategies** as a result of its efforts.

**Clean fuels and vehicles**, we are able to show that only six countries today use leaded petrol compared with **82 countries** in 2002, only **six countries now** have leaded petrol. We intend to achieve similar results through the UNEP global mercury partnership. While we strive to achieve outcomes that change the practices and actions of key institutions towards environmental sustainability, we also continue to fulfill our normative role of ensuring that our support to countries is knowledge driven. Key knowledge products have helped to support a partnership UNEP established with the **International Labour Organization (ILO), UNIDO and the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** that provides **green economy advisory services**.


Over the biennium, a mid-term evaluation of the Medium-Term Strategy for 2010-2013 and an evaluation of 50 per cent of UNEP’s subprogrammes (climate change, disasters and conflicts and environmental governance) were carried out in line with the organization’s rolling evaluation work plan. Forty-eight project evaluations were also completed: **62 per cent of projects were rated ‘satisfactory’ or higher** (a 2 per cent increase from the previous biennium) and five per cent fell within the within the unsatisfactory range (‘moderately unsatisfactory’ to ‘highly unsatisfactory’) in overall project performance—an improvement from the previous biennium where 11 per cent of projects were rated in the ‘unsatisfactory’ range.



**FIGURE 07: Leaded petrol phase-out: Global Status 2002**



**FIGURE 08: Leaded petrol phase-out: Global Status 2013**



## SUB PROGRAMME OVERALL PERFORMANCE


### Climate Change

UNEP's subprogramme on **Climate Change** has been designed to strengthen the ability of countries, in particular developing countries, to integrate climate change responses into national development processes to help them move towards a climate resilient, low carbon future. The strategy was:

- **Climate resilience:** to support countries in using ecosystem based approaches to adaptation
- **Mitigation – Low emission growth:** to support countries and institutions to adopt and scale up the use of energy efficiency and renewable energy
- **Mitigation – Access to finance:** to facilitate countries' access to clean energy finance
- **REDD:** enable countries to capitalize on investment opportunities that reduce greenhouse emissions from deforestation and forest degradation with adequate social and environmental safeguards
- **Science and outreach:** to increase access to climate scientific assessments and information

Concerning **climate resilience**, during the 2012-2013 biennium, UNEP supported **55 developing countries** in implementing concrete **adaptation** projects and programmes. UNEP has pioneered practical Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) options and is expanding its EbA work to additional ecosystems and urban and agricultural areas. In 2013, UNEP and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) (with funding from the Global Environment Facility) initiated a global support programme to assist least developed countries (LDCs) to advance **National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)**, which are seen as the main mechanism for moving the enhanced adaptation agenda forward. This programme will be key to supporting countries' integrated adaptation strategies in the long term.

FIGURE 09: Progress to phasing out inefficient lighting



UNEP's adaptation programme has developed a range of widely used information and assessments. In 2013, it assisted 9 countries and 2 regions to complete **vulnerability and impact assessments**, including six city-level assessments. UNEP supported a number of countries in meeting the Adaptation Fund Board's requirements and thus **accessing adaptation finance**. The direct access modality is key to enhancing country ownership and managing climate finance, and it is an important modality of the Green Climate Fund.

With respect to **mitigation**, UNEP has several programmes with a global reach. The **Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)** to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (of which UNEP is the Secretariat) is the first global effort to address **short-lived climate pollutants**. It had six **partners** in 2012 and currently has **72**. Partners have pledged more than **USD 46 million** to the CCAC Trust Fund. In direct response to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), UNEP hosts the **Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN)**. 2013 was an eventful year for the CTCN, with the establishment and operationalization of the centre, and the CTCN is now open for business.

Regarding energy efficiency, there has been significant progress in **phasing out inefficient light bulbs** in countries. By 2013, 55 countries had joined the UNEP enlighten partnership and **27 countries** are implementing **phase-out** activities. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) is establishing a framework for phasing out inefficient incandescent lighting by 2020. A complete phase-out will save the region an estimated USD 220 million in electricity costs annually. A similar regional partnership exists in Central America (eight countries).

**Fuel efficiency** is one other significant way of reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions while bringing down fuel costs. A global initiative on clean vehicles led by UNEP is operational in 22 countries. **Seven developing countries** adopted **vehicle fuel efficiency standards** over the biennium. If technically achievable measures were adopted in all countries CO<sub>2</sub> **emissions** from cars and heavy duty vehicles would **halve**.

UNEP has supported **30 countries'** to develop **Technology Action Plans (TAPs)**. Seven countries have used them to design **Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs)**, which are the primary vehicle for implementation of low-carbon development actions by developing countries.

By the end of 2013, UNEP successfully **mobilized investments** of approximately **USD 432 million in clean energy**, providing funding support to over 50 clean energy projects. UNEP helped catalyze use of seed capital for clean energy investments. For example, seed capital to the Armstrong Fund enabled the Fund to raise USD 164m and invest in renewables.

A parallel finance programme facilitates investments in renewable energy technologies by end users in several countries. The approach started with solar water heating for the residential sector in Tunisia and has been replicated in other sectors (hotels, industrial) and countries (Tunisia, Egypt, Montenegro) and cities. For instance, in Cape Town through UNEP's support 140,000 solar water heaters will be installed. This approach is also being replicated for other technologies such as compact fluorescent light bulbs and photovoltaics. UNEP is strengthening its approach to energy efficiency by targeting areas of high efficiency potential, from lighting and appliances to transport and buildings.

The **UN-REDD** Programme, jointly implemented with **FAO and UNDP**, supports countries in their REDD+ readiness efforts, including the elaboration of National REDD+ Strategies. The UN-REDD Programme supports REDD+ readiness efforts in 48 partner countries, covering 56 per cent of the world's tropical forests, of which **17 countries** (the target for 2012-2013 was ten) are implementing **UN-REDD national programmes**, with some

TABLE 01: CLIMATE CHANGE RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) Adaptation</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of countries that integrate adaptation, including an ecosystem-based approach, into their national development plans with the assistance of UNEP	4*	8*	9	
<b>EA (b) Clean Energy</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of countries implementing energy plans, including low-carbon alternatives, with explicit renewable energy or energy efficiency policies with the assistance of UNEP	4	12	31	
<b>EA (c) Energy Finance</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased level of national investment in clean technology projects and projects related to adaptation and mitigation supported by UNEP that are implemented with international climate change funding with the assistance of UNEP	USD 200** million	USD 300** million	USD 432 million	
<b>EA (d) Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation</b>				<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓⊗)
(i) Increased number of countries implementing sustainable forest management plans, including plans to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD plans), with the assistance of UNEP	5	10	17	
(ii) Increased percentage of land being managed to reduce emissions from deforestation as a result of the implementation of sustainable forest management plans, including REDD plans, with the assistance of UNEP (measurement focused on number of REDD+investment plans)	0***	5***	3	
<b>EA (e) Science and outreach</b>				<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓⊗)
(i) Increased number of sector-specific local, national and regional development plans that incorporate climate-related assessment with the assistance of UNEP	12****	14****	12****	
(ii) Increased number of findings or results from UNEP climate change work reported in press and media with the assistance of UNEP	1650	1850	34005*****	

\* Actual baseline value: 4 (based on performance of Dec. 2011). Revised target value 8 (+4 new)

\*\*Actual baseline value: USD 200 million (based on performance of Dec 2011).

Revised target value: USD 300 million (USD 100 million increase)

\*\*\*Actual baseline value: 0; Revised target value: 5 new


\*\*\*\*Actual baseline: 12 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target: 14 (+2 new). Actual target value is the same as the baseline value due to absence of data.

\*\*\*\*\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work.

developing strategies and moving into the implementation phase. The work on REDD+ supports climate change mitigation and improved land use management to promote sustainable investment. At the Climate Change Conference in Warsaw (COP19) further decisions on REDD+ were adopted.

Concerning **science and outreach**, the UNEP *Emissions Gap Report* is a flagship publication that informs the climate change debates, where it continues to be widely referenced in discussions on mitigation ambition levels. Among other UNEP publications, an updated *Emissions Gap Report* and *Africa's Adaptation Gap* were both released in 2013.

FIGURE 10: Countries in which UNEP provides support on REDD+



## Disasters and Conflicts

Since the start of the new millennium, over 40 major conflicts and some 2500 disasters have affected billions of people –causing millions of deaths, destroying infrastructure, displacing vast numbers of those affected, and negatively impacting the ecosystems on which people’s lives depend. UNEP’s subprogramme on **Disasters and Conflicts** has been designed to minimize environmental threats to human well-being from the environmental causes and consequences of existing and potential natural and man-made disasters. The strategy was:

- **Risk reduction:** to assist countries to use environmental management to reduce the risks of disasters and conflicts
- **Post-crisis assessment:** to support requesting countries to identify the environmental risks to human health, livelihoods and security following conflicts, disasters and industrial accidents
- **Post-crisis recovery:** in the aftermath of conflicts and disasters, to support countries to address key environmental challenges as a contribution to stronger recovery and sustainable development

22 Concerning **risk reduction**, UNEP carried out **pilot projects and risk assessments in 15 vulnerable countries**. These activities revolved around reducing the risks of disasters and conflicts associated with environmental factors, such as ecosystem degradation, unregulated exploitation of natural resources, and industrial accidents. Besides supporting countries in identifying major threats, UNEP's strategy was to provide relevant know-how and training to address these threats.

At the global level, working with partners in academia, civil society and the UN system, UNEP co-led the establishment of a body of knowledge on the environmental dimensions of disasters and conflicts. A seven-volume compendium of 150 case studies on natural resource management and peacebuilding was released, starting in 2012. An environmental peacebuilding **community of practice** was also established. In addition, a graduate (Masters level) course on ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction (eco-DRR) has been established. It is now used in **19 universities**. UNEP utilized these knowledge products for technical support and training in some 24 countries and institutions to help translate technical approaches for conflict and disaster risk reduction into relevant policy and field-level programming. Moreover, lessons learned and best practices collected by UNEP were incorporated into UN-wide guidance on natural resource management in transition settings, which was endorsed by **38 UN entities** in 2013.

The challenge for the next biennium is to promote the dissemination and adoption of this guidance in UN operations at country level. One step in that direction has been pilot testing of the guidance by the UN Country Team in Afghanistan. The UN report *Natural Resources and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan* was released in 2013. Over the 2014-2015 biennium, more attention will be given to working through established networks and partnerships to achieve uptake and upscaling of the best practices and guidance established within this subprogramme.

UNEP has carried out **post-crisis assessments in 20 countries since 2008**, including comprehensive post-crisis environmental assessments that identify environmental risks to human well-being across a broad range of sectors, and rapid assessments of acute risks conducted with the **Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)**. In **85 per cent** of the **20 countries**, national governments or the UN system have followed up on risks identified in the UNEP assessments and taken **concrete actions to mitigate these risks**. In 2012, for example, the UNEP assessment of oil contamination in Ogoniland, Nigeria, led the national Government to commit to an unprecedented clean-up operation. In the past year, a post-conflict environmental assessment was carried out in Côte d'Ivoire and rapid assessments in Haiti, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, the Philippines and South Sudan (Upper Nile). Environmental expertise was also provided to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and UN Joint Mission in Syria.

Concerning **post-crisis recovery**, UNEP is successfully delivering complex multi-million dollar **environmental recovery programmes** under the most difficult circumstances in countries such as **Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Haiti, South Sudan and Sudan**. The *Multilateral Aid Review* by the Department for International Development (DFID) in the United Kingdom commends UNEP for its work in fragile contexts. An independent evaluation of UNEP's Disasters and Conflicts subprogramme in 2012 also favourably reported on UNEP performance in meeting demands from governments and partner institutions for UNEP support in vulnerable and crisis-affected countries.

To ensure lasting results in post-crisis countries, UNEP increasingly has to consolidate its efforts in a relatively small number of countries due to the level of investment needed and because sustainable results in such contexts can only be achieved with long-term continuous support. Nevertheless, it has made significant progress in ensuring that post-crisis recovery processes contribute to improved environmental management

and sustainable natural resource use. In Haiti, for example, based on UNEP's analysis, the first ever marine protected areas were designated. In the DRC, UNEP designed a water quality analysis strategy for a safe drinking water initiative targeting 9000 beneficiaries. In a particularly notable example, in Sudan UNEP not only improved environmental management at particular sites but supported the integration of environmental considerations into seven UN and international strategies and 11 governmental reform processes, as well as supporting the development of several new ministries with environmental mandates.

To achieve such results and ensure they are sustained, UNEP will use country selection criteria as a basis for deciding where its support is most warranted and will add value in line with recommendations from the evaluation. Added value includes leveraging UNEP expertise on the green economy, ecosystem management and environmental law to support environmental recovery programmes in post-crisis countries.

TABLE 02: DISASTERS AND CONFLICTS RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS				
Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) Risk Reduction</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased investment in initiatives using national environmental management capacities for risk reduction with the assistance of UNEP	11% increase over Dec 2009 figures (USD 2.6 million)	50% increase over Dec 2009 figures	758%* (USD 22.3 million)	
<b>EA (b) Post-crisis Assessment</b>				<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓✗)
Increased percentage of inter-agency post-crisis needs assessments and national recovery plans that identify, prioritize and cost environmental needs with the assistance of UNEP	75%	90%	85%	
<b>EA (c) Post-crisis Recovery</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased percentage of the total long-term relief and post-crisis recovery funding focused on environment and natural resource management and associated livelihood projects with the assistance of UNEP Strategy	68% increase over Dec 2009 figures (USD 15 million)	100% increase over Dec 2009 figures	333% (USD 65 million)	

\* While the targets have been exceeded, these indicators have not proven useful. Their use is discontinued in the future programmes of work.

## Ecosystem Management

UNEP's subprogramme on Ecosystem Management responds to the emphasis on ecosystem degradation in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA). It aims to translate the MA's findings into a workable programme for application at national and regional levels, and to assist countries to use an ecosystem approach to enhance human wellbeing. UNEP has proposed a four-step process to progressively incorporate the concept of ecosystem services for human well-being into development planning and processes:

- **Making the case for ecosystem management** through awareness raising, capacity building, advocacy and policy support;
- **Generating knowledge on ecosystem management approaches** by documenting best practices, and developing tools to enable countries to apply ecosystem management;
- **Turning knowledge into action** at the country, regional and global levels
- **Monitoring evaluation and feedback** of the status of ecosystem services by offering technical support for the development and review of indicators of ecosystem service delivery and facilitating review of the delivery of ecosystem services against established baselines

Over the 2012-2013 biennium, the subprogramme took significant steps to build on gains made in the previous biennium while advancing work on the three expected accomplishments: **enhanced capacity of countries and regions to integrate an ecosystem management approach into development planning processes; countries and regions have the capacity to utilize and apply ecosystem management tools;** and **strengthened capacity of countries and regions to realign their environmental programmes to address degradation of selected priority ecosystem services.**

In regard to **enhanced capacity of countries and regions to integrate an ecosystem management approach into development planning processes**, with UNEP support during this biennium **eight countries** prepared **development planning** documents demonstrating their enhanced capacity to integrate ecosystem services (including ecosystem health) as a component of sustainable development. Fourteen development planning documents were finalized in 2010-2011. In response to UNEP work on **incorporating the value of forest-related ecosystem services into national accounts**, the Kenyan Government announced a similar exercise on a larger scale. The Conference on the Gaborone Declaration for Sustainability in Africa held on 7-8 October 2013 agreed to begin assigning monetary value to the benefits provided by natural resources, including ecosystems such as forests, grasslands, and coral reefs. With regard to Gabon, UNEP has begun implementing the development of a forest resource account and intends to complete the work by December 2014. Implementation of a similar project in Morocco is at the discussion phase as UNEP wants to ensure that there is institutional synergy with the World Bank led WAVES initiative which is also planning to carry out similar work in the country, thus avoiding duplication of work.

With the political and technical support of UNEP and IUCN, work on the Mayombe Forest Transboundary Protected Area was initiated in July 2009 at a ministerial conference attended by the environment ministers of Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Republic of the Congo. The Memorandum of Understanding signed at the conference has led to strategic studies on ecological corridors, land use and property rights, comparative studies on existing legal and policies frameworks, and identification of potential areas for the designation of a transboundary protected area. A five-year transboundary plan has been prepared and endorsed.



UNEP organized events during the biennium to showcase successful efforts by countries and organizations to undertake **valuation and accounting of natural capital**. The International Conference on Valuation and Accounting of Natural Capital for Green Economy (VANTAGE) in Africa was held at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi in December 2013, in partnership with the African Union Commission (AUC), the World Bank, the UN Statistics Division (UNSD) and the Government of Kenya. UNEP took part in the High-level Expert Panel on Food Security Issues at the 15th Annual Biodiversity and Economics for Conservation (BIOECON) Conference. With participants from the BIOECON professional networks, it discussed and developed future sustainable agricultural strategies and ways to integrate them into planning processes.

With respect to the capacity of **countries and regions to utilize and apply ecosystem management tools**, UNEP has assisted **23 countries** (13 in the 2012-13 biennium) to use UNEP **tools to address ecosystem degradation**. Although the Innovative Approaches towards Rehabilitating the Mau Ecosystem Project in Kenya targets only one ecosystem, its outputs are strengthening the institutional capacity of the partner organizations and have increased public and political support for ecosystem restoration at the national level. Tools to improve the management of the Mau Ecosystem are being developed, including feasibility assessment for payment for ecological services (PES), a Strategic Management Plan, an Environmental Monitoring Plan, and baseline data for REDD+. To support the livelihoods of communities near the project area, opportunities for income generation are being identified.

The Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP) is a unique alliance that protects great apes and their habitat through a secretariat shared by UNEP and UNESCO. In 2013, GRASP launched the report, *Stolen Apes*, which spurred creation of an illegal trade database; co-hosted the Great Apes Summit, which produced new funding for DNA and satellite monitoring projects; helped restore 30 hectares of protected rainforest in Indonesia; promoted frontline efforts through the GRASP-Ian Redmond Conservation Awards; and supported community-led gorilla tourism in Congo that contributed to sustainable landscape management through protected areas, community managed zones and certified logging concessions.

A management plan for the Silverbank Marine Mammal Sanctuary in the Dominican Republic prepared with UNEP technical assistance and financial support was approved by the government. A framework was developed by UNEP, GEF-STAP and CBD to collect practical experiences on marine spatial planning to identify lessons and possible enabling factors for effective implementation. The expected output will inform UNEP and GEF programming and CBD's COP11 Decision on MSP (XI/18 Paragraph C). Draft principles for Island Ecosystem Management in the Pacific were formulated by a SPREP and WCS with UNEP support and illustrated with regional case studies. The output will inform discussions at the SIDS/Barbados+20 conference in 2014 and UNEP programming on Ecosystem Management.

The knowledge and skills of national planners have been enhanced in using indicators and data analysis methods for regional assessment of the state of the marine environment in Western and Central Africa (Abidjan Convention countries) and the South West Pacific Region (Lima Convention countries). Regional maps of marine mammal distribution, human activities and draft management scenarios have been developed by UNEP and SPAW-RAC with government agencies and experts to inform transboundary spatial management of marine corridors in the East Caribbean in support of the SPAW Protocol under the Cartagena Convention.

Concerning the **strengthened capacity of countries and regions to realign their environmental programmes to address degradation of selected priority ecosystem services**, countries face different levels and types of ecosystem degradation. UNEP assists countries to identify priority ecosystem services, including those in biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), and to develop and implement plans

26 to realign environmental programmes to address these priorities. Over the 2012-13 biennium, UNEP assisted **19 countries** to incorporate their priority commitments to Target 16 of the **Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing** (ABS), paving the way for them to implement actions geared towards meeting these commitments through national budgets and with assistance from development partners.

The **Science-Policy Interface on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, IPBES**, was further strengthened at its second plenary session in Antalya, Turkey in December 2013. Agreement was reached on, inter alia, the first IPBES work programme and budget.

TABLE 03: ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS				
Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) Capacities to integrate Ecosystem Management into Development</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of national and regional development planning processes that consider ecosystem services as a component for sustainable development with the assistance of UNEP	14*	19	22	
<b>EA (b) Building Capacities to use Ecosystem Management Tools</b>				<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓✗)
Increased number of countries addressing ecosystem degradation through the application of UNEP-supported ecosystem management tools with the assistance of UNEP	10	20	23	
Increased number of terrestrial or aquatic ecosystems managed to maintain or restore ecosystem services with the assistance of UNEP	8	18	17	
<b>EA (c) Ecosystem services &amp; financing</b>				<b>“Not Achieved”</b> (✗)
Increased number of national and regional planning instruments that include commitments and targets to integrate ecosystem management at the national, regional and sectoral levels with the assistance of UNEP	6	16	6**	

\* Actual baseline: 14 based on performance as at Dec 2011. Revised target: 19 (+5 new)

\*\* Actual target value is the same as the baseline value due to absence of data

## Environmental Governance

UNEP's Environmental Governance subprogramme is designed to ensure that environmental governance at the country, regional and global levels is strengthened to address agreed environmental priorities. The strategy comprises of:

- **enhancing coherence and synergy:** to improve the manner in which the UN system and multilateral environmental agreements are coordinated and work in a coherent manner
- **strengthening norms and institutions:** to enhance the capacities of countries to meet their international obligations and national priorities
- **mainstreaming the environment into development processes:** to help countries integrate environment into sectoral and development processes and plans and support the integration of poverty and environment objectives
- **strengthening the science base of governance:** to provide countries with scientific information and analyses for use in policy- and decision-making

With respect to **enhancing coherence and synergy**, Member States addressed the shortcomings of a fragmented international environmental governance system, aiming to achieve more coherent, effective and efficient international environmental policy-making and a more integrated approach to sustainable development. As a result of activities under this subprogramme, including a consultative process on the **International Environmental Governance** (IEG) reform undertaken under the aegis of UNEP, the international community agreed at Rio+20 on elements of a reform agenda, reflected in the Rio+20 outcome document 'The Future We Want' and subsequent resolutions and decisions.

UNEP works with the rest of the UN on **system-wide coherence and coordination** on environmental issues. Greater coordination has been achieved in the way the UN system addresses several targeted issues. The **Environmental Management Group**, for which UNEP provides the Secretariat, is the key vehicle used to make progress in many areas. Over the 2012-2013 biennium, a mapping tool on **biodiversity** was developed to help the UN system track its support to implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. A UN Action Plan for coordinated action in **drylands** (2012-2018) was also prepared. The UN system is making good progress in advancing its **environmental and social sustainability**, including through a guidance document and a peer review system on how to integrate environment and social considerations in the work and operations of the system. The UN agreed on a more coordinated approach to support Member States' efforts on the **green economy** in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. **Chemicals management** was approved by the UN agencies in the Environment Management Group as a new issue for cooperation for 2014-2015. To bring greater coherence to the international environmental governance framework, UNEP worked to help countries enhance synergies among key multilateral environmental agreements. The integration of the objectives of biodiversity related MEAs in national implementation tools (e.g. National biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans) creates opportunity to achieve greater coherence and efficiency in national implementation. Progress was achieved on improving synergies through a country led process which identified ways of strengthening sound management of chemicals and wastes in the long term, through enhanced implementation, coordination and cooperation at the national level and better opportunities for financing.

Regarding **strengthening of norms and institutions**, UNEP focused its efforts at both the international and national levels. It supported intergovernmental processes leading to adoption of new international agreements

28

such as the Minamata Convention, as well as continued development of existing MEAs, and worked in various areas of international environmental law to promote a greater integration of environmental standards in other sectors, enhance coherence, and increase clarity and understanding of existing legal frameworks and relevant linkages.


To facilitate access by environmental professionals at regional and global levels, **information on environmental law** has been made available through a unique **portal** managed by UNEP in partnership with relevant MEA Secretariats. At the national level, UNEP focused on enhancing capacities and promoting an enabling environment for implementation of international regimes (particularly existing MEAs) and, more broadly, on supporting countries' efforts to achieve internationally agreed goals or national priorities. It supported integration of international environmental obligations into **national legislation**, focusing on a variety of issues including water management, biodiversity conservation, law for a green economy, and chemicals management. It supported the development and implementation of framework environmental laws in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), South Sudan and other countries.

Another important element to support countries capacities to address the environment through adequate legal, policy and institutional measures is the overall context in which these efforts take place, thus the importance of general principles that underlie the work of institutions, such as the rule of law, the recognition of participatory rights, transparency and accountability. It engaged a broad range of actors beyond the executive branch of governments, including judges, prosecutors and public auditors, and undertook initiatives in partnership with major groups and stakeholders (for example, to promote wide implementation of Rio Principle 10 on access to information, public participation and access to justice and the related UNEP guidelines).

Regarding **mainstreaming the environment into national development processes**, UNEP's strategy is to help Member States progressively take environmental considerations into account in development processes and plans. In the 2012-13 biennium, UNEP continued to work with UN country teams and governments to mainstream the environment into the development sector including in the context of poverty alleviation, including through the UNEP-UN Development Programme (UNDP) Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) as well as regional and subregional fora. **Twenty-five countries integrated environmental considerations into UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs)**. The level of integration reflects priorities established by countries. Environmental considerations are integrated into 79 countries' UNDAFs (or 72 per cent of the countries using UNDAFs as a planning tool for UN-wide assistance). **Poverty-environment linkages were integrated in 83 instruments in 20 countries** where the PEI partnership between UNEP and UNDP is operating. Including environmental considerations in national sectoral and development plans, including UNDAFs, creates an enabling environment that can ultimately lead to changes in the approach to development.

With respect to the **scientific basis supporting environmental decision-making**, UNEP produced and disseminated a number of thematic and geographically based scientific **assessments** that provide scientific information and policy-relevant analysis needed to inform sound decision-making and policies from the national to the international levels, resulting in strengthening of the science-policy bridge and in informed discussions within various intergovernmental fora including Rio+20 and in the post-2015 agenda process.

**FIGURE 11: Countries with UN related development planning processes (UNDAF)**



**TABLE 04: ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) International Policy Setting</b>				
Increased number of coordinated approaches to environmental issues targeted by UNEP that are addressed in a complementary manner by other United Nations entities and multilateral environmental agreements	10*	13*	14	<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓✗) **
Increased number of inter-agency partnerships and joint initiatives between UNEP and other United Nations entities to tackle complementary environmental issues	30	35	34	
Increased number of coordination activities concerning environmental issues addressed under the Environmental Management Group, the Chief Executives Board for Coordination and United Nations Development Group that are being acted upon by partner United Nations entities	8	11	17	
Increased number of joint initiatives undertaken by multilateral environmental agreement secretariats and UNEP showing progress towards measurable environmental outcomes	25	27	30	

\*\* Three indicator targets have been over achieved and one indicator target nearly achieved

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (b) Strengthening Environmental Law</b>				
Increased number of States implementing laws to improve compliance with environmental goals and targets as agreed at the relevant United Nations summits and conferences and the conferences of parties to multilateral environmental agreements with the assistance of UNEP	16	21	22	<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of international organizations that demonstrate progress towards measurable environmental outcomes after applying UNEP policy advice in the area of the environment	16**	17**	18	
<b>EA (c) Integrating Environment into Development</b>				
Increased number of United Nations country teams that successfully mainstream environmental sustainability into common country assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks	66***	76***	91	<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
	22	25	83	
Increased percentage of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks in countries where UNEP has intervened that present a coherent environment and development package	0	3	25	
<b>EA (d) Sound Science for Decision making</b>				
Increased number of UNEP-led or UNEP-supported environmental assessments cited in academic writings, leading newspapers and other relevant media	62	65	5120****	<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓⊗)
Increased participation of researchers and institutions from developing countries in UNEP led/supported environmental assessments	55%	56%	48%	

\* Actual baseline value: 10 (based on performance as at Dec 2011). Revised Target value: 13 (+3 new/additional)

\*\*Actual baseline value: 16 (based on performance as at Dec 2011). Revised Target value: 17 (+1 new/additional)

\*\*\* Actual baseline value: 66 (based on performance as at Dec 2011). Revised target value: 76 (+10 new)

\*\*\*\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work

## Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste

Chemicals play an important role in every economic sector and virtually every industry worldwide. Many are critical to human well-being and development. UNEP's Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste subprogramme helps countries improve the management of chemicals and hazardous waste throughout their life-cycles. The strategy was:

- **Sound management at national levels:** to increase the capacity of countries to assess, manage and reduce risks to human health and the environment posed by harmful chemicals and hazardous waste
- **International policy and technical advice:** to help develop coherent international policy and technical advice so that countries can manage harmful chemicals and hazardous waste in a more environmentally responsible manner
- **Policy and control systems for harmful substances of global concern:** to help countries develop and implement policy and control systems for harmful substances of global concern and in line with their international obligations

During 2012-2013, to increase countries' capacity for **sound management at national levels**, UNEP helped **23 countries** develop **legislation**, integrate sound chemicals management into **development planning processes**, assess the cost of inaction, form policy guidance on **chemical accident prevention** and develop responsible production guidelines for **risk management** in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Three of these countries have assessed their need to revise chemicals legislation, two have drafted chemicals legislation, seven are in the process of integrating sound chemicals management into national development strategies, four have been helped by UNEP to develop policy guidance on chemical accident prevention and eleven have had assistance in drawing up responsible production guidelines for the safe use and handling of hazardous chemicals in SMEs. Four of the twenty-three countries had more than one activity ongoing.

Concerning **international policy and technical advice**, the UNEP-supported **Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)** Secretariat extended the SAICM's Quick Start Programme, which has to date distributed USD 32 million. The fourth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) in 2015 is expected to finalize the strategy for achieving its goal of sound chemicals management by 2020. Under the auspices of the SAICM, **78 countries** have reported their progress in implementing policies for sound chemicals management. The 2014-2015 biennial work programme aims to increase the number of countries that have appropriate legislation and economic instruments in place so that sound chemicals management at national level will continue and expand in line with the GC 27/12 decision. Eight countries have applied UNEP guidance to assess the costs of improper chemicals management, and another five are assessing and/or developing legislation or legal and institutional infrastructure to enable sound chemicals management. Ten intergovernmental organizations use UNEP guidance to promote sound chemicals management at regional and national levels.

While UNEP helps countries improve their overall management of harmful chemicals and hazardous waste, in some cases it is necessary to target specific chemicals of high concern. For example, heavy metals such as lead, which is one of the top ten chemicals of major health concern. The **Global Alliance to Eliminate Lead in Paint**, led by UNEP and the World Health Organization (WHO) and with 27 participants, aims to phase out the manufacture and sale of paints containing lead. A new partnership with the International Paint and Painting

32 Ink Council (IPPIC), whose membership comprises trade associations around the world, ensures private sector support. The aim is to **phase out lead in paint by 2020**.


Another lead related initiative, is the **Partnership for Clean Fuels and Vehicles**. In **2002**, when UNEP launched this partnership **82 countries used leaded petrol**. The UNEP-sponsored study, *Global Benefits From the Phase-out of Leaded Fuel* estimated the cost of eliminating leaded petrol to the global economy at USD 2.4 trillion (4 per cent of global GDP)<sup>2</sup>. At that time, 48 of 49 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa used leaded fuel; whereas **today** only **six** countries globally still use it.

While health and environmental benefits often take years to become visible, **blood level analysis** carried out before and after leaded petrol was phased out in Nairobi, Kenya showed that mean blood lead levels dropped from 8.0 microgrammes per decilitre during the pre-phase-out period to 5.6 microgrammes per decilitre in the post phase-out period – a 38 per cent decrease in blood lead levels. Phasing out lead in petrol globally would mean 1.2 million fewer deaths per year, of which 125,000 are children.

Most chemicals incorporated into products are benign but some are of concern due to known or suspected risks. From toys and furniture to electronic equipment and textiles, addressing the problems and challenges posed by these chemicals in products requires coordinated international action. UNEP through its multi-stakeholder work on **Chemicals in Products** continues to advance on formulating guidance on how to address this emerging policy issue, which aims to ultimately ensure that sufficient information is available for informed chemicals management decisions.

The **Global Partnership for Waste Management** continues to foster dialogue and coordinate individual members’ activities on a range of waste issues, including e-waste, municipal solid waste, waste oils and health care and integrated solid waste management.

**FIGURE 12: Progress of leaded petrol phase out in Sub-Saharan Africa**





These multi-stakeholder initiatives showcase the strategic relevance of partnerships in promoting sound chemicals management and increasing UNEP's outreach capacity.

In regard to **policy and control systems for harmful substances of global concern**, UNEP's support for the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee led to the adoption of the 2013 **Minamata Convention on Mercury**. The Global Mercury Partnership, whose membership continues to grow, was key in offering timely advice to Minamata negotiators, and in helping to build capacity and facilitate early action. UNEP provides the Secretariat for the Minamata Convention during the interim period (prior to entry into force). UNEP also coordinates the eight partnership areas of the Global Mercury Partnership. Through the Partnership, which includes 26 governments, five UN agencies and 98 companies, technical assistance and financial support has been provided to 57 countries.

UNEP provides expertise and capacity building to help developing countries assess and take action towards environmentally sound management of chemicals and waste, and to meet their reporting requirements related to legally binding instruments. It supports Parties' implementation of their obligations under the Stockholm Convention on **Persistent Organic Pollutants** (POPs). Sixty-eight countries have national inventories on dioxin and furan releases that complement the global monitoring plan for POPs. Two examples of UNEP guidance are the Dioxin/Furan Toolkit to develop national release inventories, and guidance for the Global Monitoring Plan on POPs. This stream of work is largely funded by the GEF, with four regional projects focused on implementing the **global monitoring plan** for POPs recently approved.

**TABLE 05: HARMFUL SUBSTANCES AND HAZARDOUS WASTE RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) Sound management at national level</b>				<b>"Partially achieved"</b> (✓✗)
(i) Increased number of countries and stakeholders implementing policies in sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	162*	172*	171	
(ii) Increased number of countries that have incentives, including market-based incentives and business policies and practices promoting environmentally friendly approaches and products aiming at reduced releases of and exposures to harmful chemicals and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	49**	56**	49**	
(iii) Increased support to developing countries to assess, manage and reduce risks to human health and the environment posed by chemicals and hazardous waste	65	76	76	

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (b) International policy and technical advice</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
(i) Increased number of Governments and other stakeholders showing reductions in harmful substances and hazardous waste as a result of applying UNEP guidelines and tools on assessment, management and replacement of hazardous chemicals and waste management with the assistance of UNEP	40	72	72	
(ii) Increased number of international subregional and regional organizations applying UNEP guidance on harmful substances and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	0***	8	10	
(iii) Increased number of intergovernmental, regional and national policymaking processes that consider, address and monitor the environmental, economic, social and human health impacts of harmful substances and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	98****	108****	240	
<b>EA (c) Policy and control systems for harmful substances of global concern</b>				<b>“Partially Achieved”</b> (✓⊗)
(i) Agreement is reached at the international level on the means of addressing mercury with the assistance of UNEP	N/A	1	1	
(ii) Increased number of countries with control systems and policies being implemented to meet their international obligations with regard to harmful substances and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	498	560	529	
(iii) Increased number of countries showing reductions in harmful substances and hazardous waste as a result of their control systems and policies with the assistance of UNEP	20	30	76	

\* Actual baseline value: 162 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value (non-cumulative): 172

\*\* Actual baseline value: 49 (based on performance of Dec 2011. Revised target value: 56 (+7 new). Actual target value is the same as the baseline value due to absence of data.

\*\*\* Established baseline value is 0.

\*\*\*\* Actual baseline value: 98 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value: 108 (+10 new)



36 the **10 Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production**. Member States' call for action on green economy also fostered the launch of PAGE, "**Partnership for Action on Green Economy**", a joint UNEP, ILO, UNITAR and UNIDO initiative. Governments' capacity to manage resources and mainstream sustainability aspects in development planning has overall been strengthened in 42 countries, 11 of which have adopted or implemented related policies.

An enabling policy environment is key to encouraging private sector investment in **sustainable business practices**. UNEP has launched the 120-member **Green Industry Platform with UNIDO**, and two additional UNIDO-UNEP **National Cleaner Production Centres** have been set up to further support the uptake of sustainability practices by SMEs. This brings the network to **50 centres** to enable SMEs adopt resource efficient practices.

In key target sectors, UNEP's work through multi-stakeholder partnerships aims at providing knowledge and tools to support the uptake of more resource efficient technologies and practices by the private sector and stimulate the adoption of supportive policies. UNEP **Finance** initiative contributed to the Principles for Sustainable Insurance, launched at Rio+20, which gathers **42 insurance companies** signatories – representing approximately **15 per cent of world premium volume** –, 30 of which have already publicly disclosed how they are implementing the Principles.

The **33-member Sustainable Building and Construction** Initiative contributed to greater awareness and adoption of sustainable building policies. For example, it supported reporting on building energy efficiency initiatives in 7 countries and facilitated the application of the Common Carbon Metric, which measures energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions from building operations, in 3.

UNEP further strengthened its partnership with the **Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)** through the FAO-UNEP Sustainable Food Systems Programme and Agri-Food Task Force on SCP to scale up sustainable practices in **food** supply chains. Specifically on **rice**, which uses **34-43 per cent of the world's irrigation water**, is responsible for 5-10 per cent of global methane emissions and representing more than 20 per cent of the daily calories of 3.5 billion people, the multi-stakeholder Sustainable Rice Platform is developing a farm-level methodology for **sustainable rice production** and innovative incentive mechanisms for its uptake, to be pilot tested in the next biennium.

To raise awareness that about one-third of all food production worldwide is lost or wasted, and to mobilise citizens and relevant stakeholders to prevent and reduce food waste, a major communication effort was initiated with the "Think.Eat.Save. Reduce Your Foodprint".

**Sustainable consumption** enabling policies, methodologies and use of tools have also been strengthened. 61 countries or organizations joined the international **Sustainable Public Procurement** Initiative, launched at Rio+20. A major effort to build the capacities of relevant public authorities for environmental printing was conducted in **18 countries** so far. On **sustainability reporting**, the Group of Friends of Paragraph 47, also launched at Rio+20, which promotes provision of more information to stakeholders on companies' sustainability practices, has been joined by **nine Governments**.

UNEP with the rest of the UN is reducing its environmental impact. The **UN Milestones Framework for Environmental Management Systems** is the reference framework for implementing emission reduction strategies and environmental management systems (EMS). Results include an increase in the number of **UN agencies** improving their **sustainability** practices.

TABLE 06: RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND SCP RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) Bridging science and policy</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of UNEP-associated scientific assessments, analytical reports and scarcity alerts used and referenced by a specified number of target Governments and public and private sector organizations	100,000 downloads 25 references	200,000 downloads 50 references	1,000,000* downloads 145 references	
<b>EA (b) Taking policy action</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of Governments and other public institutions implementing policies, economic instruments and initiatives for resource-efficiency improvements and introducing environmentally sustainable aspects into their economies	10	20	21	
<b>EA (c) Increasing sustainable business practices</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased number of businesses adopting and investing in resource-efficient management practices and technologies and cleaner and safer production methods	60	70	82	
<b>EA (d) Stimulating more sustainable products and lifestyles</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increase in the sales of targeted resource efficient and environmentally friendly products, goods and services	USD 52 billion (third party certified organic foods) 160,000 certifications with ISO 14001	USD 60 billion (third party certified organic foods) 180,000 certifications with ISO 14001	USD 62.9 billion as of 2011 <sup>3</sup> 250,972 as of 2011 <sup>4</sup>	
Increased number of Governments, companies and consumer groups with access to and making use of recognized tools and communications made available through UNEP-supported initiatives when making purchasing decisions with respect to more resource efficient and environmentally friendly products, goods and services.	20	40	59	

\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work

3 Data from the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) is obtainable with two-year delays


4 Data on ISO certifications is obtainable with two-year delays.

# BUDGET PERFORMANCE


UNEP’s biennial budget planned for 2012-2013, comprising the Environment Fund, Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions<sup>5</sup>, the UN Regular Budget including UNSCEAR<sup>6</sup> & UN Development Account allocations and Programme Support Costs (OTA), was USD 479.6 million. Overall budget allocations for the biennium were **USD 556.5 million<sup>7</sup>, exceeding the planned budget by 16 per cent** due to the unspent fund balances brought forward from the previous biennium and higher than planned contribution receipts for trust funds and earmarked contributions in 2012-2013. Total expenditure for the 2012-2013 biennium was USD 438.4 million, approximately 91per cent of the approved budget (see Figure 14) .

Despite exceeding the targeted budget, **demand** for UNEP services outstripped the financial resources to deliver support to member states. This is in part because, under United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS), funding for multi-year projects is recorded as income for the biennium in which it is received while in reality it is to be utilized over the life of the projects, often exceed or overlap a biennium. A significant part of contributions received by UNEP are earmarked for specific projects and thus unavailable for meeting incoming demands for services from countries unless these services are those to which funding was earmarked. Thus, for UNEP’s subprogrammes on Climate Change and Environmental Governance, fund balances carried forward

**FIGURE 14: The financial overview of UNEPs POW for 2012-2013 by source of funding**



**FIGURE 15: Analysis of 2012-2013 budgets and income by fund category**



5 Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions for Conventions, Protocols and Regional Seas Action Plans, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Multilateral Fund are not included in this report  
 6 United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation  
 7 Financial figures in this report are preliminary and based on data as at 31 December 2013

from the previous biennium allowed allocations to exceed the 2012-2013 approved budget, and meant that certain actions received more attention based on donor earmarked priorities.

At 1 January 2012, the Euro cash pool balance held by UN Treasury on behalf of UNEP was Euro 145 million (equivalent to USD 187 million), which constituted a major currency fluctuation risk that would alter actual income available to UNEP. During 2012-2013 UNEP reduced the Euro cash pool by instructing the sale of Euros when exchange rates were favourable. UNON has been requested to now maintain a maximum balance of Euro 6 million, to cover operational requirements for a two month period, thereby largely eliminating the currency risk associated with the Euro cash pool.

## Analysis of Donor Contributions

UNEP's Secretariat is supporting its Member States and partners in the transition to a global responsibility for its voluntary funding in the spirit of universal membership. Other than USD 18 million from the regular budget of the UN and UN Development Account, UNEP must mobilize from individual donors financial resources for its other sources of funding—the Environment Fund, Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions. In the context of the continued global economic crisis, **Environment Fund** contribution receipts were **lower** than the USD 191 million approved budget for the biennium. UNEP secured 152.2 million in contributions and miscellaneous income of its Environment Fund - USD 38 million, or 20 per cent less than the targeted budget. When the fund balance of 13 million brought forward from the previous biennium is included, available Environment Fund resources in 2012-2013 amounted to USD 165 million – 86 per cent of budget. The Executive Director applied prudence by issuing 2012-2013 allocation of USD 158 million based on the the actual income received and by utilizing USD 6 million of the USD 13 million fund balance of unspent Environment Fund contributions carried over from the 2010-2011 biennium.

During the biennium UNEP secured USD 392 million in Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions – USD 150 million more than the targeted biennial budget of USD 242 million. This growth, as compared to rather stagnant Environment Fund contributions, may have been as a result of governments facing budget constraints and hence needing to demonstrate more selectively in public spending by earmarking for selected subprograms and projects.

The **relative increase in extrabudgetary earmarked income versus unearmarked Environment Fund income** made it more difficult for UNEP to take advanced decisions on resource allocations based on performance, resource gaps and countries requests for assistance and resulted in some areas of work having

TABLE 07: CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT FUND 2009-2013

Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Pledged contributions (in USD millions)	85.6	81.7	80.8	72.4	79.8
Paid contributions (in USD millions)	85.6	81.4	80.7	72.4	77.9
Number of contributions	102	106	111	101	99
Paid as percentage of pledged contributions	100%	88%	100%	100%	98%


**TABLE 08: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOP 15 DONORS TO THE ENVIRONMENT FUND 2009-2013.MILLIONS)**

Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Pledged contributions (in USD millions)	85.6	81.7	80.8	72.4	79.8
Pledged contributions by top 15 donors (in USD millions)	79.2	75.4	75.5	67.4	73.5
Top 15 donors as percentage of pledged contributions	92.52%	92.29%	93.44%	93.09%	92.17%

**TABLE 09: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TOP 15 DONORS TO OVERALL FUNDING OF UNEP’S POW (ENVIRONMENT FUND, TRUST FUNDS AND EARMARKED CONTRIBUTIONS) FOR 2009-2013 (IN USD THOUSANDS)**

Category	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Contributions by Top 15 Donors	148,199	190,035	175,821	198,160	288,675
Total paid contributions	182,724	218,346	204,259	222,601	321,568
Top 15 donors as percentage of total contributions	81%	87%	86%	89%	90%

**FIGURE 16: Analysis of 2012-2013 Environment Fund contributions by region (as percentage and USD millions)**





received more attention at the expense of others. Consequently the **delivery of programme of work has at times been uneven**. For instance, in UNEP's subprogramme on harmful substances and hazardous waste, while an international agreement on mercury was negotiated and adopted, other work on integrated chemicals management, has suffered, especially in terms of promoting on-the-ground application of norms and guidelines on the subject.

As summarized in Table 7, 99 countries made pledges and/or payments to the Environment Fund in 2013 compared to 101 countries in 2012 (see contributions by individual member states in Annex 1). However most of UNEP's contributions in terms of dollar value comes from a narrow base of traditional donors. Contributions from the **top 15 donors** to the Environment Fund and extra budgetary contributions together accounted for **89 per cent of the income** to these funds (see Table 9), of which 46 percent of the total contributions came from three donors (see Annexes 2 and 3 for further detail). This confirms the need for a widened donor base.

In Rio+20 Summit in June 2012, and later at the UN General Assembly and UNEP Governing Council\*, member states committed to strengthening UNEP and, in particular, to provide secure, stable, adequate and increased financial resources (SSAIFR). Simultaneously, the Member States and the UNEP Secretariat have initiated joint efforts to enable alignment of the resources with the delivery of the approved medium terms strategies, and the biennial programmes of work, so that they are delivered in an effective and balanced manner that respects the joint decisions that the governments have made. This is being pursued, particularly through contributions to the Environment Fund from a widened donor base. Increased efforts are also placed on softening the earmarking of funds towards longer term predictability and a programmatic approach. Good examples of this are the long-term partnerships with Sweden and Norway and with the recent **new partnership with Brazil and China** that are also developing in this direction.

## Expenditure Analysis

Total expenditure for the 2012-2013 biennium was USD 438.4 million, approximately **91 per cent** of the approved budget. Total Environment Fund available resources for 2012-2013 were USD 165 million, comprising USD 13 million in unspent funds carried over from the previous biennium and USD 152 million in biennial income. Total 2012-2013 expenditures for the Environment Fund were USD 156 million against allocations of USD 158 million - 99 per cent of allocations (see Figure 14). Expenditures against Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions for 2012-2013 were USD 239 million\* against allocations of 351 million - 68 per cent of allocations. The total expenditures from the regular budget of the UN<sup>8</sup> were USD 17 million against appropriations of USD 18 million. The appropriations included USD 3 million for the UN Development Account of which USD 2 million were expended (see Figure 14).

In its efforts to increase resources available for activities, UNEP significantly reduced its Environment Fund **post costs** in 2012-2013 to **USD 112 million**, lower than the post cost target of USD 122 million based on a budget of USD 191 million set by GC Decision 26/9. Figure 6 provides an analysis of post and non-post costs for budget,

\* Rio+20 outcome document "The Future We Want", A/RES/66/288, GC.27/17 decision 27/2, A/RES/67/213

\* Equal to USD 144 million from Trust Funds and USD 89 million in Earmarked Contributions.

8 Excluding allocations for the UN Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR), which UNEP provides secretariat support.

allocations and expenditures, for the Environment Fund and for total funding. Environment Fund staff costs have decreased by USD 7 million or 6% when compared to 2010–2011 costs of USD 119 million. With the General Assembly approving a **regular budget** of the UN to UNEP of **34.9 million** for the biennium 2014–2015, 23 posts will be moved from the Environment Fund and extra budgetary sources with 37 additional posts subject to a “phased approach” and initially funded from the Environment Fund. This will have a direct and structural effect on the availability of Environment Fund’s budget for activities for the whole of UNEP during the years to come.

Since 1 January 2014, UNEP has transitioned from United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS) to applying **International Public Sector Accounting Standards** (IPSAS). The 2014 and future years and biennia budget performance analysis will be based on IPSAS figures.

A parallel **data** cleansing exercise is ongoing, and has largely been completed, to enable the organization to transition from the use of the UN’s current financial management and reporting system IMIS, to a new enterprise resource planning system that has been named **Umoja** by UN HQ, a Swahili word meaning unity. This transition was, until very recently, planned for mid-2014 but has now been rescheduled by UN HQ to November 2014. The two processes (IPSAS and Umoja) will enable the organization to manage and analyse its financial performance against the programme of work in more efficient ways and we will strive to ensure additional clarity in financial data and reporting.

In spite of these exceptional circumstances, UNEP was able to contain the expenditures for Executive Direction and Management and Office for Operations below the approved budget as shown in Figure 17.

## IMPROVING PROSPECTS FOR RESULTS

Relevant and balanced information on the impact of all our operations is particularly important to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our stakeholders. We sought feedback from governments and other stakeholders on the relevance, usefulness and effectiveness of UNEP work. We received an **80 per cent satisfaction rating** on the **relevance of UNEP’s work**, **72 per cent satisfaction rating** on the **usefulness of UNEP’s capacity building support** and **60 per cent satisfaction rating** on the **organization’s effectiveness**. A survey of governments showed 87 per cent of the respondents expressing satisfaction with the quality and relevance of programme planning and performance documents.

To strengthen UNEP’s effectiveness and hence impact, we will strengthen the way in which we work with the **UN system** and **major groups and stakeholders**, establishing stronger links along the life-cycle of decision-making in the UN system. We will also strengthen the way we communicate with these groups, from the UN system to major groups and stakeholders to address their different priorities and needs. Moreover, we will ensure stronger **coherence** in addressing the needs of countries. We have established stronger standards for project review to ensure a more coherent approach to UNEP’s delivery at regional and national levels and to enable UNEP to work more strategically with partners that could be key in upscaling the use of tools and methods.

To better plan and report on UNEP’s effectiveness—essentially, the results from its work,—we have introduced the **theory of change** concept to plan and show how what we deliver enables outcomes that are attributable to UNEP. We are also refining our use of the theory of change to plan and report also on higher level changes beyond immediate outcomes to a development outcome level. This will allow Member States to see not only the outcomes that are directly attributable to UNEP but also those that are attributable to a higher level of change—development outcomes—to which UNEP contributes to with partners. We intend to use UNEP Live to routinely review the overall global context within which UNEP operates. This will enable us to ensure the relevance of our work within a broader context.


We are taking on a major transition to ensure that all planning and delivery efforts within the organization—from programme planning, human and financial resource mobilization, allocation and management to partnerships management, risk management, monitoring and evaluation—have mutually reinforcing objectives. This transition will enable us to operate in a coherent way to support attainment of results in the Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work. Already, we have taken the first steps towards **results-based budgeting**, where budgets are not based on inputs but rather on the results to which UNEP Divisions and Regional Offices contribute. We are improving the **alignment of human and financial resources** to the results in the programme of work having completed a thorough portfolio planning exercise, which has helped to determine the resources needed to deliver targeted results.

Already, **performance and risk information** is being used to support a more structured approach to management in the organization. A **project-at-risk system** in our Programme Information Management System (PIMS) now tracks programmatic, budget and project cycle risks. We are working towards a broader corporate risk system to track additional risks that will help improve management decision-making. Human resource dashboards for example will help to track human resources management in a more efficient manner, and improve efficiencies in recruitment and management, where it has been especially difficult to meet the targets UNEP had originally hoped to achieve.

International best practice also calls for processes to bring about continual improvement through both monitoring and evaluation. While UNEP’s performance monitoring and reporting process has been strengthened to ensure compliance with reporting requirements, quality in reporting and adaptive management are areas we are still strengthening. **External audits** and UN Office of International Oversight Services (**OIOS**) reviews of the organization show good performance and full compliance in implementing recommendations made. In addition, **evaluation** findings are increasingly being used to improve the quality of our programme and project planning. In their reviews of UNEP’s evaluation work, the UN Evaluation Group with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) and OIOS concluded that there is a robust evaluation function with good procedures. Table 10 shows UNEP’s performance made against several other parameters from the Programme of Work for the biennium 2012-2013 relevant to the organization’s overall management and operational effectiveness.

With key organizational reforms taking hold, UNEP is poised to increase prospects for results and enhance the benefits that our operations deliver to all stakeholders.

**FIGURE 17: Budget Performance for overall Programme of Work**



**TABLE 10: EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT RESULTS ACHIEVED AGAINST EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (a) Relevance of UNEP's work</b>				<b>"Fully Achieved"</b> (✓)
Percentage of Governments that rate relevance and impact of UNEP work (such as in support of the Bali Strategic Plan) as satisfactory	80	80	80*	
<b>EA (b) Environmental leadership in UN system</b>				<b>"Fully Achieved"</b> (✓)
Increased number of topics of global environmental concern are the focus of a coordinated approach within the United Nations system, with coherent and complementary actions carried out by United Nations entities	3	6	6	
<b>EA (c) Use of Science</b>				<b>"Fully Achieved"</b> (✓)
Increased number of initiatives included in the work of UNEP showing the strengthened use of science in the implementation of its programme of work	5	10	50**	
<b>EA (d) Accountability</b>				<b>"Fully Achieved"</b> (✓)
Increased percentage of audit and investigation recommendations and findings on UNEP performance acted upon	70	80	100	
<b>EA (e) Geographical representativeness and gender balance of staff</b>				<b>"Partially achieved"</b> (✓⊗)
Increased percentage of women appointed to posts at the P4 and above levels	35***	45	38	
Improved percentage of personnel from underrepresented Member States in posts in the Professional and management categories	15	15	31	
<b>EA (f) Efficiency in staff recruitment</b>				<b>"Not Achieved"</b> (⊗)
Reduced average number of days taken to fill a vacant extra budgetary post (measured by the time between the announcement to the appointment)*	200	120	175	

Results Achieved Against Expected Accomplishments	Baseline (2011)	Target (2013)	Actual (2013)	Assessment of performance
<b>EA (g) Servicing meetings of governing bodies</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Reduced percentage of UNEP-organized meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the Governing Council give rise to negative comments on the meeting agenda, document distribution or other logistical matters	15	12	1.9	
<b>EA (h) Implementation of Evaluation findings</b>				<b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓⊗)
Percentage of accepted evaluation recommendations on UNEP performance at the subprogramme level are implemented by the organization.	80	85	80	
<b>EA (i) Quality of programme planning and performance reporting</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased level of satisfaction expressed by the Committee of Permanent Representatives with the relevance of the programme planning and performance documents of UNEP to its mandates (expressed in percentage of those surveyed)	70	80	89****	
Level of satisfaction expressed by the Committee regarding the format, clarity and accuracy of UNEP programme documents	70	80	87*****	
<b>EA (j) Financial management</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Low numbers of adverse audit findings related to financial matters	0	0	0	
<b>EA (k) Mobilization of Financial resources</b>				<b>“Fully Achieved”</b> (✓)
Increased percentage of resources required for the year mobilized to implement the programme of work within the first half of the year	50	50	66	

\* Based on a survey conducted through Member States in the Committee of Permanent Representatives

\*\* This indicator has been used first time in PoW 2012-2013. The target value was under estimated. Upward adjustments have been made in the future programmes of work.

\*\*\* Actual baseline is 35% (based on performance of 2011).

\*\*\*\* Based on a survey conducted through Member States in the Committee of Permanent Representatives

\*\*\*\*\* Based on a survey conducted through Member States in the Committee of Permanent Representatives





# **PERFORMANCE: CLIMATE CHANGE**

*To strengthen the ability of countries, in particular  
developing countries, to integrate climate change  
responses into national development processes*



## HIGHLIGHTS

In 2013, UNEP and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) (with funding from the GEF) initiated a global support programme to assist least developed countries to advance National Adaptation Plans. This programme will be key to supporting countries with their integrated adaptation strategies on a long-term basis. In addition, the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), led by UNEP in collaboration with the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and 11 other international research and development bodies, began operations. The German Government also committed funding to a Green Climate Fund (GCF) Readiness Programme, managed by UNEP in collaboration with UNDP and the World Resources Institute (WRI). The GCF was established by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2010, to become the new operating entity of the Convention's financial mechanism and the main global fund for financing climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in developing countries.

There was strong backing at the 2013 Warsaw Climate Change Conference (COP19) for the UN-REDD Programme. Jointly implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), UNDP and UNEP, UN-REDD supports REDD+ readiness efforts in 48 partner countries. The decisions adopted in Warsaw pave the way towards full implementation of REDD+ activities, while pledges from individual countries mean the initiative is now backed by USD 280 million and can begin to deliver on its promise.

In 2013, the second year of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) to Reduce Short-Lived Climate Pollutants, the number of partners reached 75. The CCAC approved ten high-impact initiatives in areas such as municipal solid waste, cookstoves and domestic heating, and brick production. A key area of focus is dirty diesel fuels, which new research shows are largely responsible for approximately 3.2 million premature deaths annually and are a source of black carbon, the second most significant climate pollutant.

Another key element of UNEP's work on climate change is promotion of efficient and renewable energy sources, including through its contribution to Sustainable Energy for All (SE4All), a UN initiative to (by 2030) provide universal access to modern energy services, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency, and double the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix. In 2013, two UNEP supported initiatives – en.lighten, and the Global Fuel Economy Initiative (GFEI) – were key contributions to SE4All.

The Seed Capital Assistance Facility (SCAF) achieved significant results over the last biennium. SCAF assists entrepreneurs in developing countries overcome the challenges of lack of early-stage financing, high transaction costs, and insufficient risk-adjusted returns. The Facility, operated with the Asian Development Bank and the African Development Bank and funded by the Global Environment Facility and the UN Foundation, offers clean energy focused cost-sharing support to investment fund managers who include a seed investment window within their overall investment strategy. Agreements are in place with six clean energy investment funds, supporting 52 projects. Two supported projects are at the construction phase, with USD 19 million in total financing secured.


UNEP's 2013 *Emissions Gap Report* demonstrates that even if countries meet their current emission reduction pledges, greenhouse gas emissions in 2020 are likely to be 8 to 12 gigatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (GtCO<sub>2</sub>e) above the level that would provide a likely chance of remaining on the least-cost pathway to keeping the





world below a 2°C target temperature rise this century. The report continues to inform discussions on mitigation ambition levels. *Africa's Adaptation Gap*, also released in 2013, highlights the financial burden for Africa, where adaptation costs could reach USD 350 billion per year by 2070 if the two-degree target is significantly exceeded, while the costs would be USD 150 billion per year lower if the target is met.

**FIGURE 18: Status of Global Fuel Economy Initiative**



**Funds total**

The 2012-2013 total budget for the Climate Change subprogramme was USD 83 million. Total allocations issued in 2012-2013 were USD 129 million, in part due to the USD 30 million of contributions received towards the new Short Lived Climate Pollutants (SLP) trust fund. Also earmarked Contributions received more income than planned. Total expenditure was USD 93 million, 78% of allocations.

**The Environment Fund**

The 2012-2013 expenditure rate of the Environment Fund for the Climate Change subprogramme was 100% of allocations.



50 Post and non-post cost of the subprogramme are provided in Figure 20 below. It shows a higher expenditure level for posts as compared to budget.

FIGURE 19: Climate Change subprogramme budget performance




FIGURE 20: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the climate change subprogramme







FIGURE 21: UNEP Adaptation Project Portfolio 2012 – 2013





## ADAPTATION

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (a):</b> Adaptation, including an ecosystem-based approach, is incorporated into country development planning and policymaking based on scientific assessments, policy and legislative advice and lessons learned from pilot projects supported by UNEP and adaptation experiences, including an ecosystem-based approach, showcased at the global level</p>	<p>Assessment:<sup>9</sup> “Fully Achieved” (✓)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>Increased number of countries that integrate adaptation, including an ecosystem-based approach, into their national development plans with the assistance of UNEP</p>	<p>Number of countries incorporating adaptation, into development strategies and plans</p>	<p>4*</p>	<p>8*</p>	<p>9</p>

\* Actual baseline value: 4 (based on performance of Dec. 2011. Revised target value 8 (+4 new).

### Results against indicator

The target for the number of countries that integrated adaptation into their national development plans with UNEP assistance was exceeded. Adaptation planning and mainstreaming were facilitated by supporting countries’ implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), by the work of the Poverty-Environment Initiative, and by longer-term adaptation planning (i.e. through the National Action Plan process). Countries that have integrated adaptation into national plans with UNEP’s support include **Bangladesh, Bhutan, Myanmar, Mozambique, and Nepal**. Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) approaches were piloted in Nepal, Uganda, Peru and Ethiopia, as well as in several countries through UNEP’s Global Environment Fund (GEF) adaptation portfolio. This is expected to result in strengthened or restored delivery of ecosystem services, contributing to communities’ increased resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

In some situations, changes in political administration may impact on climate priorities. Regular stakeholder consultations and involvement are undertaken to ensure that Governments maintain their commitments. The results of changes in policy are not always clear during project implementation. Longer-term monitoring and an effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework are needed. Strengthened M&E components and budgets are being incorporated in new projects. Building long-term learning and knowledge management components into project design can also help establish longer-term monitoring systems through collaboration with national partners, allowing project impacts to be tracked beyond a project’s life span.

9 Assessment of progress towards expected accomplishment indicator target: “Fully Achieved” (✓) if all indicator values show progress of 100% toward target; “Partially achieved” (✓✗) if (averaged) progress of indicator value(s) is within the range 50-99%; “Not Achieved” (✗) if (averaged) progress of indicator value(s) is ≤50%.  
Narrative assessment: information on progress made in achieving EA indicator target with other supporting evidence that shows progress towards EA.



Planned Programme of Work outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Ecosystem-focused adaptation and vulnerability assessments and associated capacity development actions are undertaken and best practice approaches disseminated through relevant networks and partnerships. (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Countries are supported in efforts to maintain and restore the functioning of targeted ecosystems to provide adaptation services by undertaking ecosystem-based adaptation pilots and by scaling them up through United Nations and other partnerships and in efforts to strengthen in country capacity to implement adaptation actions, including ecosystem-based adaptation approaches. (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Countries are supported in integrating adaptation, particularly ecosystem-based adaptation approaches, into national development and climate change policies and plans, and guidelines and materials developed to mainstream ecosystem-based adaptation into the work of United Nations partners. (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Understanding of the economics of climate change impacts and economic value of ecosystem services for adaptation is strengthened and shared with United Nations partners for inclusion in their programmes (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Countries are supported in efforts to gain access to adaptation financing and to build their capacities for direct access to such financing (Target: five countries)</p>	<p>By December 2013, UNEP had provided advisory services to support assessments in 12 countries, including six cities in Asia, as well as regional assessments in the Pacific and the Andes and Chacos regions in Latin America. Currently, 28 GEF-financed UNEP adaptation projects support maintenance and restoration of mountain, dryland, coastal, forest and agricultural ecosystems to enable countries adapt to climate change. Vulnerability, impact and adaptation assessments were finalized in mountain ecosystems in three countries. Comprehensive hydrological and vulnerability assessments were undertaken in the Nile River Basin, with pilot activities implemented in two countries. Upscaling outcomes through partnerships is facilitated through their incorporation in the Nile Climate Change Strategy.</p> <p>Adaptation was mainstreamed through support for countries’ implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and strengthening capacities for development of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). The NAP Global Support Programme (GSP) provides support to all LDCs, but contains a component providing one-on-one technical support to LDCs requesting it. Twenty-five LDCs have requested such support. Sixteen countries (Uganda, Nepal, Peru, Seychelles, Grenada and 11 Nile Basin countries) are being supported to integrate EbA into national policies, and five have integrated adaptation into national development plans.</p> <p>The 2013 report Africa’s Adaptation Gap highlights Africa’s increasing vulnerability to climate change and provides estimates of adaptation costs.</p> <p>Guidance on the environmental and financial benefits and costs of 40 EbA actions was produced in the context of partnership with microfinance institutions. Cost-benefit analyses of EbA in mountain ecosystems are under way in several countries.</p> <p>Since UNEP’s programme to support countries’ direct access to the Adaptation Fund (AF) began in 2010, 19 countries and one regional entity have been supported towards accreditation of their National Implementing Entities (NIEs). Nine countries and one regional entity submitted NIE applications to the AF Board and two countries’ NIEs have so far been accredited. Partnerships were developed with six microfinance institutions in two countries, and investment decision-making processes were created for financing EbA actions by small-scale farmers. Privately financed investments have begun to flow. Public policy opportunities are being identified in order to catalyze large-scale EbA.</p>



## CLEAN ENERGY

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (b):</b>                  Low carbon and clean energy sources and technology alternatives are increasingly adopted, inefficient technologies are phased out and economic growth, pollution and greenhouse gas emissions are decoupled by countries based on technical and economic assessments, cooperation, policy advice, legislative support and catalytic financing mechanisms</p>	<p>Assessment:  <b>“Fully Achieved” (✓)</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>Increased number of countries implementing energy plans, including low carbon alternatives, with explicit renewable energy or energy efficiency policies with the assistance of UNEP</p>	<p>Number of countries implementing energy policies and measures with explicit renewable energy or energy efficiency components</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>31</p>

### Results against indicator

The target for the number of countries implementing policies and measures with explicit renewable energy or energy efficiency components resulting from UNEP projects was significantly exceeded. Twenty-seven are implementing activities to phase out incandescent lighting by 2016, and more than 55 countries world-wide have committed to make a transition to efficient lighting. Globally 78 countries have completed their Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and thirty-two have done so with UNEP’s support. In addition 30 countries have also produced their Technology Action Plans with UNEP support. Vehicle fuel efficiency policies and standards were developed in seven countries. A mandatory fuel labelling system was adopted in several countries, supported by the Global Fuel Economy Initiative (GFEI). The Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) began operations.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Impacts within a single country are sometimes limited, as UNEP support is spread across several countries. To manage this risk, UNEP has increasingly bundled its activities. Mitigation cuts across ministries, and achieving government coordination on policies and actions, may be challenging. In its activities, UNEP stresses the importance of coordination across ministries as a component of projects. It increasingly establishes inter-ministerial task teams at the outset of projects. Setting up these task teams and developing a modus operandi usually means a slower project start, but pays off in the long run.



Planned Programme of Work outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Economic and technical (macroeconomic, technology and resource) assessments of climate change mitigation options that include macroeconomic and broad environmental considerations are undertaken and used by countries and by major groups in developing broad national mitigation plans. (Target: eight countries).</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Technology-specific plans are developed through public-private collaboration and used to promote markets for and transfer of cleaner energy technologies and speed up the phase-out of obsolete technologies in a manner that can be monitored, reported and verified. (Target: eight countries).</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Knowledge networks and United Nations partnerships to inform and support key stakeholders in the reform of policies, economic incentives and the implementation of programmes for renewable energy, energy efficiency and reduced greenhouse-gas emissions are established, supported and used to replicate successful approaches. (Target: three regional networks).</p>	<p>Over 70 developing countries completed their TNAs. Thirty-two countries had completed TNAs with UNEP’s assistance in April 2013, reaching a national consensus on priority sectors and related technologies; 30 had also produced national Technology Action Plans (TAPs). Building on the TNAs and TAPs, UNEP supports seven countries in the design of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) Forty-two NAMAs have been submitted by 11 countries. NAMA development for the agriculture and waste sectors was completed by one country.</p> <p>Vehicle fuel efficiency policies and standards were developed in seven countries, and a mandatory fuel labeling system was adopted in one. Proposals for geothermal exploration studies were developed for four countries; two were selected. Fifty-five countries committed to phase out inefficient incandescent lighting, and 27 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and the Middle East initiated development of National or Regional Efficient Lighting Strategies. These Strategies will result in the phase-out of incandescent lighting globally by 2016.</p> <p>Three regional climate change networks continue their activities: the Southeast Asia Network of Climate Change Offices (SEAN-CC), the Regional Gateway for Technology Transfer and Climate Change Action in Latin America and the Caribbean (REGATTA), and the Low Carbon Emission Societies Capacity Building network for Central Asia.</p> <p>During the biennium UNEP continued to enhance its global knowledge networks. There are three global knowledge sharing networks/portals: the Clean Energy Solutions Center (CESC,) the Global Network on Energy for Sustainable Development (GNESD) and the Renewable Energy Policy Framework for the 21st Century (REN21). In 2013, the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) began operations.</p>



## ENERGY FINANCE

<b>Expected Accomplishment (c):</b> Countries’ access to climate change finance is facilitated at all levels and successful innovative financing mechanisms are assessed and promoted at the regional and global level	Assessment: <b>“Fully Achieved” (✓)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target (cumulative)</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Indicator of Achievement</b>	<b>Unit of Measure</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2013</b>
Increased level of national investment in clean technology projects and projects related to adaptation and mitigation supported by UNEP that are implemented with international climate change funding	Total value of investments that result from UNEP projects in clean energy	USD 200 million*	USD 300 million*	USD 432 million

\* Actual baseline value: USD 200 million (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value: USD 300 million (USD 100 million increase)

### Results against indicator

Over USD 400 million in investments have been stimulated by UNEP energy finance projects, primarily due to the significant level of funds mobilized by the Seed Capital Assistance Facility (SCAF). Besides USD 10 million in seed capital raised for 19 projects, two SCAF-supported projects are now at the construction phase, with USD 215 million in financing secured. USD 60 million was committed by investors under the SCAF to the Armstrong Fund for renewables projects. USD 45 million was recently committed by the Lereko Metier Sustainable Capital Fund. The Mediterranean Investment Facility (MIF) mobilized USD 84.5 million in clean energy investments. The Climate Finance Innovation Facility (CFIF) stimulated USD 16 million for development of new finance products for the clean energy sector. Finance for Access to Clean Energy Technologies (FACET) obtained a commitment of USD 10 million from local banking partners to implement small-scale clean energy technologies. The African Rural Energy Enterprise Development Programme (AREED) previously leveraged nearly USD 2 million from local banks for clean energy projects.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Despite the positive results of UNEP programmes, there is a risk that potential clean technology investors will remain unaware of such climate finance opportunities. Focused efforts are therefore needed to effectively promote successful outcomes. In this regard, a communication roadmap for the mitigation programme was developed and is currently being implemented.





Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Financing barriers are removed and access to financing is improved for renewable and energy-efficient technologies through public-private partnerships that identify costs, risks, and opportunities for clean energy and low-carbon technologies. (Target: eight countries; leveraging of USD 10 million)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Use of the Clean Development Mechanism and other innovative approaches to mitigation finance is stimulated through analyses and the development and application of relevant tools and methodologies, including on environmental sustainability and measuring, reporting and verification compatibility. (Target: eight countries; leveraging of USD 30 million)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Institutional capacity for assessing and allocating public funding and leveraging private investment for clean energy is strengthened and new climate finance instruments are developed and applied by financiers, lenders and investors. (Target: eight countries; leveraging of USD 60 million)</p>	<p>By the end of 2013, UNEP had mobilized clean energy finance investments of approximately USD 432 million. This was achieved through initiatives such as the Seed Capital Assistance Facility (SCAF), which provides seed capital and technical assistance to clean energy fund managers to invest in clean energy projects. The SCAF operates in Asia and Africa through six private equity funds and has provided enterprise development support and seed funding to development of 17 renewable energy projects. Support has been given to 15 countries and a regional programme. Total investment leveraged was USD 330 million.</p> <p>Based on successful implementation of the SCAF, funding in the order of USD 18 million has been secured from two countries to support a programme aimed at engaging funds and investors that provide early stage financing to low carbon project developments and ventures in the next eight years.</p> <p>Another finance programme facilitates investments in renewable energies by end users. The approach began with solar water heating for the residential sector in one country and has been replicated in other sectors (e.g. hotels, industrial), countries (Tunisia, Egypt, Montenegro) and technologies (e.g. compact fluorescent light, photovoltaics).</p> <p>This project approach has also been replicated at city level. UNEP has managed several projects focused on building capacities to manage public funding and leverage private investment. Public finance institutions in six countries have received climate finance related technical assistance support. Nine commercial banks in Asia have been supported in developing new financing products for the clean energy sector, leveraging USD 16 million in investment.</p>



## REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (d):</b> Reduction in deforestation and land degradation with countries moving towards sustainable forest management, conservation and full terrestrial carbon accounting based on tackling all drivers of deforestation, and taking fully into account co-benefits and safeguards</p>	<p>Assessment: <b>“Partially achieved”</b> (✓✗)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>(i) Increased number of countries implementing sustainable forest management plans including REDD plans to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation, with the assistance of UNEP</p>	<p>Number of countries with sustainable forest management plans that include REDD plans</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>17</p>
<p>(ii) Increased percentage of land being managed to reduce emissions from deforestation as a result of implementation of sustainable forest management plans including REDD plans, with the assistance of UNEP</p>	<p>Number of national REDD-based investment plans finalized by countries, or begun implementation</p>	<p>0*</p>	<p>5*</p>	<p>3</p>

\* Actual baseline value: 0. Revised target value: 5 new.

### Results against indicator

The Programme objective for the period 2011-2015 is to promote the elaboration and implementation of national REDD+ strategies to achieve REDD+ readiness, including transformation of land use and sustainable forest management and performance-based payments. The Programme supports national REDD+ readiness efforts in 48 partner countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America, covering 56% of the world’s tropical forest. Seventeen countries have REDD+ National Programmes designed to support the development of strategies to address drivers of deforestation and update sustainable forest management plans to include REDD+. Four of these countries have completed their National Programmes and are moving into Phase 2 implementation. Three countries have integrated REDD+ into their sustainable forest management planning, set up funds for this purpose, and finalized REDD+ investment plans.



**Risk analysis and risk management measures**

The current risk concerns ensuring the sustainability of actions in countries in order to achieve the required impact of reducing land degradation and deforestation regardless of developments at the international level. Ensuring sustainability in light of uncertainties at the international level partly requires focusing the readiness work on multiple benefits and the potential for REDD+ to be a cornerstone for a green economy transition.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Countries are supported in efforts to develop their capacities for delivering REDD and transforming the management of their forests and related sectors to achieve lower greenhouse-gas emissions, conservation, more sustainable forest development and enhancement of forest stocks through the assessment of drivers of deforestation, the analysis and application of guidelines for addressing multiple benefits, and their monitoring, and trade-offs among forest and land-use choices and in promoting stakeholder participation. (Target: five countries)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Countries are supported in building their capacities to leverage investments for sustainable changes to forest use and to negotiate and reach investment agreements that draw on opportunities arising out of REDD (forest carbon) and broader use of and benefits from forests. (Target: two countries).</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Tools to enable the full inclusion of terrestrial carbon mitigation (or accounting) are developed (i.e., agriculture, other land uses and coastal areas) and tested for broader uptake in the work of three international partner agencies. (Target: three agencies (UNDP, FAO, CGIAR)).</p>	<p>The UN-REDD Programme continues to provide support to countries in developing their capacities to deliver REDD+. Seventeen countries have UN-REDD National Programmes. These Programmes are designed to assist developing countries in preparing and implementing national REDD+ strategies and mechanisms. They also help them develop their capacities to implement REDD+ strategies and move towards REDD+ readiness. The 48 partner countries supported by the UN REDD programme cover 56% of tropical forest. UNEP is the lead on two substantive work areas: (1) Realising the multiple benefits of forests and (2) the development of safeguards. UNEP is currently providing targeted support for the assessment of multiple benefits (both ecosystem and social benefits) in at least seven countries, up from four in 2012. UNEP is working with three countries (5 target countries have been identified for the period up to 2015) to develop and implement safeguards. REDD safeguards cover a range of issues including the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, transparent and effective national forest governance structures, as well as protecting knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. Thanks to increased funding commitments by Norway, UNEP will be scaling up the work on multiple benefits and safeguards.</p> <p>In 2013, UNEP undertook a study on “using spatial information to support decisions on safeguards and multiple benefits for REDD+ in Tanzania”. The maps developed under the study are expected to increase understanding of the spatial distribution of potential REDD+ benefits and also support decision-making on where and how REDD+ might be implemented. Tanzania is a good example, because it is now being used as a model of the type of work that can be done in countries and already this work has been used to shape work in Nigeria and Republic of Congo. The project has developed detailed technical tutorials in the use of open source software for REDD+ planning, enabling forest services throughout the world to undertake the same analyses.</p>



## SCIENCE AND OUTREACH

Expected Accomplishment (e): Increased access of target audiences to relevant climate change assessments and information for decision-making and long-term planning	Assessment: “Partially achieved” (✓ ☒)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of sector specific local, national and regional development plans that incorporate climate-related assessment with the assistance of UNEP	Number of sector-specific development plans integrating climate-related assessments	12 *	14*	12*
(ii) Increased number of findings or results from UNEP climate change work in press and media with the assistance of UNEP	Number of quoted findings from UNEP climate change work in selected national and regional media**	1650	1850	34005

\*Actual baseline: 12 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target: 14 (+ 2 new) . Actual target value is the same as the baseline value due to absence of data

\*\* Measurement focuses on press articles in national and regional media referencing UNEP’s work on climate change. While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work.

### Results against indicator

UNEP was unable to obtain accurate information to validate the indicator. However, four major global governmental processes<sup>10</sup> made use of UNEP’s climate related findings. UNEP has produced some key assessments that informed international negotiations and policy discussions in 2012 and 2013. These include the study on black carbon, which provided the scientific basis for the CCAC initiative, and the updated *Emissions Gap Report*, which informed climate negotiations on the emission reductions actions that countries need to take by 2020. The European Union (EU) has cited the mitigation potentials identified in the *Emissions Gap Report*. This report informs EU strategy. During the biennium, 34,000 media articles referred to UNEP work on climate change. The number of visits to UNEP’s climate change websites reached 1,355,917 in 2013.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Staffing/capacity issues remain urgent. Short-term recruitment of staff to manage aspects is under way but is not a long-term solution. The Division of Communication and Public Information (DCPI) does not have sufficient resources to deliver in all official UN languages.

10 The Camp David Declaration by the Leaders of the Group of Eight (May 2012), the Svalbard (Ministerial) Declaration on Shortlived Climate Forcers (March 2012), the Gothenburg Protocol to the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (revision adopted May 2012), and restructuring the World Climate Programme (WCP).



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Science-based assessments (including sectors and scenarios) are undertaken and publicized and used to support climate change policy planning and decision-making. (Target: three assessments)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Climate negotiators, decision makers and other affected stakeholders are provided with relevant scientific information. (Target: three groups of negotiators)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> UNEP climate change work to support countries on adaptation, clean technology and forest management and other major climate change subjects is communicated to key target audiences, including major groups, leading to discourse and uptake of policy and implementation in countries. (Target: All countries receiving UNEP support in this subprogramme)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Research and assessment capacities are strengthened in developing countries to prioritize, accelerate, consolidate, harmonize and mobilize research on climate change vulnerability, impact and adaptation to support decision-making by policymakers, planners and resource managers. (Target: eight countries)</p>	<p>The fourth update of the Emission Gaps Report was released in November 2013 before the UNFCCC COP19 in Warsaw. It was referenced throughout the climate talks. Examples of other recently released UNEP science-based assessments include Policy Implications of Warming Permafrost, Blue Carbon – First Level Exploration of Blue Carbon in the Arabian Peninsula, and Drawing Down N2O to Protect Climate and the Ozone Layer.</p> <p>In 2012-2013, UNEP hosted a number of training programmes for climate negotiators, as well as providing supporting material. The focus has been on Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and small island developing states (SIDs), to support their negotiators in developing and sharpening their positions.</p> <p>The number of visits to the climate change website was 739,993. With 615,924 visits to the CCAC site, this totals 1,355,917. Outreach and communication at major events included UNEP participation in COP19, where a communication strategy was implemented with the slogan “The Future is Priceless – Put a Price on Carbon!” UNEP organized, facilitated and participated in several COP19 side events, such as the Secretary-General’s High Level Event on the UN System as a Catalyst for Climate Action; supported the launch of key publications including the 2013 Emissions Gap Report; and disseminated various outreach materials.</p> <p>UNEP established the Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation (PROVIA) to provide the latest scientific research and methodologies linked to Vulnerability and Impact Assessment (VIA). PROVIA released a synthesis report on VIA research gaps and priorities in June 2013. The PROVIA guidance on VIA assessments, completed in November 2013, was presented to UNFCCC Parties at COP19. In May 2013, PROVIA was approved as a fourth component of the World Climate Programme (WCP). The WCP, established by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), primarily aims at enhancing climate services with an adequate focus on user interaction, in order to facilitate useful applications of climate information to derive optimal socio-economic benefits. It thereby underpins the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS).</p>



# **PERFORMANCE: DISASTERS AND CONFLICTS**

*To minimize environmental threats to human well-being from the environmental causes and consequences of existing and potential natural and man-made disasters*



## HIGHLIGHTS

### Risk Reduction

UNEP played a lead role in developing a significant body of knowledge to help countries better assess and address the environmental dimensions of disasters and conflicts. The best practices collected by UNEP were incorporated into UN-wide guidance on natural resource management in transition settings that was endorsed by 38 UN entities. Capacities for environmental management and risk reduction were built in over 20 countries across Africa, Asia and Europe as well as Latin America.


### Post-crisis assessment

UNEP responded to requests to identify environmental risks stemming from disasters and conflicts in 13 countries, including the Philippines and Syria, where it has deployed environmental experts to advise the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and UN Joint Mission on the destruction of Syria’s chemical weapons stockpile. Since 2008, national governments or the UN system have followed up on risks identified in UNEP assessments and taken concrete actions to mitigate risks in 85% of a total of 20 countries.

### Post-crisis recovery

To consolidate achievements to date, UNEP focused its environmental recovery efforts on five countries: Afghanistan, Haiti, DRC, South Sudan and Sudan. Through UNEP support to Sudan, in 2012-2013 environmental considerations were integrated into seven UN and international strategies and 11 governmental reform processes while new ministries with environmental mandates were established.

FIGURE 22: UNEP interventions related to disasters and conflicts 2010-2013









**Funds total**

The 2012-2013 total budget for the Disasters and Conflicts subprogramme was USD 50 million. Total allocations issued in 2012-2013 were USD 32million. Total expenditure was USD 30 million, 94% of allocations.

**The Environment Fund**

The 2012-2013 expenditure rate of the Environment Fund for the Disasters and Conflicts subprogramme was 100% of allocations.

Post and non-post cost of the subprogramme are provided in Figure 24 below. It shows a higher expenditure level for posts as compared to budget.





## RISK REDUCTION

Expected Accomplishment (a): Enhanced capacity of Member States for environmental management in order to contribute to natural and man-made disaster risk reduction	Assessment: “Fully achieved” (✓)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
Increased investment in initiatives using national environmental management capacities for risk reduction with the assistance of UNEP	Percentage funding increase for risk reduction	11% increase over Dec 2009 figures (USD 2.6 million)	50% increase over Dec 2009 figures	758% (USD 22.3 million*)

\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work

### Results against indicator

In 2012-2013, the amount of international funding dedicated to initiatives using environmental management as a tool to reduce conflict and disaster risk in UNEP-assisted countries totaled USD 12.6 million. The target for the 2012-2013 biennium – a 50% increase over December 2009 figures – was significantly exceeded: a total of USD 22.3 million has been secured since 2010, representing a 758% increase over the 2009 baseline of USD 2.6 million. This substantial increase in funding can be attributed to the following secured grants: EUR 2.5 million from the EU for Eco-DRR demonstration projects, EUR 3 million from the Government of Finland for Phase III of the Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding programme, and USD 500,000 for disaster risk reduction from the UN Development Account. UNEP has also successfully leveraged an additional USD 150,000 for DRR through the World Bank and the Center for Natural Resources and Development.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Deteriorating security conditions in countries where UNEP pilot projects are being executed can challenge implementation of field activities. To minimize risk, project managers closely monitor all areas of concern. UNEP also builds flexibility into project work plans and utilizes strong local partners to deliver activities, thereby also contributing to the sustainability of project results. In terms of policy support, incorporating technical approaches for conflict and disaster risk reduction into field-level programming requires a strong presence on the ground and approaches that are amendable according to the country’s context. UNEP is therefore designing tailor-made risk reduction strategies with strong backstopping from UNEP country operations.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Risk assessments and pilot projects are delivered in countries (and regions) vulnerable to natural hazards and conflicts as a result of environmental factors to catalyse practical risk reduction action by Member States and other United Nations entities. (Target: 15 assessments)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Policy support, including tools and training on best practices for reducing conflict and natural hazard risk through improved environmental management, are provided to relevant United Nations agencies, Member States, and subregional institutions. (Target: 24 institutions or countries)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> National preparedness to respond to and mitigate acute and secondary environmental risks caused by conflicts and disasters is improved through risk information and capacity development. (Target: six countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> National and local preparedness to respond to and mitigate environmental risks from industrial accidents are strengthened through capacity development and institutional and legal frameworks. (Target: six countries)</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Awareness of the environmental dimensions of disasters and conflicts is raised through multimedia communication initiatives targeting relevant stakeholders in countries receiving support and partner agencies, Governments and the general public at the international level. (Target: six initiatives)</p>	<p>Degraded ecosystems and natural resource endowments that are managed in unsustainable ways can become factors of disaster and conflict risk in countries that have low capacity to assess and address these risks. Reducing environmental degradation and improving the management of natural resources can contribute to protecting human well-being from conflicts and disasters. UNEP therefore aimed to increase the capacity of vulnerable countries to use environmental management to reduce the risk of disasters and conflicts. UNEP specifically targeted requesting countries with limited resilience and capacity.</p> <p>Over the biennium, pilot projects and risk assessments were conducted in 15 countries to catalyse practical risk reduction action. One notable result is the development of national action plans for ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction in Afghanistan, Haiti, DRC and Sudan. Further progress to apply risk reduction approaches is planned for 2014.</p> <p>Emergency plans were initiated for three sites in China to increase preparedness for industrial accidents. The aim is to upscale this approach through the UNEP Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at Local Level (APPELL) network.</p> <p>Action was taken by the UN peacekeeping mission, the Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), to reduce its environmental footprint. The UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) also took up energy and water efficiency measures. The aim is to catalyze such change through the rest of the system of UN peacekeeping missions.</p> <p>Field interventions were complemented by policy support and training to 24 institutions and national governments on environmental best practices for conflict and disaster risk reduction. In DRC, for example, the Water Management Policy now under review includes disaster risk reduction measures.</p> <p>To further develop countries’ capacities, a knowledge platform and community of practice on environmental peacebuilding has documented experiences from 60 conflict-affected countries. In addition, 19 universities in 15 countries are offering a graduate level course on ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction (eco-DRR) with UNEP support. The Environmental Emergencies Centre (ECC), an online training platform for environmental emergency and response developed by UNEP together with OCHA, is also operational. In addition, UNEP developed short educational videos on community pilot projects using eco-DRR and capitalized on TEDx talks to expand its reach, target new audiences, and showcase novel approaches to conflict and disaster risk reduction.</p>



## POST-CRISIS ASSESSMENT

Expected Accomplishment (b): Rapid and reliable environmental assessments following conflicts and disasters as requested	Assessment: “Partially achieved” (✓✗)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
Increased percentage of inter-agency post-crisis needs assessments and national recovery plans that identify, prioritize and cost environmental needs with the assistance of UNEP	Ratio of UNEP assessments to international needs assessments and recovery plans with environmental priorities	75%	90%	85%

### Results against indicator

In the second half of 2013, UNEP undertook rapid assessments in four requesting countries: Kenya, the Philippines (following Typhoon Haiyan), South Sudan (Upper Nile) and Syria. UNEP also completed fieldwork for a post-conflict environmental assessment in Côte d’Ivoire. It is currently under review by the Government. Cumulatively, since 2008, such UNEP support has led to the inclusion of environmental priorities and needs in 17 of 20 countries where it was able to respond to demand: an 85% success rate for uptake of UNEP recommendations.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

With multiple agencies engaged in environmental emergency response, a key step for improving the efficiency of response is to baseline existing capacities, roles and mandates and to ensure all actors are aware of them in order to improve coordination. Following GC decision 26/15, UNEP undertook the development of an information-sharing mechanism that would ensure more integrated and efficient emergency response. Furthermore, in a post-crisis context rapid action is often required to respond to multiple needs. In these situations environmental expertise must be available immediately after the event to ensure environmental concerns are assessed and factored into the initial response. Additional expertise should also be available for longer periods to ensure proper implementation of preliminary recommendations. Where additional engagement is not requested, UNEP should maintain dialogue with humanitarian actors to ensure uptake of assessment findings.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Environmental expertise is coordinated and mobilized to identify and mitigate acute environmental risks to human health stemming from emergencies and related secondary risks and catalyse mitigation action by affected countries and United Nations partners. (Target: 12 interventions)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Field-based scientific assessments are conducted to identify environmental risks to human health, livelihoods and security and catalyse mitigation action by conflict and disaster affected countries and United Nations partners (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Environmental needs and priorities are integrated into national recovery plans and United Nations peacebuilding and recovery strategies in conflict and disaster-affected countries. (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Environmental considerations are integrated into humanitarian relief policies, operations and appeals to ensure that humanitarian operations do no harm. (Target: four relief policies, operations or appeals)</p>	<p>During this biennium, UNEP responded to requests to identify environmental risks stemming from emergencies in 12 countries: Comoros, Congo Brazzaville, the Gambia, Haiti, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, the Philippines, Samoa, South Sudan and Syria. In each case UNEP ensured it undertook its operations within the UN system’s post-crisis support system, with the aim of ensuring uptake of findings by both governments and the UN.</p> <p>UNEP responded to the impacts of the devastating Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines by deploying a waste management specialist and an oil spill expert to advise on immediate clean-up efforts. An environmental field advisor was also recently deployed there for six months, ensuring that major environmental concerns are integrated into humanitarian and reconstruction efforts.</p> <p>UNEP experts have been deployed to Syria and embedded in the OPCW-UN Joint Mission to advise both the Joint Mission and Syrian officials on environmental risks related to packing, transporting and destroying Syria’s chemical weapons stockpile. Operations are ongoing and expected to last well into 2014.</p> <p>In Côte d’Ivoire, UNEP undertook a Post-Crisis Environmental Assessment (PCEA) to baseline environmental conditions. It covers several key sectors: forests, including national parks and classified forests; environmental degradation of Ebrie Lagoon; environmental issues related to unplanned urban expansion; and industrial and artisanal mining. The Government is reviewing the findings.</p> <p>In Sudan, due to continued UNEP support following a post-conflict environmental assessment released in 2007, environmental considerations were integrated into seven UN and international strategies and 11 governmental reform processes.</p> <p>Concerning relief efforts, UNEP also continued to support integration of environmental issues into key humanitarian documents in Sudan using the UNEP-initiated Environment Marker, an innovative tool for screening projects submitted for humanitarian funding for their environmental impact. In 2013, 339 participants were trained in North Darfur and Khartoum. To date, there have been over 20 trainings on use of the Environment Marker. More than 380 projects have been assessed, with 59% maintaining a strong positive environmental component. In South Sudan, a rapid environmental assessment of the refugee-hosting areas in Maban county, Upper Nile, was conducted jointly by UNEP and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), leading to drafting of an environmental strategy for these areas.</p>



## POST-CRISIS RECOVERY

<b>Expected Accomplishment (c):</b> Improved environmental management and sustainable use of natural resources that have built upon the inter-agency post-crisis assessment and recovery process	Assessment: <b>“Fully achieved”</b> (✓)	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target (cumulative)</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Indicator of Achievement</b>	<b>Unit of Measure</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2013</b>
Increased percentage of the total long-term relief and post-crisis recovery funding focused on environment and natural resource management and associated livelihood projects with the assistance of UNEP Strategy	Percentage increase in environment funding in relief and recovery budgets	68% increase over Dec 2009 figures (USD 15 million)	100% increase over Dec 2009 figures	333% (USD 65 million*)

\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work

### Results against indicator


In 2012-2013, UNEP secured approximately USD 31.5 million for environmental recovery projects. Since 2009 it has secured USD 65 million, representing a 333% increase over the 2009 funding baseline (USD 15 million). The significant increase in funds is attributable to successful efforts in Afghanistan, Haiti and Sudan, where UNEP has a track record of delivering effective projects aimed at improving environmental management capacity. In Afghanistan, for example, UNEP has secured the first ever full-size GEF project (with a total budget of USD 6 million), which aims to improve climate resilience. UNEP also recently launched a USD 8.5 million project in North Darfur to improve sustainable livelihoods, while securing some USD 11.5 million in Haiti to support sustainable energy, agroforestry, and marine ecosystems regeneration.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Deteriorating security situations in countries such as Afghanistan, South Sudan and Sudan can pose challenges for timely delivery of project outputs; however, UNEP has developed a series of strategies to ensure programme delivery in the most difficult conditions, including detailed preparation, extensive training of field staff, and development of flexible implementation plans that allow adaptation to political and security developments at country level. Slow bureaucratic processes (including government delays in issuing visas and travel permits for international personnel) can also challenge project activities. To mitigate these risks, UNEP has worked to develop flexible and self-sustaining project activities to ensure work can continue in tenuous security climates. Projects also rely on national consultants and resident in-country international consultants where possible. When developing large projects in-country, care needs to be taken to ensure thematic activities combine to deliver the intended project objective. UNEP has provided training to all programme managers on developing theories of change to inform project and programmatic design.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Environmental policy and institutional support are provided to post-crisis countries as part of United Nations peacebuilding and recovery activities. (Target: five countries)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Environmental clean-up projects are catalyzed with United Nations partners at sites contaminated by hazardous substances and wastes as a result of conflicts or disasters. (Target: three projects)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Ecosystem restoration and management projects are catalyzed with United Nations partners for sites damaged by conflicts or disasters. (Target: two projects)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> National and local authorities and United Nations partners in post-crisis countries are supported in efforts to apply sustainable building and construction guidelines as a contribution to building back better. (Target: two projects)</p>	<p>To consolidate achievements to date and leverage the strength of established partnerships, UNEP focused its efforts on five countries (Afghanistan, DRC, Haiti, South Sudan, Sudan) within the framework of United Nations recovery support. The countries where UNEP operates are characterized by significant environmental degradation, important natural resource governance gaps, limited technical and institutional capacity, and insecurity. Thus long-term, sustained investments are paramount to ensure UNEP efforts can become self-sustaining.</p> <p>In Sudan, new ministries with environmental mandates (e.g. the Ministry of Water Resources and Environment; the Ministry of Environment, Youth and Tourism) were established with UNEP support. Sudan is on track to be the first country to complete a National Adaptation Plan. UNEP also launched a new three-year, USD 8.5 million project to demonstrate integrated natural resource management in North Darfur. In South Sudan, where waste management and population growth are an escalating problem, UNEP undertook a series of waste characterization assessments and the Juba City Council is developing a waste recycling system.</p> <p>In Haiti, ecosystem restoration has been supported through the Government’s move to designate the country’s first ever marine protected areas based on UNEP analyses. Haiti is crippled by energy poverty, but UNEP catalyzed development of two private sector-driven renewable energy projects.</p> <p>UNEP is also advancing local-level watershed management in DRC, including rehabilitation activities, development of participatory three-dimensional models, and a series of training events on environmental law. In addition, UNEP developed a water quality operational framework for the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF) Healthy Villages National Programme, targeting 9000 beneficiaries.</p> <p>UNEP is executing Afghanistan’s first ever full-sized GEF project to build adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change. Demonstrations in four provinces are being established and baseline data, field locations. Strengthened partnerships are in place with provincial government and civil society partners.</p> <p>The project on sustainable building and construction guidelines was terminated in early 2013. The guidelines have been produced and are publicly available, but have not been pilot tested due to insufficient funding.</p>







# **PERFORMANCE: ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

*To ensure that countries utilize the ecosystem  
approach to enhance human well-being*



## HIGHLIGHTS


Countries have been assisted through a global initiative, The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity, to make progress towards a green economy by engaging policy makers, entrepreneurs and experts from different fields. The use of science in policy making has also been strengthened through the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), established in 2012. UNEP facilitates IPBES inter-sessional processes and plenary meetings. There are currently 111 IPBES members.

In May 2012, the inaugural Global Land-Oceans Connections Conference and the third session of the Intergovernmental Review meeting on the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities convened in Manila, the Philippines. 64 Governments and the European Commission adopted the Manila Declaration, which focuses on nutrients, marine litter and wastewater. The Global Nutrient Management Partnership and the Global Partnership on Waste Water Management have gained wide acceptance and support by countries, as well as private sector stakeholders.

Through the application of UNEP-developed tools, 11 countries use integrated ecosystem-based management plans for marine protected areas; forest valuation and accounting is used in Senegal and Kenya; ecosystem management of freshwater resources is used in the Zambezi and Tana River Basins; a transboundary management plan is used in the Mayombe Forest (Congo Basin); the Iraqi Marshlands are being rehabilitated as a World Heritage site; and a trade-off analysis between ecosystem services and food security has been carried out in India and Uganda. Ecosystem rehabilitation projects include the Mau Forest in Kenya (40,000 hectares recovered), the Haiti regeneration initiative, and the LifeWeb protected areas project.

UNEP continues to make the case on issues such as illegal trade in wildlife, the green economy, and the land-ocean connection through awareness raising activities (including sensitizing journalists). The UNEP and International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change (IHDP) Inclusive Wealth Report 2012 contributes to understanding the importance of ecosystem services.

**FIGURE 25: UNEP Ecosystem Management Project Portfolio 2012-2013**






**Funds total**

The 2012-2013 total budget for the Ecosystems Management subprogramme was USD 68 million. Total allocations issued in 2012-2013 were USD 86 million as Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions received more income than planned. Total expenditure was USD 68 million, 79% of allocations.


**The Environment Fund**

The 2012-2013 expenditure rate of the Environment Fund for the Ecosystems Management subprogramme was 100% of allocations.

**FIGURE 26: Ecosystem Management subprogramme budget performance**



**FIGURE 27: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Ecosystem Management subprogramme**





## CAPACITIES TO INTEGRATE ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT INTO DEVELOPMENT

<b>Expected Accomplishment (a):</b> Enhanced capacity of countries and regions to integrate an ecosystem management approach into development planning processes	Assessment: “Fully achieved” (✓)	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target (cumulative)</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Indicator of Achievement</b>	<b>Unit of Measure</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2013</b>
Increased number of national and regional development planning processes that consider ecosystem services as a component for sustainable development with the assistance of UNEP	Increased number of national and regional development planning documents that show a relationship between ecosystem health, ecosystem services and sustainable development	14*	19	22

\* Actual baseline: 14 based on performance of Dec 2011. Revised target: 19 (+5 new)

### Results against indicator

Eight national development planning documents demonstrate that countries are incorporating ecosystem services (including ecosystem health) as a component of sustainable development. Haiti incorporated an ecosystem management approach in its environmental restoration plan, as part of post-disaster recovery development planning. In Kenya two management plans (for the Mau Forest ecosystem, and integrated water resources management in the Tana River Basin) are guiding ecosystem restoration. In the Dominican Republic, a marine protected area management plan is in place for the Silverbank Humpback Sanctuary. Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua approved a final draft policy seeking to harmonize contradicting legislation on mangroves to ensure their comprehensive management and protection. A joint transboundary plan exists for the Mayombe ecosystem (Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Republic of the Congo), with countries jointly setting up an operational Secretariat to ensure the coherence of their efforts. The Borneo Futures Project (Indonesia and Malaysia) provides countries with reliable data, tools and scenarios for land use planning and for sustainable and equitable land use management choices. Senegal completed the review and pilot testing of the use of a forest eco-taxation model in national planning processes. Bio-cultural community protocols in four countries (Cameroon, Colombia, Indonesia, Peru) were developed through community engagement in policy discussions.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Political dynamics in the Congo Basin countries have slowed implementation of the transboundary management plan UNEP and partners have supported. To address this risk, UNEP has facilitated high-level meetings among relevant Member States to renew commitment and re-energize the Secretariat set up by countries. Involvement of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in the trans boundary project has provided further sustainability.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Global, regional and national awareness and understanding of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services for sustainable development are improved. (Target: United Nations agencies and all countries supported by UNEP under this subprogramme)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Policy dialogue with all sectors of society using economic evidence of the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services is promoted and used for development planning. (Target: five countries)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Regional cooperation mechanisms are promoted to strengthen or develop regional policies and laws for the management of transboundary ecosystems. (Target: three transboundary ecosystems)</p>	<p>Based on increased awareness and regional mechanisms in place for conservation of transboundary ecosystems in the Hindu Kush region (Mount Kailash ecosystems) and the Congo Basin countries, including availability of scientific data and relevant tools and methodologies, UNEP contributed significantly to improved understanding of the value of ecosystems, ecosystem services and biodiversity in regions and countries – mainly in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean. It disseminated over 130 press releases to international media at key events, including RIO+20, the Governing Council (GC) and the World Water Forum, resulting in over 45,000 articles on ecosystem management issues.</p> <p>UNEP provided media training during the GC and a workshop for 40 journalists at the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties (COP11), and gave technical support to the CBD Secretariat on media matters. UNEP ecosystems management websites received some 209,000 visits over the biennium and social media continued to be used. UNEP hosted a number of capacity building workshops with key partners (e.g. the Ecosystem Services Partnership conference in Bali), mainly focusing on the science-policy interface and tools for integrated ecosystem assessment and management. These workshops built the capacity of approximately 60 participants from several countries to better understand and manage the science-policy interface and use the InVEST tool.</p> <p>The Sub-Global Assessment (SGA) Network facilitated a session on ecosystem services in boosting green economies in biosphere reserves at the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) African Biosphere Reserves Network (AfriMAB) General Assembly in Ghana in September 2013, developing the capacity of participants from at least 20 African countries in the area of ecosystem services and their contribution to the green economy. A parallel session was held at the 9th Pacific Islands Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in Fiji in December 2013 on the role of ecosystem assessments in supplying the evidence base for bridging the science-policy interface. Representatives of Pacific countries participated.</p> <p>UNEP and its partners engaged communities in policy discussions leading to the development of bio-cultural community protocols in four countries. In Kenya a high-level policy dialogue promoted an ecosystem-based management approach to conservation and management of the country's water towers, which are threatened by ecosystem degradation due to anthropogenic activities.</p>



## BUILDING CAPACITIES TO USE ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT TOOLS

Expected Accomplishment (b): Countries and regions have the capacity to utilize and apply ecosystem management tools	Assessment: “Partially achieved” (✓✗)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of countries addressing ecosystem degradation through the application of UNEP-supported ecosystem management tools with the assistance of UNEP	Number of countries and regions using UNEP-supported ecosystem management tools to tackle ecosystem degradation	10	20	23
(ii) Increased number of terrestrial or aquatic ecosystems managed to maintain or restore ecosystem services with the assistance of UNEP	Number of ecosystems where activities are completed or under way to maintain or restore ecosystem functioning with UNEP assistance	8	18	17

### Results against indicator

Thirteen additional countries were supported by UNEP in using its tools to address ecosystem degradation. Kenya uses ecosystem management tools developed with UNEP assistance for the restoration of the Mau Forest Complex. Conservation tools for protected areas are used in the Central African Republic, El Salvador, Panama and the Republic of the Congo. With UNEP support, Indonesia and Sierra Leone use ecosystem-based management tools to manage marine protected areas. Mozambique has developed a drought management tool to manage freshwater resources. At the regional level, economic evaluation was carried out for the Zambezi River with eight riparian countries. Papua New Guinea uses an ecosystem-based spatial planning tool for marine protection. Five countries use the guidance manual for valuation and accounting of ecosystem services. UNEP supports development of a framework for establishing protected areas in the Iraqi Marshlands. Economic assessment in national and regional contexts is ongoing, as seen in work in India and Uganda on the trade-off analysis of food security and ecosystem services. Development of an analytical tool to link the contribution of forests to various economic sectors in Kenya was completed. Gabon and Morocco requested assistance to do similar work. The Great Apes monitoring and reporting tool was developed, and plans are under way to support its use by two range states in Cameroon and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Additional nine ecosystems have either implemented or are in the process of implementing ecosystem approach. In Kenya and with specific UNEP support over 40,000 hectares of Mau Forest land were recovered, tree seedlings successfully planted, the forest boundary demarcated, and institutions and instruments to oversee the restoration effort established at national and county government level. Erosion and siltation in Kenya’s Tana River basin ecosystem was arrested through constructing sand dams, planting trees and community wood lots and practicing on-farm conservation activities. In Mauritania, UNEP supported the overall surveillance with patrols along the coast of Cape Blanc while also spectacular new monk seal caves were identified and photo-trap cameras installed to monitor seal populations as basis for future management planning. Activities



are ongoing concerning the broad-scale marine spatial planning of marine mammal corridors in the Wider Caribbean and East Pacific facilitating the sharing of knowledge on data collection methodology and mapping, as well as marine mammal management strategies. Support provided to 2 National Parks and 1 Natural Park in Guinea Bissau to protect marine turtles regionally have led to improving fishing zones and regulations, improved maritime surveillance and the development of a plan to monitor critical species and habitats. Support included the development of a regional mapping of the climate change and anthropogenic risks to sea turtles. Several years of data collection and advocacy following UNEP guidance culminated in the approval of marine protected areas in Sierra Leone with the designation of new protected areas, mapping of turtle habitats and vulnerabilities, and publication of peer-reviewed scientific literature. In Congo, the Nouabale Ndoki and Lossi health protocols have not only been developed but implemented as well resulting in improved protection of park including monitoring and law enforcement activities which secured a stable great ape and elephant population inside the park. Following the approval of the Chilika Lake Ecosystem Health Report, the Government of Odisha, India is now implementing the recommendations to restore and maintain the ecosystem.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Political dynamics in the Congo Basin countries slowed progress on transboundary projects. Regular high-level meetings in early 2013 helped to meet this challenge. In some countries, changes at national level affecting institutional restructuring posed a risk to the uptake of tools and the sustainability of technical support. Continued close engagement with a wide range of partners and institutions helped to address this risk.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Ecosystem management tools to tackle ecosystem degradation are applied at the local, national or regional levels by countries and their uptake is catalysed through United Nations agencies. (Target: 10 countries)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Coherent application of tools and approaches for the assessment and conservation of biodiversity is promoted by countries and the uptake of such tools and approaches is catalysed through the United Nations system. (Target: five countries)</p>	<p>UNEP developed a number of tools to help countries tackle ecosystem degradation. Publications including norms and guidelines were disseminated on ‘how to do it’ (e.g. the Benefit Transfer Method, the Inclusive Wealth Report, the Outcome Declaration from VANTAGE). The ‘what and how’ of economic assessment in national and regional contexts were made available (e.g. trade-off analysis work in India and Uganda). At the regional and national levels, UNEP supported countries in coherently applying various UNEP tools. Examples are integrated ecosystem-based management plans for marine protected areas; forest valuation and accounting in Kenya and Senegal; ecosystem management of freshwater resources in the Zambezi and Tana River Basins; a transboundary management plan in the Mayombe Forest (Congo Basin); rehabilitation of the Iraqi Marshlands as a World Heritage site. As a collaborative initiative between UNEP and the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change (IHDP), the Inclusive Wealth Report 2012 was published. Two major follow-up actions were the dissemination and broadening of Government representatives’ understanding of this initiative, and consolidation of the methodological aspects of the new report to be published in 2014.</p> <p>UNEP promoted a number of conservation tools for protected areas in Cameroon, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Indonesia, Panama and the Republic of the Congo. Broad-scale marine spatial planning of marine mammal corridors in the Wider Caribbean and East Pacific facilitated sharing of knowledge on data collection methodology and mapping, as well as marine mammal management strategies. In Africa, marine protected areas were supported using the tool “Taking Steps Towards Marine and Coastal EBM – An Introductory Guide” in Guinea Bissau and Mauritania.</p>



## ECOSYSTEM SERVICES & FINANCING

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (c):</b> Strengthened capacity of countries and regions to realign their environmental programmes to address degradation of selected priority ecosystem services</p>	<p>Assessment: “Not Achieved” (⊗)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>Increased number of national and regional planning instruments that include commitments and targets to integrate ecosystem management at the national, regional and sectoral levels with the assistance of UNEP</p>	<p>Number of planning instruments committed to preserving biodiversity and selected ecosystem services with specific targets for the benefit of human well-being</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>6*</p>

\* Actual target value is the same as the baseline value due to absence of data.

### Results against indicator

UNEP was not able to obtain accurate information to validate the indicator. However, national action plans to prepare for early ratification and implementation of the 2010 Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing were drafted in 19<sup>11</sup> countries. A project in Argentina to demonstrate potential for uptake of ecosystem-based management (EBM) in wheat commodity supply chains created a draft planning instrument with commitments to pay for ecosystem services provided by wheat processors and investors. Haiti developed a five-year strategic plan with commitments to integrate EBM in the energy, marine and tourism sectors. The Viet Nam National Strategy on Green Growth and National Strategy on Environment Protection make a commitment to integrate natural capital in national systems by 2020. In South Africa, commitment to national priority targets for Strategic Water Source Areas were included in the National Water Resources Strategy and the Strategic Integrated Projects that will guide implementation of the presidential National Development Plan.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Security is a concern in some project areas. The project on restoration of the Lake Faguibine ecosystem in Mali was closed prematurely due to insecurity. In addition, UNEP’s due diligence process is relatively long, leading to delays in project implementation.

11 Angola, Belarus, Bosnia, Burkina Faso, Cote d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Guinea Bissau, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Zimbabwe





Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Technical support is provided to Member States in their efforts to use science to inform policy in the management of biodiversity and ecosystem services for sustainable development. (Target: one global partnership)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> The impacts of land-based activities affecting river basins and coastal areas are reduced through provision of technical support to countries to improve ecosystem management at the regional and national levels. (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Countries' capacity to generate and use scientific knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services is enhanced. (Target: four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Technical support is provided to countries to pilot test approaches for equity in ecosystem management, such as payments for ecosystem services. (Target: six countries)</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Technical support is provided to countries to pilot test approaches and, if possible, operationalizing the protocol for access and benefit-sharing. (Target: six countries)</p> <p><b>Output 6:</b> Collaboration with the private sector, including the agribusiness sector, is enhanced through partnerships and pilot projects to integrate ecosystem management into sector strategies and operations. (Target: two countries)</p>	<p>UNEP provided technical support and took part in discussions with UN partners and countries, including private sector and civil society leaders, on the need to change the compass of development by embracing valuation and accounting of natural capital (e.g. at meetings in Bangkok, Thailand, and Nairobi). It works with the Wealth Accounting and the Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) partnership, the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA), the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), and regional banks and financial institutions. UNEP and its partners have applied relevant ecosystem management approaches in national, regional and sub-regional development plans and strategies. Combined with legislative and policy recommendations, these approaches are becoming commonly accepted.</p> <p>UNEPs EM pilot and demonstration projects have been shown to be effective, especially for watershed management (the Tana River, Kenya) and payment for ecosystem services (PES) pilots in Argentina, using PES to enable commodity buyers to stimulate the build-up of natural capital in agri-ecosystems. UNEP involved small island developing states (SIDS) and least developed countries (LDCs) in executing demonstration projects. International recognition of UNEPs interventions was obtained at several international fora.</p> <p>A basis for broader understanding of the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity, including valuation of ecosystem services, has been achieved. Activities during the biennium not only emphasized the need to capture values of natural capital and internalize/mainstream them in the decision-making framework, but also produced a guidance manual on how to do this. UNEP provided the “what and how” of economic assessment in national and regional contexts, trade-off analysis (work in India and Uganda), and the economics of ecosystem-based adaptation by engaging partners in the professions of ecological economics and development studies, who contributed to its work.</p> <p>UNEP reaches out to scientific networks to bring cutting edge ecological economics to its work and shares experiences with them. It has established a solid and synergistic relationship with many networks and programmes.</p>



A pair of weathered, brown hands is shown from the side, gently cupping a small, vibrant green seedling. The seedling has several leaves with prominent veins and is growing out of a small amount of dark soil. The background is a soft, out-of-focus green, suggesting an outdoor setting. The overall image conveys a sense of care, growth, and environmental stewardship.

## **PERFORMANCE: ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE**

*To ensure that environmental governance at the country, regional and global levels is strengthened to address agreed environmental priorities*



## HIGHLIGHTS


A country-led consultative process on international environmental governance, undertaken under the aegis of UNEP, was part of the work under this subprogramme that led to adoption at Rio+20 of a reform package to support more coherent, effective and efficient addressing of environmental issues at the international level. Transformational changes include universal membership for UNEP; establishment of the UN Environment Assembly (UNEA); support for more secure, stable, adequate and increased financial resources; a revitalized UNEP coordinating role, including leadership for the formulation of system-wide strategies on the environment; and an increased focus on regional delivery and stakeholder participation.

The World Congress on Justice, Governance and Law for Environmental Sustainability gathered national stakeholders involved in environmental law development and implementation (judiciary, prosecutors, enforcement officers, public auditors and others) in Rio in June 2012 to discuss the contribution of these actors' functions to environmental sustainability. The Congress led to a programme to promote the environmental rule of law and the continued engagement of these actors.

Through joint UNDP-UNEP support, poverty-environment linkages were integrated as an objective in 83 national and subnational development plans and related implementation planning and budgeting processes in 18 countries, bringing the total number of countries achieving such implementation to 20.

The GEO-5 report and other scientific publications were launched during the biennium. UNEP-generated scientific information continues to be of fundamental importance in intergovernmental processes.

**FIGURE 28: Poverty and Environment Initiative Project Countries 2012-2013**





**Funds total**


The 2012-2013 total budgets for the Environmental Governance subprogramme was USD 86 million. Total allocations issued in 2012-2013 were USD 118 million as Trust Funds and Earmarked Contributions received more income than planned. Total expenditure was USD 94 million, 80% of allocations.

**The Environment Fund**


The 2012-2013 expenditure rate of the Environment Fund for the Environmental Governance subprogramme was 98% of allocations.

Funds allocations and expenditures for the post and non-post were for 2012-2013 slightly higher compared to what was budgeted and planned as shown in Figure 30.

**FIGURE 29: Environmental Governance subprogramme budget performance**



**FIGURE 30: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Environmental Governance subprogramme**





## INTERNATIONAL POLICY SETTING

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (a):</b> The United Nations system, respecting the mandate of each entity, progressively achieves synergies and demonstrates increasing coherence in international decision-making processes related to the environment, including those under multilateral environmental agreements.</p>	<p>Assessment: <b>“Partially Achieved”</b> (✓✗)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>(i) Increased number of coordinated approaches to environmental issues targeted by UNEP that are addressed in a complementary manner by other United Nations entities and multilateral environmental agreements</p>	<p>Number of environmental issues targeted by UNEP that are tackled in a complementary manner by other United Nations agencies and multilateral environmental agreements</p>	<p>10*</p>	<p>13*</p>	<p>14</p>
<p>(ii) Increased number of inter-agency partnerships and joint initiatives between UNEP and other United Nations entities to tackle complementary environmental issues</p>	<p>Number of inter-agency partnerships and joint initiatives between UNEP and other United Nations entities working together on selected environmental issues</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>35</p>	<p>34</p>
<p>(iii) Increased number of coordination activities concerning environmental issues addressed under the Environmental Management Group, the Chief Executives Board for Coordination and United Nations Development Group that are being acted upon by partner United Nations entities</p>	<p>Number of decisions taken by the Environment Management Group, the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination and UNDG to promote common actions proposed by UNEP and implementing measures initiated by United Nations agencies</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>17</p>
<p>(iv) Increased number of joint initiatives undertaken by multilateral environmental agreement secretariats and UNEP showing progress towards measurable environmental outcomes</p>	<p>Number of joint activities or projects</p>	<p>25</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>30</p>

\* Actual baseline value: 10 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised Target value: 13 (+3 new/additional)



### Results against indicator

Regarding indicator (i)<sup>12</sup>, four coordinated approaches to environmental issues were established. The adoption of Paragraph 88 of the Rio+20 outcome document, and subsequent GC decision and GA resolutions led to the establishment of significant new ways to address the environment in the UN system and beyond, with new approaches cutting across all environmental issues addressed by UNEP, namely, universal membership for UNEP, establishment of UNEA and strengthened CPR, provision of secure, stable, adequate and increased financial resources from the regular budget of the United Nations and voluntary contributions, as well as the strengthening of delivery at the regional level to fulfill its mandate<sup>13</sup>.

Further, UNEP has actively contributed to enhancing system-wide policy coherence and coordination within the work of CEB and its subsidiary bodies (HLCP, HLCM and UNDG). UNEP promoted environment considerations in the consideration of the following areas addressed over the biennium: Rio+20 preparations and implementation of the Rio+20 outcome; elaboration of the Post-2015 Development Agenda; Review of MDG Implementation at the country level; QCPR - Delivering as One; Climate Change; Sustainability management in the UN; Energy; Water; Oceans; Disaster Risk Reduction; Promoting the Rule of Law; Human Rights; Demographic dynamics; Implications of Internal and International Migration; Least Developed Countries; Children and Youth; Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women; Transnational Crime; and Cyber Security and Cyber Crime. (<http://www.unsceb.org/>)

Regarding indicator (ii), four interagency partnerships and joint initiatives were established. The prominence of environmental/human rights linkages in policy-making was advanced through stronger UNEP-Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OHCHR) collaboration. The UN Chief Executive Board for Coordination-High Level Committee on Programmes (CEB/HLPC) increased its focus on the environment/human rights nexus. Partnerships on environmental crime (including international wildlife trade) were consolidated and expanded with the participation of UNODC, INTERPOL and others. Partnerships were achieved for implementing specific MEAs. For instance, UNEP in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat has established a continued Partnership with the Republic of Korea at various COP-MOPs of the Biosafety protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity, leading to strengthened regional cooperation among Asian countries and maximized use of existing capacity building resources enhancing national compliance. A formal partnership was also established with INTOSAI, with the signing of an MOU focusing on collaboration on environmental governance related issues.

Regarding indicator (iii), Nine decisions and initiatives contributed to a more coordinated approach to environmental issues in the UN system including decisions to support Member States on Green Economy for Sustainable Development issues, and to develop UN wide actions plans and joint and common approaches in areas such as: chemicals management, preparation of a Drylands Action Plan (supporting the UNCCD), implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020), adoption of a Framework for enhancing environmental and social sustainability in the UN system, and development of UN environmental management systems within each UN entity and voluntary environmental management peer-reviews.

12 Note: while the unit of measure for indicator (i) refers to “number of environmental issues” targeted by UNEP that are tackled in a complementary manner by the United Nations, the indicator narrative refers to “coordinated approaches to environmental issues” targeted by UNEP, which is in fact what the International Environmental Governance reform has been working towards. There is therefore a slight misalignment between the language under unit of measure and the indicators’ narrative and the progress is measured in the reporting exercise against the narrative of the indicator

13 GA resolution 67/213, GC decision 27/2 and follow-up GA resolution 67/784



88 Regarding indicator (iv), six joint initiatives were undertaken by UNEP and MEA Secretariats. MEA synergies were promoted primarily through initiatives between UNEP and biodiversity-related conventions at the national level. Several decisions were adopted by conference of parties of MEAs, as well as UNEP’s Governing Council in support of synergistic implementation MEAs, such as Decision 14.38 (CITES COP 15) which directed the Secretariat to continue collaborating with the secretariats of other conventions, UNEP and other bodies in order to facilitate the harmonization of knowledge management and reporting and Decision SS.XXII/3 of the UNEP Governing Council in February 2012 which also promotes synergies among MEAs. A collaborative project between UNEP and relevant MEA secretariats was initiated on the effective and synergistic implementation of biodiversity-related MEAs. In the chemicals and waste cluster progress was achieved on improving synergies through a country led process that sought to identify way of strengthening sound management of chemicals and wastes in the long term, including how to enhance implementation, coordination and cooperation at the national level and the submission for adoption at the UNEA a special programme for institutional strengthening the chemicals and waste cluster at the national level for the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, the Minamata Convention and SAICM.

**Risk analysis and risk management measures**

Further strengthening of international environmental governance is needed, including through a stronger UNEP, firmer inclusion of the environment in work of the UN system, and the firm integration of environmental sustainability in the post-2015 development agenda, including the Sustainable Development Goals. Meeting this need requires continued consultations with Governments and information provision to support informed decision-making. To address the risk of a disconnect between high-level political decisions on IEG and regional and national priorities, greater engagement at the highest levels has been pursued through active high-level UNEP participation and substantive inputs to regional fora.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Emerging environmental problems are considered by the Governing Council for decision-making based upon environmental assessment and analytical inputs. (Target: two assessment reports)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Main intergovernmental bodies within the United Nations system have considered in taking their resolutions and decisions key environmental issues arising from decisions and policy guidance of the Governing Council, the outcomes of Rio+20 and the consultative processes on international environmental governance (including incremental changes agreed during the process) and supported their implementation. (Target: two issues)</p>	<p>The project portfolio under this expected accomplishment ranges from provision of scientific information to inform policy processes, to support to intergovernmental process and coordination bodies, to facilitating effective and synergistic implementation of MEAs.</p> <p>Issues highlighted in the UNEP Year Book on Emerging Environmental Issues were discussed at the Governing Council (GC27) and received wide media coverage. The chapter on minimizing chemical risks (2013) is used as teaching material in universities</p>





Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 3:</b> Coordination of strategies and actions in the United Nations system on selected environmental work areas identified by the issue management groups of the Environment Management Group is supported through UNEP engagement with the Group, the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination and UNDG (Target: three environmental work areas)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> The implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and the tasks of their secretariats are supported in such areas as lessons learned, information exchange, capacity-building, support for enhanced cooperation and coordination in order to assist the agreements, in specific areas, to address common issues, as appropriate, through advanced cooperative mechanisms in a manner that does not duplicate the services and functions of the agreements and their secretariats. (Target: three arrangements)</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Priority areas of multilateral environmental agreements are increasingly reflected in policies and actions of bodies, funds, programmes and agencies of the United Nations system, including their strategies and activities in countries. (Target: five priority areas)</p> <p><b>Output 6:</b> Effective policy exchange on environment and development issues is supported through regional ministerial and other intergovernmental forums and consultations. (Target: six forums)</p> <p><b>Output 7:</b> Awareness of policymakers, all relevant stakeholders and the public concerning emerging and important environmental governance issues are raised through public information, communication, publications and outreach activities, including through mass-media, public campaigns and public events. (Target: all countries and agencies supported by UNEP in this subprogramme)</p>	<p>Important progress was made in mainstreaming issues arising from UNEP’s policy and scientific work into decision-making and the work of intergovernmental processes and organizations. Elements emerging from the consultative process on IEG were included in the reform package adopted by Rio+20. There is a stronger focus on the human rights and environment nexus in UN bodies, and close collaboration within the UN on the development of the Sustainable Development Goals and post-2015 development framework.</p> <p>UNEP worked to achieve greater coherence in the way environmental issues are tackled in the UN system.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Group (EMG) was an important vehicle to ensure coherence on key issues such as biodiversity, drylands, and sustainability in the UN system. A number of governments’ capacities to support implementation of MEAs, including synergistic implementation of MEA clusters, were built, for instance on NBSAPs as vehicles for implementing multiple biodiversity related conventions. A more effective approach to financing the chemical and wastes cluster, including through a special programme for financing institutional strengthening in support of the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Minamata Convention and SAICM.</p> <p>UNEP support to regional environmental ministerial forums facilitated effective policy exchange and priority setting on the environment in all regions, including small island developing states (SIDS), with 17 regional action plans.</p> <p>Social media have been a successful and cost-effective communication tool, used to reach a new and much wider audience. The content of major scientific reports, such as GEO-5, the Global Chemicals Outlook, the Global Biodiversity Outlook and Bridging the Emissions Gap, and the UNEP Year Book were effectively communicated to target audiences.</p>



## STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Expected Accomplishment (b): Enhanced capacity of States to implement their environmental obligations and achieve their environmental goals, targets and objectives through strengthened institutions and the implementation of laws	Assessment: “Fully Achieved” (✓)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of States implementing laws to improve compliance with environmental goals and targets as agreed at the relevant United Nations summits and conferences and the conferences of parties to multilateral environmental agreements with the assistance of UNEP	Number of Governments implementing laws with the assistance of UNEP	16	21	22
(ii) Increased number of international organizations that demonstrate progress towards measurable environmental outcomes after applying UNEP policy advice in the area of the environment	Number of UNEP-targeted international (subregional, regional or global) organizations that have applied UNEP guidance	16*	17*	18

\* Actual baseline value: 16 (based on performance of Dec 2011. Revised Target value: 17 (+1 new/additional))

### Results against indicator

UNEP supported several countries’ development and implementation of environmental laws. For example, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo it supported officials from the Ministry of Environment in implementing the country’s environmental laws by sharing knowledge and skills through a workshop. A bio-cultural protocol was adopted in Colombia. The African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) project on MEAs implementation assisted countries to develop secondary legislation to implement MEA provisions at domestic level. An inter-ministerial regulation on REDD+ was adopted in Ecuador. In Asia and the Pacific, countries were targeted and subsequently adopted and implemented legislation. As the result of UNEP support, Timor-Leste’s first Framework Environmental Law was developed and approved by the Council of Ministers in 2011, and enacted by the National Parliament in 2013. UNEP supported the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism of Mongolia in amending the Law on Environmental Impact Assessments. In Lao People’s Democratic Republic, UNEP supported the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment in amending the country’s Environmental Protection Law, UNEP’s inputs to international processes and initiatives are reflected in the work of the UN as a whole. For example, UNEP work on Advancing Justice, Governance and Law for Environmental Sustainability led to emergence of the new concept of the environmental rule of law and the progressive integration of the environment into UN-wide Rule of Law efforts. UNEP’s legal technical advice and written report was incorporated into the Secretary-General’s report on the oil slick on Lebanese shores. Environmental issues have been increasingly included in the human rights agenda through close collaboration and inputs into the mandate of the UN Independent Expert on Human Rights and the Environment along with OHCHR.



**Risk analysis and risk management measures**

Risks relate to countries’ stability, political support, and availability of funds, as well as continued relevance of topics. UNEP interventions take into account emerging priorities and trends, the findings of scientific assessments, and initiatives by countries or regions to ensure that UNEP’s interventions continue to be relevant to actual needs. Cooperation with partners requires careful design of joint projects and cooperation instruments to respond to UNEP’s POW and partners’ mandates. For example, the joint project on good practices on human rights and the environment focuses on areas of the POW that also respond to the very specific mandate of the Independent Expert on human rights and the environment. Work on environmental law takes account of work undertaken in the UN system as a whole, as coordinated by the UN Rule of Law Unit. Regarding national environmental law development and implementation, an important challenge is to ensure that UNEP technical assistance in developing national legislation leads to adoption of drafts and subsequent implementation. While UNEP works closely with key actors, responsibility rests with the governments themselves.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Initiatives for the further progressive development of environmental law are supported in the selected areas of the fourth Programme for the Development and Periodic Review of Environmental Law (Montevideo Programme IV), including those for promoting the implementation of internationally agreed environmental objectives and goals. (Target: five initiatives)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Legal instruments and tools are developed and applied to strengthen the legal basis of environmental components of the legal and institutional infrastructures of countries, including through model legislation and other legislative guidance documents. (Target: five countries)</p>	<p>The portfolio under this expected accomplishment includes work at the national and international levels, including the progressive development of national and international environmental law, technical assistance and capacity building, information products and promotion of partnerships with major groups and stakeholders.</p> <p>To enhance countries’ capacity to meet their environmental obligations, UNEP provided support on international environmental law and national legislation and institutions, including a focus on enhancing capacities. It contributed to the Secretary-General’s report of the on the oil slick on Lebanese shores and promoted increased coherence in relation to water-related conventions. The Human rights and environment nexus was addressed through reports clarifying the linkages, expert and ministerial discussion, and consultations on good practices. Collaboration with a number of centres of expertise and International organizations is ongoing on these themes.</p>



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 3:</b> Information and knowledge base to support more effective implementation of multilateral environmental agreements by parties is enhanced and made accessible to parties. (Target: three multilateral environmental agreements)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Countries’ judicial and enforcement capacity to implement environmental law is enhanced through training, awareness-raising, information exchange and legal advisory services to reinforce the integration of the environment in the rule of law for achieving environmental justice. (Target: three regions).</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Capacity of government officials and other stakeholders from developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate effectively in multilateral environmental negotiations is enhanced through training, awareness-raising and capacity-building activities. (Target: three regions)</p> <p><b>Output 6:</b> Strategic partnerships between major groups and UNEP to achieve mutually supportive action on selected environmental areas are supported. (Target: four environmental work areas)</p>	<p>The capacity of States to implement environmental obligations was enhanced through provision of UNEP assistance in national law development processes. Access to information and knowledge of environmental law (including MEAs) was enhanced through expansion of the UN Information Portal on Multilateral Environmental Agreements (InforMEA) partnership.</p> <p>National stakeholders involved in developing and implementing environmental law participated in the World Congress on Justice, Governance and Law for Environmental Sustainability. This initiative was followed by a programme for promoting the rule of law and the environment, supported by the UNEP Governing Council, relevant MEA Secretariats, and a wide partnership of international bodies.</p> <p>Capacities to negotiate and implement MEAs were strengthened in all regions through preparatory meetings, national level initiatives and global training programmes. Efforts to enhance the capacities of Governments, major groups and other stakeholders in developing countries to implement Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration 10 on access to information, public participation and access to justice and the related UNEP Guidelines were undertaken in collaboration with the World Resources Institute (WRI).</p>





## INTEGRATING ENVIRONMENT INTO DEVELOPMENT

Expected Accomplishment (c): National development processes and United Nations common country programming processes increasingly mainstream environmental sustainability into the implementation of their programmes of work	Assessment: “Fully Achieved” (✓)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of United Nations country teams that successfully mainstream environmental sustainability into common country assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks	Number of countries with United Nations development assistance frameworks that integrate environmental sustainability	66*	76*	91
	Number of national and sectoral development policies and other national and sector policy instruments containing objectives, targets and actions to integrate pro-poor environmental sustainability	22	25	83
(ii) Increased percentage of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks in countries where UNEP has intervened that present a coherent environment and development package	Number of countries with United Nations development assistance frameworks that show how development goals can be supported through environmental interventions	0	3	25

\* Actual baseline value: 66 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value: 76 (+10 new)

### Results against indicator

Assistance to UN-related development planning processes and to countries regarding the integration of poverty alleviation and environmental objectives in national planning processes and budgets and efforts to mainstream environmental issues in regional and sub-regional institutional arrangements contributed to mainstreaming the environment in development processes through the available and accessible entry points. As a result, environment and climate change are dedicated, stand-alone outcomes and outputs in 25 additional UNDAFs. With regards to the poverty-environment linkage, addressed primarily through the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative, such linkages have been integrated as an objective in 83 national, sub-national, and sectoral plans and policies, in 20 countries where PEI is working. Furthermore, increased cross-sector ministerial collaboration is reported in and reporting on poverty-environment objectives is now standard practice in 18 countries. The five-year PEI joint programme document (PRODOC) for 2013-2017, endorsed in 2013, aims at enhanced implementation of development plans, policies and budgets that combine environmental sustainability and poverty reduction to contribute to inclusive and sustainable development goals.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Countries’ stability remains an issue. UNEP cooperates closely with the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) on security. A soft, bottom-up approach (fostering strong regional cooperation on the scientific/



academic level) was taken in the Caucasus region due to the geopolitical situation. The main objective remains governance by supporting political decision-making through the science-policy interface to enable better understanding of the region, foster collaboration, and trigger region-level political action at a later stage.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> The capacity of United Nations country teams to integrate environmental sustainability into United Nations common country programming processes, United Nations development assistance frameworks and action plans and the One-UN initiative is strengthened. (Target: 20 United Nations country teams).</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> In response to national priorities and needs articulated in national development strategies, relevant UNEP subprogramme interventions, including those aimed at supporting the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, are integrated into the preparation or review of selected United Nations development assistance frameworks and One-UN programmes. (Target: 10 United Nations development assistance frameworks or One-UN programmes)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Support is provided to countries in their efforts to integrate environmental sustainability into national and sectoral development planning processes, in particular addressing the poverty and environment linkage through the Poverty and Environment Initiative with a view to contributing to the achievement of goal 7 of the Millennium Development Goals, (Target: 25 countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Regional and subregional institutional arrangements are further developed and strengthened to address transboundary environmental issues. (Target: six institutional arrangements). To achieve integration of environmental considerations into national and regional development processes and plan, UNEP provided support to UN-related development planning processes, namely UNDAFs, and assistance to countries in the transition towards a more integrated approach to development, poverty alleviation and environmental objectives in their national planning processes and associated budgets. Further, UNJEP supported by countries to mainstream environmental issues in regional and sub-regional institutional processes and plans.</p>	<p>UNEP provided support to UN-related development planning processes and assisted countries in transition to include more integrated approaches to development, poverty alleviation and environmental objectives in national planning processes and associated budgets. It also supported countries’ mainstreaming of environmental issues in regional and sub-regional institutional processes and plans. Its efforts led to 25 additional UN Country Teams (UNCTs) receiving training and assistance, resulting in environmental sustainability and climate change being mainstreamed in their UNDAFs/ UN Development Assistance Plans (UNDAPs). UNEP support involved UNCT training and contributing to country analysis, including production of National Environmental Summaries (NESS) and participation in key UNDAF/UNDAP formulation stages. Fourteen UNDAFs include priorities corresponding to UNEP subprogrammes and MEA priorities.</p> <p>Poverty-environment linkages have been integrated as an objective in national and subnational development plans and related implementation planning and budgeting processes. They have been integrated as an objective in 83 national, sub-national, and sectoral plans and policies in 20 countries where the PEI is working. Increased cross-sectoral ministerial collaboration is reported (and reporting on P-E objectives is standard practice) in 18 countries.</p> <p>Environmental mainstreaming at the national level was complemented with consideration of environmental issues within regional and subregional institutional arrangements to address countries’ common interests with respect to shared natural resources and transboundary environmental issues. Five transboundary mechanisms were developed or strengthened for: sand and dust storms in West Asia; environmental and health considerations in Southeast and Eastern Asia; management of ballast water on the Black and Caspian Seas; the marine environment of the Caspian Sea through the adoption of a Protocol for the Protection of the Caspian Sea Against Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities; and the Caucasus mountains by fostering regional cooperation on the scientific level. Strengthened governance mechanisms provide the basis for integrating environmental issues into management of such areas. Strengthened governance mechanisms like these create the legal foundation upon which environmental issues can be integrated into management of such areas.</p>



## SOUND SCIENCE FOR DECISION-MAKING

Expected Accomplishment (d): Improved access by national and international stakeholders to sound science and policy advice for decision-making	Assessment: “Partially achieved” (✓✗)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of UNEP-led or UNEP-supported environmental assessments cited in academic writings, leading newspapers and other relevant media	Number of scientific publications or leading newspapers citing UNEP-supported assessment findings	62	65	5120*
(ii) Increased participation of researchers and institutions from developing countries in UNEP led/supported environmental assessments	Percentage of researchers participating in UNEP environmental assessments who come from developing countries and countries with economies in transition	55	56	48

\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work

### Results against indicator

The target for indicator (i) was exceeded largely due to the success of GEO-5. There were a total of 5,019 media reports and 101 citations, including media reports and citations for the other UNEP assessments, particularly environmental sustainability in Asia and the Pacific. The number of citations continues to increase, reflecting further uptake of UNEP findings by the scientific community and international stakeholders. The average percentage of researchers from developing countries or countries with economies in transition participating in UNEP environmental assessments (across seven assessments) was 48%. This was below the target of 56%. However, participation by researchers is influenced by the scope of the assessment and geographical coverage and as such a cumulative figure across seven assessments is somewhat misleading.


### Risk analysis and risk management measures


A consistent risk across all seven assessments concerned provision of sufficient financial and human resources to undertake the assessments and disseminate them. To meet this challenge, large resource mobilization efforts were carried out within and outside UNEP, with strong reliance on the special efforts of UNEP’s partners for technical inputs, peer review and final production. Another potential area of risk is uncertainty about the timing of major fora, where assessment findings can be disseminated with maximum relevance and impact. To ensure the best access to assessment findings, it is imperative to improve access to decision-makers. Risk mitigation requires continued adjustments to project programming and scheduling of tasks, constant communication with stakeholders, and monitoring processes during the final production stages of assessments.





Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Global environmental assessment and outlook reports and alerts on environmental issues, such as the fifth Global Environment Outlook report, other non-carbon-dioxide climate forcing assessments and the third African Environment Outlook report, are produced and disseminated to promote their use by decision makers and relevant stakeholders. (Target: three assessments)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Multi-disciplinary scientific networks are more strategically connected to policymakers and development practitioners in integrating environment into development processes and decision-making. (Target: five networks or Ad hoc expert groups)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Institutional and technical capacities of Governmental and partner institutions in environmental monitoring, assessment and early warning are strengthened to support national decision-making. (Target: five countries)</p>	<p>To improve access to science and its use in decision-making, UNEP published scientific assessments and developed stronger network capacities for scientific assessment.</p> <p>The Global Environment Outlook (GEO-5) and assessments on the vulnerability of freshwater resources to climate change, environmental sustainability in Asia and the Pacific, policy implications of warming permafrost, Pacific marine minerals and deep sea mining, and linkages between the environment and health in Africa all support policy processes and decision-making at the global and regional levels.</p> <p>UNEP work resulted in more strategic connection of a climate change adaptation network to policy-level activities through participation by network members in the intergovernmental process of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and events organized during its COP18 in Doha, leading to further uptake of scientific findings by policy-makers. Meetings on operationalization took place in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific and West Asia.</p> <p>Scientific and institutional capacities were strengthened by undertaking national assessments such as the Lao Environment Outlook 2012. The Global Universities Partnership on Environment for Sustainability (GUPES) was launched in 2012. Knowledge from Science to Societies (KNOSSOS) hosted four policy dialogues at the European Parliament and Rio+20 and three related policy briefs were developed to present the results to policy-makers. A formal agreement between FAO, UNEP, WHO and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was signed to support developing countries in accessing scientific information until 2016: 17,000 peer-reviewed scientific journals and other resources (13,600 more than in 2012-11) have been made available to 109 developing countries through the Research4Life/Online Access to Research in the Environment (OARE) initiatives.</p>





# **PERFORMANCE: HARMFUL SUBSTANCES AND HAZARDOUS WASTE**

*To minimize the impact of harmful substances  
and hazardous waste on the environment and  
human beings*



## HIGHLIGHTS

Adoption of the Minamata Convention on Mercury in 2013, the first new global convention on environment and health in a decade, was the most significant event of 2012-2013. That it was adopted after four years of negotiations gives new momentum to intergovernmental cooperation on the environment. The Minamata Convention provides for controls and reductions across a range of products, processes and industries where mercury is used, released or emitted. It also addresses mercury mining, its export and import, and the safe storage of waste mercury. Identifying populations at risk, improving medical care, and providing better training for health-care professionals so they can identify and treat mercury-related health conditions will all result from compliance with the new treaty.

Another significant event was the third session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), which agreed to extend the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Quick Start Programme (QSP) Trust Fund until 2015. The SAICM QSP has supported the development of sound chemicals management in developing countries, least developed countries (LDCs), small island developing states (SIDS) and countries with economies in transition since 2006, providing more than USD 32 million in funding to date. Its extension will allow additional countries to make use of the SAICM QSP. ICCM3 also agreed to “build awareness and promote actions on endocrine disrupting chemicals by improving the availability of and access to information on chemicals that are proven or suspect of having endocrine disruptive potential”. Endocrine disruptors affect the endocrine (hormonal) system, may interfere with important developmental processes in humans and wildlife and may be linked to infertility and cancers. Working through multi-stakeholder partnerships has also delivered results. The development of the Chemicals in Products programme continues to attract interest and involvement from major industry associations and product sectors, including those representing the global chemicals industry and 40 per cent of the global apparel and footwear sectors. These groups’ commitments to this multi-year effort will be key to delivering tangible environmental benefits.

The first comprehensive global assessment of its kind UNEP’s Global Chemicals Outlook was launched in 2012 and received significant policy and media attention. This publication highlights the economic cost of chemical hazards. For example, the estimated cost of poisonings from pesticides in Sub-Saharan Africa exceeds total annual overseas development aid to the region for basic health services, excluding HIV/AIDS. Between 2005 and 2020, the accumulated cost of illness and injury linked to pesticides in small-scale farming in Sub-Saharan Africa could reach USD 90 billion. Release of this report follows renewed commitments by countries at Rio+20 in June 2012 to prevent the illegal dumping of toxic wastes, develop safer alternatives to hazardous chemicals in products, and increase waste recycling, among others. By examining global chemicals trends and their economic implications, the Global Chemicals Outlook maps out the most effective approaches for decision-makers to deliver on these commitments. Consequently, at its last meeting the Governing Council requested that the work on Outlook continue.




**Funds total**

The 2012-2013 total budget for the Harmful substances and Hazardous Wastes subprogrammes was USD 60 million. Total allocations issued in 2012-2013 were USD 57 million. Total expenditure was USD 45 million, 79% of allocations.


**The Environment Fund**

The Environment Fund for the Chemicals and Waste subprogramme’s 2012-2013 expenditure was 100% of allocations.

**FIGURE 31: Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste subprogramme budget performance**



**FIGURE 32: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste subprogramme**





## SOUND MANAGEMENT AT NATIONAL LEVEL

Expected Accomplishment (a): Increased capacities of States and other stakeholders to assess, manage and reduce risks to human health and the environment posed by chemicals and hazardous waste	Assessment: "Partially achieved" (✓✗)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of countries and stakeholders implementing policies in sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	Number of countries and private companies with strengthened policies, practices or infrastructure for the sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste	162*	172*	171
(ii) Increased number of countries that have incentives, including market-based incentives and business policies and practices promoting environmentally friendly approaches and products aiming at reduced releases of and exposures to harmful chemicals and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	Number of Governments that have adopted incentives and policies.	49**	56**	49
(iii) Increased support to developing countries to assess, manage and reduce risks to human health and the environment posed by chemicals and hazardous waste	Number of developing country governments receiving UNEP assistance for assessing, managing or reducing harmful effects of chemicals on human health	65	76	76

\* Actual baseline value: 162 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value (non-cumulative): 172

\*\* Actual baseline value: 49 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value: 56 (+7 new). Actual target value is the same as the baseline value due to absence of data.

### Results against indicator

Regarding indicator (i), UNEP supported 12 countries in carrying out activities to mainstream and develop legal and institutional infrastructures with sustainable funding. Two of these countries have drafted chemicals legislation and seven are in the process of integrating sound chemicals management into national development strategies. In addition, three countries have assessed their need to revise chemicals legislation. SAICM stakeholders comprising 78 Governments, 23 NGOs (of which 19 are civil society organizations and four private sector organizations) and nine IGOs completed progress reports for the period 2009-2010 in time for inclusion in the assessment presented at the third session of the International Conference of Chemicals Management (ICCM) in 2012.

Regarding indicator (ii), it was impossible to carry out a survey identifying countries with incentives (including market-based ones) and business policies to reduce chemical releases and exposures. UNEP assisted eight countries to assess the need to develop legal and institutional infrastructures including use of economic instruments to finance sound management of chemicals. This is a complicated and lengthy process which cannot be completed in one biennium.

Regarding indicator (iii), eleven national governments and businesses received support to improve chemical safety practices through the Flexible Framework Initiative for Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness



and Responsible Production tools for safe use and handling of hazardous chemicals in SMEs. Country-level implementation projects that help improve chemical accident prevention and preparedness are based on the Flexible Framework Guidance developed by UNEP under the auspices of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC). UNEP supported four countries' identification of chemical accident risks. It has brought together international experts and organisations to assist with local workshops/training sessions. Through UNEP activities, countries have improved the capacity to address the risks of chemical accidents and are drafting action plans and related policies. UNEP supported seven countries' use of the Responsible Production toolkit. UNEP-led capacity building activities allowed industry in these countries to apply voluntary measures at their sites.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Availability of financial and human resources continues to limit support to national efforts. UNEP works with UN system partners including IOMC participating organizations (e.g. the UN Development Programme, UNDP, for mainstreaming and WHO for the Health and Environment Strategic Alliance in Africa). Partnerships with the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the UN Economic Council for Europe (UNECE) expand outreach beyond UNEP's capacity to promote its tools, methodologies and strategic frameworks to a greater number of countries. Expanding UNEP activities that raise awareness of the need for sound chemicals management is crucial to ensure support from Governments.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Support is provided to Governments to integrate knowledge on harmful substances and hazardous waste into countries' development policies and programmes and to catalyze further use by donor agencies, developing countries and United Nations agencies. (Target: 12 countries)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Sharing of and access to knowledge and information related to harmful substances and hazardous waste are improved through national and regional exchange networks. (Target: five exchange networks)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Support is provided to countries to reduce risks in the production, handling, use and disposal of harmful substances through the use of technical tools, methodologies and strategic frameworks and to further use by the private sector, government partners and United Nations agencies. (Target: 11 countries)</p>	<p>UNEP supported 12 countries in carrying out activities to mainstream and develop legal and institutional infrastructures with sustainable funding with the following results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Belize and Cambodia have drafted new chemicals legislation;</li> <li>ii. Nigeria, Vietnam and Uruguay assessed the needs for further development of legislation</li> <li>iii. Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Mauritania, Mauritius, Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia is in the process or have finalized the assessment of cost of inaction based on the process designed for UNEP/UNDP partnership on mainstreaming sound management of chemicals into their national development policies.</li> <li>iv. Mauritania, Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia have finalized their assessment of Cost of Inaction.</li> </ol> <p>The Chemicals Information Exchange Network (CIEN) was not funded during this biennium. It is being incorporated in GEF projects and other bilaterally funded activities.</p> <p>National governments and businesses have received support to improve chemical safety practices through the Flexible Framework Initiative for Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness (Cambodia, Mali, Senegal and Sri Lanka) and Responsible Production tools for risk reduction. (Ghana, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Brazil, Egypt, Vietnam, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Tanzania). This allows national Government agencies to manage risks involving industry at the national level. Capacity building activities related to Responsible Production allow industry to apply voluntary measures to manage risks.</p>



## INTERNATIONAL POLICY AND TECHNICAL ADVICE

Expected Accomplishment (b): Coherent international policy and technical advice provided to States and other stakeholders for managing chemicals and hazardous waste in a more environmentally sound manner, including through better technology and best practices	Assessment: “Fully achieved” (✓)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Increased number of Governments and other stakeholders showing reductions in harmful substances and hazardous waste as a result of applying UNEP guidelines and tools on assessment, management and replacement of hazardous chemicals and waste management with the assistance of UNEP	Number of Governments and private companies with data showing activities on reduction of risk from selected harmful substances and hazardous wastes	40	72	72
(ii) Increased number of international subregional and regional organizations applying UNEP guidance on harmful substances and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	Number of international, regional and subregional organizations using UNEP guidance on harmful substances and hazardous waste	0*	8	10
(iii) Increased number of intergovernmental, regional and national policymaking processes that consider, address and monitor the environmental, economic, social and human health impacts of harmful substances and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	Number of Governments using UNEP policy advice, guidelines and tools	98**	108**	240

\* Established baseline value is 0.

\*\* Actual baseline value: 98 (based on performance of Dec 2011). Revised target value: 108 (+10 new)

### Results against indicator

Regarding indicator (i), private sector actions include those coordinated by the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), which is promoting the UNEP Legal and Institutional Infrastructures for Sound Management of Chemicals and Measures for Recovering Costs of National Administration (LIRA) guidance in Vietnam as a part of its Global Product Strategy (GPS). ICCA has also highlighted within the context of the Chemicals in Products (CiP) project 10 companies that they are supplying safe use data for chemicals they sell into the supply chain through the GPS. Through projects under UNEP’s Mercury partnership 11 governments are participating in a variety of activities: showing reductions in the use of mercury-containing dental amalgam; on mercury storage and disposal; and for reduced mercury emissions from coal fired power plants, small-scale gold mining and from compact fluorescent bulbs. 10 mining organizations in Indonesia have also participated in a gold mining project, with the result of avoiding the release of 3,000 Kg/year of mercury to the environment.

Regarding indicator (ii), UNEP guidance on sound chemicals and waste management is implemented through the nine IOMC participating organizations: FAO, ILO, OECD, UNDP, UNIDO, UNITAR, WHO and the World Bank. OCHA and UNECE have taken up the UNEP guidance on sound chemicals and waste management. This UNEP guidance is also an integral part of the IOMC Toolkit, which the IOMC organizations use broadly in supporting sound chemicals and waste management activities. A number of the chemicals and waste multilateral environmental agreement (MEA) regional centres apply UNEP guidance to monitor risks arising from POPs and improper management of chemicals and waste. UNEP guidance on chemical hazard management is applied within the UNEP- UNIDO network of National Cleaner Production Centres (Sri Lanka, China, Vietnam, Brazil, Egypt, Ghana, Kenya and El Salvador).





Regarding indicator (iii), over the biennium, 142 countries used UNEP's policy advice, guidelines and tools and participated in UNEP-led project activities to address harmful substances. 68 countries applied the UNEP Standardized Toolkit to quantify their dioxin and furan emissions; 31 countries participated in project activities led by UNEP, under the Global Monitoring Plan for POPs, to establish ambient air POPs monitoring networks; 28 countries used guidance on monitoring POPs in mothers' milk; Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Mauritius and Vietnam undertook activities to develop legislative frameworks which took the cost of inaction into account; 5 countries were supported to implement the Flexible Framework and responsible production. Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia carried out activities on mainstreaming of the sound management of chemicals; and Tanzania, Zambia and Ghana used guidance developed and issued under UNEP's Scientific Expert Group on Chemicals and the Environment (SECE) in addressing environmental factors and concerns linked to pesticides use.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

During the biennium, WHO withdrew secondment of a staff member from the SAICM Secretariat. This left a gap, particularly in regard to health related aspects of SAICM Secretariat delivery. WHO has been approached at the highest level to rectify the situation. While the Quick Start Programme received USD 3.08 million over the biennium, this was USD 3.09 million (around 50%) short of the funding needed to finance all approved projects.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> International governance of chemicals is facilitated through the provision of secretariat services to the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management and its Quick Start Programme. (Target: 32 Quick Start Programme projects approved).</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Global scientific assessment and monitoring of harmful substances and hazardous waste and emerging issues of potential concern and assessment of global progress to address related risks provide knowledge that informs policy and management decisions, including by catalyzing actions on the part of United Nations agencies. (Target: 3 emerging issues identified).</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Support is provided to countries to reduce risks from harmful substances and hazardous waste through improved risk assessment and management using scientific and technical guidance and methodologies and to catalyze the use of such guidance and methodologies by United Nations agencies. (Target: 20 countries)</p>	<p>Secretariat support was provided to SAICM with the third Session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) in 2012. The SAICM Quick Start Programme (QSP) Implementation Committee approved an additional 36 projects totalling USD 6.2 million to 36 countries over the biennium. The number of approved projects since the QSP's inception stands at 171, amounting to approximately USD 32-33 million over the life to the QSP.</p> <p>UNEP/WHO State of the Science of Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals 2012 informed ICCM3, which called for new work to be undertaken on this emerging issue and for continuation of work on lead in paint, chemicals in products, nanomaterials, perfluorinated chemicals and greener design of electronics. UNEP also supports countries' monitoring of persistent organic pollutants (POPs). In 2013, a report demonstrating declining trends for almost all of the POPs has been published; the next comprehensive report on the presence of POPs in humans and the environment is due in 2015. Capacity building of POPs laboratories is an ongoing activity.</p> <p>UNEP is the lead or co-lead organization on the emerging issues of endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs), lead in fuels and in paint, chemicals in products and perfluorinated chemicals. These issues are addressed under the umbrella of UNEP activities implementing SAICM. All saw significant to major advances during the biennium:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICCM3 established EDCs as a new emerging issue, supported by the UNEP/WHO publication</li> <li>• UNEP continues to lead the drafting the Chemicals in Products programme in consultation with major stakeholders.</li> <li>• On lead in paint, the work plan with a 2020 target for elimination of leaded paint was established and implementation is under way.</li> <li>• The Partnership for Clean Fuels and Vehicles continued to engage the six remaining countries globally still using leaded petrol.</li> </ul> <p>Additional activities implementing sound chemicals and waste management were carried out in 29 countries where UNEP assisted in applying guidance and tools to achieve actions aimed at pollution reduction strategies or reduction of wastes from mercury, lead or pesticides.</p>



## POLICY AND CONTROL SYSTEMS FOR HARMFUL SUBSTANCES OF GLOBAL CONCERN

Expected Accomplishment (c): Appropriate policy and control systems for harmful substances of global concern are developed and being implemented in line with international obligations of States and mandates of relevant entities.	Assessment: “Partially achieved” (✓⊗)	Baseline	Target (cumulative)	Actual
Indicator of Achievement	Unit of Measure	2011	2013	2013
(i) Agreement is reached at the international level on the means of addressing mercury with the assistance of UNEP	International agreement on mercury	N/A	1	1
(ii) Increased number of countries with control systems and policies being implemented to meet their international obligations with regard to harmful substances and hazardous waste with the assistance of UNEP	Number of multilateral environmental agreement reports submitted by Governments describing progress in the implementation of relevant international instruments with UNEP support	498	560	529
(iii) Increased number of countries showing reductions in harmful substances and hazardous waste as a result of their control systems and policies with the assistance of UNEP	Number of countries with data showing reductions in harmful substances and hazardous waste	20	30	76

### Results against indicator

Regarding indicator (i), Governments approved the Minamata Convention on Mercury following five meetings of the intergovernmental negotiating committee between 2011 and 2013 and a Conference of Plenipotentiaries in October 2013. The Convention now has 94 signatories and one ratification of the convention: the United States of America<sup>14</sup>. 26 governments, five UN agencies, and 98 companies are members of the Global Mercury Partnership. UNEP is supporting stakeholders through the partnership including initial GEF grants worth USD 4.7 million for five projects in China, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Latin America and the Caribbean region and a global initiative on monitoring/analytical approaches for mercury. The projects are targeted to develop mercury emission inventories as a basis for reduction and on monitoring mercury in the environment and humans.

Regarding indicator (ii), on activities supporting governments in meeting their obligations under multilateral environmental agreements, UNEP has 25 national reports from countries undertaking POPs analysis and monitoring activities with assistance from UNEP<sup>15</sup>. Six countries have submitted during this biennium their second national reports to the Stockholm Convention, showing progress in POPs reduction / elimination.

However, by 31 December 2013, the number of Parties to Basel and Stockholm Conventions and addition to such agreement including Montreal protocol is as follows: Basel Convention = 180, Ban Amendment = 76; Rotterdam Convention = 154; Stockholm Convention = 179; Montreal Protocol = 197. A total of 786 Parties. In 2012, eight countries and in 2013, six countries, respectively, have become party to one of the MEAs.

14 Countries that submitted reports are Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Solomon Islands, Samoa, Antigua and Barbuda, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico (sp), Peru (sp), Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mauritius, Uganda, Zambia, DR Congo (fr), Ghana, Mali (fr), Nigeria, Senegal (fr) and Togo (fr).

15 URL: <http://www.mercuryconvention.org/Countries/tabid/3428/Default.aspx>



Regarding indicator (iii), 54 countries reduced hazardous waste by export and reported to the Basel Convention Secretariat during the biennium. Additionally, Indonesia has shown reductions in mercury releases to the environment from small-scale gold mining and Kyrgyzstan has secured previously uncontrolled stocks of DDT with assistance from UNEP.


**Risk analysis and risk management measures**

Availability of resources (financial and human in some regions) is a constraint on work in this area. Greater regional presence would be beneficial for the rollout of some of these activities in the next biennium. The approved new Regular budget posts for the subprogramme in some key regions would increase UNEP’s delivery capacity at regional and country level.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Analytical and secretariat support are provided to the intergovernmental negotiating committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury and technical support is provided to countries to improve the management of the use and anthropogenic release of mercury through Global Mercury Partnership activities. (Target: one international agreement on mercury plus 46 countries supported).</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Support is provided to countries to strengthen implementation and evolution of existing chemicals and waste multilateral environmental agreements through capacity building and technical cooperation in collaboration with the multilateral environmental agreement secretariats. (Target: 67 country reports showing strengthened implementation).</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Support is provided to national and regional enforcement agencies to reduce illegal trafficking of harmful substances and hazardous waste. (Target: five national and regional enforcement agencies).</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Knowledge of the environmental and health risks of harmful substances and hazardous waste is communicated to relevant groups in UNEP-supported countries. (Target: all countries supported by UNEP under this subprogramme).</p>	<p>UNEP supports countries through hosting the interim secretariat to the Minamata Convention on Mercury Prior to this, UNEP organized the fourth and fifth meetings of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) which were held in June/ July 2012 and January 2013, respectively. The INC-5 agreed to forward the text to a Conference of Plenipotentiaries for adoption and signature. The Diplomatic Conference was held in Kumamoto, Japan, in October 2013. By 31 December 2013, the Minamata Convention had 94 signatories. The US was the first to ratify the Convention in November 2013.</p> <p>The work on mercury is further supported through the voluntary Global Mercury Partnership, having 26 governments, 5 UN agencies, and 98 companies as members of the, which supported activities in 57 countries.</p> <p>In 2013, 64 Governments and the European Commission in the Global Programme of Action (GPA) partnership endorsed further work on nutrient management. A report with 334 nutrient management best practices from 59 countries was compiled and analyzed. Nutrients in the GPA refer to the excess nitrogen and phosphorus that come from application of fertilizers on farm that end up in the ocean causing algal growth and leading to hypoxia or dead zones. UNEP has piloted in Lake Chilika (India) the use of an ecosystem health report card for reporting on nutrients loads into the coastal waters as well as the over state of the ecosystem. This is now being replicated in Laguna de Bay in the Philippines. The aim is to have it taken up at wider scales by other countries and also the RAMSAR convention. The Global Partnerships on Marine Litter and on Nutrient Management continue to deliver outputs.</p> <p>UNEP’s assistance to countries in implementing their obligations under the Stockholm Convention had a portfolio of 19 POPs projects financed by the GEF worth of USD 36 Million, mainly in the area of POPs monitoring, PCB, DDT and national implementation. The GEF projects have generated some concrete results such as the 17.2 tons of DDT which have been secured in the Kyrgyz Republic</p> <p>The Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention recommends using the UNEP Toolkits for PCDD/PCDF release inventories and the Guidance on the Global Monitoring Plan on POPs, including a joint UNEP/WHO protocol for human milk surveys. These guidance documents are also used by IOMC partners in their support to countries. The Dioxin/Furan Toolkit is used by almost all countries assisted by UNIDO, UNDP and the World Bank (and UNEP) for national reporting under Convention Articles 5, 7, 15. The PCBs Elimination Network and the Global Alliance for Alternatives to DDT are hosted by the UNEP Chemicals Branch. Work on developing a road map on sustainable and safe alternatives for DDT started in 2013.</p> <p>Illegal trafficking of banned substances affects countries’ abilities to comply with international obligations. UNEP work has increased the capacities of border liaison officers in several countries.</p>



FIGURE 33: Tracking changes in DDT levels in humans









# **PERFORMANCE: RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION**

*To ensure natural resources are produced, processed and consumed in a more environmentally sustainable way, in which environmental impact is decoupled from economic growth and social co-benefits are optimized*



## HIGHLIGHTS

Adopted at Rio+20, the 10 Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (10 YFP) is an intergovernmental framework to accelerate the shift towards SCP in all countries, and support the exchange and development of best practices and policy tools, as well as to build capacity on the ground. UNEP serves as its Secretariat. Its implementation is well under way with its 10-member Board established, as well as 108 National and 41 Stake holder focal points, a UN Inter-Agency Coordination Group (19 UN agencies, with UNEP and the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs as co-chairs), a dedicated Trust Fund, and a more than 1500-member web-based Global Sustainable Consumption and Production Clearinghouse. In 2013, meetings were held in the Latin America and the Caribbean, Arab, and Asia and Pacific regions, leading to policy recommendations and the development of regional roadmaps. Initial 10 YFP programmes are being developed through multi-stakeholder consultations for launch scheduled in 2014. These initial programmes will be dedicated to sustainable tourism (including ecotourism), sustainable building and construction, consumer information, sustainable public procurement, and sustainable lifestyles and education. They will bring together existing initiatives and partnerships working in similar areas, building synergies and cooperation between stakeholders to leverage resources in order to reach mutual objectives.

The call by Member States at Rio+20 for action on green economy led in 2013 to the launch of the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE), a joint ILO, UNEP, UNIDO and UNITAR initiative.

During the biennium, as a result of UNEP's advisory services on green economy and sustainable consumption and production, the capacity of Governments to manage resources and mainstream sustainability aspects in development planning – from assessment to policy implementation – has been strengthened in 42 countries. 10 of them have formally adopted related policies or are engaged in implementing them.

### Funds total

The 2012-2013 total budget for the Resource Efficiency subprogramme was USD 72 million. Total allocations issued in 2012-2013 were USD 76 million as Trust Funds. Earmarked Contributions received more income than planned, although the for the Environment Fund the allocation was lower than budget. Total expenditure was USD 54 million, 71% of allocations.


### The Environment Fund

The 2012-2013 expenditure rate of the Environment Fund for the Resource Efficiency subprogramme was 100% of allocations.






**FIGURE 34: Resource Efficiency subprogramme budget performance**



**FIGURE 35: Analysis of 2012-2013 post and non-post costs of the Resource Efficiency subprogramme**





## BRIDGING SCIENCE AND POLICY

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (a):</b> Enhanced understanding by Governments and other stakeholders of scientific assessment of resource flows and related environmental impacts along global value chains, as well as of potential for decoupling</p>	<p>Assessment: "Fully Achieved" (✓)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>Increased number of UNEP-associated scientific assessments, analytical reports and scarcity alerts used and referenced by a specified number of target Governments and public and private sector organizations</p>	<p>Number of downloads by Governments and references to UNEP assessments and reports in government policy documents and organizational reports.</p>	<p>100,000 downloads 25 references</p>	<p>200,000 downloads 50 references</p>	<p>1,000,000* downloads 145 references</p>

\* While the target has been exceeded, this indicator has not proven useful. Its use is discontinued in the future programmes of work

### Results against indicator

The number of downloads of and references to UNEP Resource efficiency scientific publications exceeded the biennial targets. References come from policy documents from the European Commission and national Governments, such as the German Resource Efficiency Programme (ProgRes), adopted by the Federal Cabinet in 2012, which states that the Federal Government intends to continue at a high level the German involvement in international bodies "such as the UNEP backed International Resource Panel (IRP)" and refers to the 2011 decoupling report as authoritative. Reports were also cited by the High-level Panel on Global Sustainability (GSP) and in strategic documents from UN Agencies and other stakeholders and forum, including the World Economic Forum.


### Risk analysis and risk management measures

Ensuring that the scientific assessments are demand-driven and based on the needs of the policy-making community is a key challenge. Efforts to enhance exchanges between the Panel's experts and Government representatives during IRP meetings are underway. Regional consultations with senior policy-makers, beginning in 2013 with Africa and Asia and Pacific, are a way for Governments to communicate critical issues on which policy-relevant scientific knowledge is lacking. Availability of data on certain resources or regions/countries is also a challenge, as is securing active expert members (working on a pro bono basis) from developing countries. A more regional approach to the IRP's newer assessments, including regional workshops, to secure inputs from experts from the regions is one measure taken to address this challenge.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Authoritative scientific assessments on global resource use by industries and consumption clusters, social and economic drivers and decoupling of environmental degradation from economic growth, with policy-relevant conclusions, are introduced into governmental decision-making. (Target: three assessments)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Resource scarcities and major environmental impacts caused by unsustainable resource use are identified and publicized, with findings assessed and government agencies supported to use findings in their policy decisions and programmes. (Target: four critically affected countries)</p>	<p>The IRP has published nine reports since its establishment in 2007, including four over this biennium. Three more, on REDD+, global land use and decoupling policies and technologies, were finalised for publication, seven are in progress (food, soils, integrated scenarios, and material flows and resource productivity, trade and GhG mitigation technologies (2)).</p> <p>IRP reports are used to inform policy. For example, the IRP was mentioned in the draft negotiating text during the Rio+20 preparatory process and the European Commission’s <i>Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe</i> refers to its work on decoupling.</p> <p>IRP findings are complemented by the region-specific Resource Efficiency: Economics and Outlooks (REEOs), which have been developed for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, and China. As a follow up to earlier REEO reports, a material flows database was updated for Asia and the Pacific and created for Latin America and the Caribbean, in partnership with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.</p>

**FIGURE 36: Green Economy & Sustainable Consumption and Production policy related results achieved 2012-2013**





## TAKING POLICY ACTION

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (b):</b> Improved capacity of Governments and public institutions to identify, regulate and manage key resource challenges, mainstream sustainable development aspects in their development planning and implementation, and adopt policies and tools for resource efficiency</p>	<p>Assessment: "Fully Achieved" (✓)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>Increased number of Governments and other public institutions implementing policies, economic instruments and initiatives for resource-efficiency improvements and introducing environmentally sustainable aspects into their economies</p>	<p>Number of Governments that have adopted or begun implementing new policies, regulations or economic instruments promoting resource efficiency and sustainable consumption and production</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>21</p>

### Results against indicator

UNEP continued to support national governments and local authorities in mainstreaming sustainable consumption and production and green economy in the context of poverty eradication and sustainable development. It has been working in 42 countries, 11 of which, have formally adopted related policies or engaged in implementing them during the biennium. Following green economy assessments, some countries have for example, adopted new plans and included regulations, market-based instruments and incentives that encourage a transition to a green economy, such as Barbados, China, the Republic of Korea or South Africa. Some other have strengthened their commitments to SCP through the adoption of national action plans or mainstreaming of SCP in their development planning, such as Indonesia, or Mexico. In Africa, second phase pilot countries under the African 10 Year Framework of Programmes on SCP are implementing some of the priority actions identified in their national SCP programmes, such as Burkina Faso, Ghana, Uganda and Zambia.

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

With the momentum created by Rio+20, a number of international organisations have been redirecting programmes towards green economy, creating a risk of overlap and competing offers. UNEP addresses this risk and ensures synergies through the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE), with the ILO, UNIDO and UNITAR, its engagement in the Green Growth Knowledge Platform with the OECD, the World Bank and the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI), and partnerships with other organizations.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Authoritative policy assessments, cost-benefit analyses and sectoral examples of the economic, environmental and social – including poverty reduction – gains from applying policies and economic instruments for resource efficiency are developed with a global perspective and used in governmental decision-making. (Target: two assessments)</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Activities based on the results of the Marrakech Process are scaled up in all regions, with Governments and other major groups involved in a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production to support Governments and business in the transition to such consumption and production and resource-efficient societies. (Target: one framework; five regional round tables)</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> National advisory services on the greening of economies and mainstreaming of sustainable consumption and production in national development planning and programmes are combined with capacity-building on the introduction of economic and legal instruments and other appropriate delivery vehicles. (Target: 10 rapidly industrializing economies or natural-resource-dependent developing countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Tools, best practices and action plans for sustainable urban development – including appropriate infrastructure, efficient water, sanitation and waste management – are identified and promoted through catalyzing actions in collaboration with partner government agencies. (Target: eight rapidly growing large and medium-sized cities)</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Good practices on efficient use of natural resources – land, water, forests and their products – are applied in countries in support of rural development and sustainable supply, with further replication catalysed in relevant industries and United Nations agencies. (Target: four localities in natural resource-dependent countries)</p>	<p>The adoption of the 10 Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (10 YFP) at Rio+20 and the launch of the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) were major achievements of the biennium.</p> <p>UNEP, serving as Secretariat of the 10YFP, has supported its institutional structure set-up by 10-Member Board, 108 National and 41 Stakeholder Focal Points, a UN Inter-Agency Coordination Group (19 UN agencies; co-chaired by UNDESA and UNEP), a dedicated Trust Fund, and a web-based Global SCP Clearinghouse (1,500 members). Regional meetings led to policy recommendations and regional roadmap developments in Latin America and the Caribbean, Arab, and Asia and Pacific regions. The five initial 10 YFP programmes are being developed through multi-stakeholder consultations. They will bring together existing initiatives and partnerships in similar areas, building synergies and cooperation between stakeholders to leverage resources towards mutual objectives.</p> <p>In addition to PAGE, analysis of key aspects of the green economy (GE) was developed with partners, including a report on GE and trade opportunities; a report and guidelines for governments on measuring progress towards GE; and an interagency paper on opportunities and challenges for overcoming poverty and inequality. The Green Growth Knowledge Platform, was developed jointly by UNEP, OECD, World Bank and GGGI to fill knowledge gaps, involving a global network of international organizations and experts.</p> <p>Overall, as a result of UNEP’s advisory services on GE and SCP, the capacity of national and local governments to manage resources and mainstream sustainability aspects in development planning improved in 42 countries and 12 cities (from assessment to policy implementation). For example, 15 countries completed assessments of green economy options and developed policy recommendations; SCP action plans or sectoral assessments were implemented in 10 others; relevant legal frameworks developed in two and pilot activities to mainstream resource efficiency in city development planning were delivered in three.</p>



## INCREASING SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS PRACTICES

<b>Expected Accomplishment (c):</b> Increased investment in efficient, clean and safe industrial production methods through voluntary action by the private sector	Assessment: <b>“Fully Achieved” (✓)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target (cumulative)</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Indicator of Achievement</b>	<b>Unit of Measure</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2013</b>
Increased number of businesses adopting and investing in resource-efficient management practices and technologies and cleaner and safer production methods	Number of companies in UNEP initiatives and reporting improvements in environmental performance and investments.	60	70	82

### Results against indicator

Partnerships with the private sector and within sectors have grown in size and in maturity. These partnerships are promoting sustainability along supply-chains and are instrumental in the development of assessment reports, as well as practical methodological and technical guidance and tools and benchmarks. An additional 22 participating companies have reported improvements in their environmental performance over the biennium. In addition, UNEP and UNIDO launched the Green Industry Platform which now counts 120 members, and established two new National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs) . The Principles for Sustainable Insurance launched at Rio+20 counts 42 insurance companies signatories - representing USD 8 trillion in assets -, 30 of which have already publicly disclosed how they are implementing the Principles. UNEP’s Sustainable Buildings and Construction Initiative (SBCI) – including 12 private sector companies - is supporting work to green the building sector value chain.6 private sector companies have joined the Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP).

### Risk analysis and risk management measures

As businesses need a level playing field in order to be able to invest, UNEP interventions in priority sectors and value chains have evolved to increasingly include work on sectoral green economy and sustainable consumption and product policies. The 2014-2015 programme of work is designed to better reflect this, articulating outputs that consider sectoral policies together with business practices.

As UNEP focuses on policy enablers and on strengthening and building the capacity of intermediaries such as NCPCs, it is difficult to track and assess impacts and improvements by companies. UNEP progressively includes more focused reporting requirements in contractual agreements and in conditions for joining UNEP partnerships.



Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Technical guidance for resource-efficient management practices is developed and promoted through UNIDO to assist a network of national cleaner production and related expert centres to support small businesses and industries in developing countries in their investment decision-making and the introduction of environmentally sound technologies. (Target: four new cleaner production centres and support to 50 existing cleaner production centres).</p> <p><b>Output 2:</b> Innovative practices in sustainable agri-food production and food supply chain management are promoted and supported by capacity-building in supplier countries and dialogue on actionable pathways to sustainability, including tools and labels, where appropriate, for communicating resource use efficiency issues along the full value chain and helping Governments and consumers to consider resource implications of agri-food. (Target: one partnership with at least 10 organizations participating and introducing a new standard, pilot testing in two countries).</p> <p><b>Output 3:</b> Shared understanding of high-impact and policy-relevant areas in the metals and manufacturing value chain, with agreed methodologies and best practices in metals extraction, product design and metals use, is established to close the materials cycle and methodologies are pilot tested in two countries. (Target: one partnership, with at least 10 organizations participating and implementing efficiency plans, pilot testing in two countries)</p> <p><b>Output 4:</b> Support is provided to countries in their efforts to adopt and implement national and local policies and standards in support of sustainable and energy efficient buildings based on internationally recognized references, policy advice and funding models. (Target: one partnership; new standards introduced in four countries)</p> <p><b>Output 5:</b> Investment opportunities in the development, transfer and implementation of resource-efficient technologies and business practices are advanced through finance sector interventions targeting financial services and capital markets in the development of new management principles approaches and building capacity in their use. (Target: one partnership, with over 100 companies from three sectors: banking, insurance and investment)</p>	<p>Businesses are supported through the development of UNEP-led global assessment reports such as ‘GEO-5 for business’ which supports businesses understanding of the changing environment.</p> <p>Particular emphasis is placed on SMEs. UNEP and UNIDO strengthened their partnership with the launch of the Green Industry Platform (120 members), an additional two UNIDO UNEP NCPCs set up, and a RECP network established to expand and ‘professionalise’ RECP service providers. A three year project to develop eco-innovation technical and policy capacities was started with a first roundtable (Hanoi) dedicated to eco-innovative solutions for the agri-food value chain.</p> <p>In the food and agriculture sector, under the auspices of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)-UNEP Sustainable Food Systems Programme and Agri-Food Task Force on SCP, UNEP developed an approach to scale up sustainable practices in high-impact food supply chains through national food roundtables, pilot tested in two countries. It also elaborated a practical guidance to support food waste prevention and reduction. The multi stakeholder Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP), jointly led with the International Rice Research Institute, is developing a farm-level methodology for sustainable rice production and innovative incentive mechanisms for its mass uptake to be pilot tested in the next biennium.</p> <p>The UNEP Finance Initiative (FI) (232 members) trained 945 people (mainly from the banking sector), launched 14 reports and an online tool to assist the mainstreaming of sustainable finance, and hosted its Global Roundtable (Beijing). In Latin America, a survey showed that seven members have reduced the environmental impact of their offices or established credit lines to support resource efficiency related investments. UNEP FI also contributed to the development of the Principles for Sustainable Insurance, launched at Rio+20.</p> <p>In the building and construction sector the Sustainable Buildings and Climate Initiative (SBCI) contributes to greater awareness and adoption of sustainable building policies. Specific project activities have reached 12 countries in Southeast Asia, seven in Latin America, five in Africa and three in Eastern Europe. For example, collaboration between UNEP and the Centre for Sustainable Buildings (Singapore) has led to reporting on building energy efficiency initiatives in seven countries, which contributes to establishing baseline information to support related policies.</p>



## STIMULATING MORE SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTS AND LIFESTYLES

<p><b>Expected Accomplishment (d):</b> Demand-side decisions and consumption choices favor more resource efficient and environmentally friendly products, driven by standardized and internationally recognized tools and communications and by an enabling social infrastructure</p>	<p>Assessment: “Fully Achieved” (✓)</p>	<p><b>Baseline</b></p>	<p><b>Target (cumulative)</b></p>	<p><b>Actual</b></p>
<p><b>Indicator of Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>Unit of Measure</b></p>	<p><b>2011</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>	<p><b>2013</b></p>
<p>(i) Increase in the sales of targeted resource efficient and environmentally friendly products, goods and services</p>	<p>Sales of products, goods and services with recognized environmental standards and labels</p>	<p>USD 52 billion (third party certified organic foods) 160,000 certifications with ISO 14001</p>	<p>USD 60 billion (third party certified organic foods) 180,000 certifications with ISO 14001</p>	<p>USD 62,9 billion as of 2011<sup>16</sup> 250,972 as of 2011</p>
<p>(ii) Increased number of Governments, companies and consumer groups with access to and making use of recognized tools and communications made available through UNEP-supported initiatives when making purchasing decisions with respect to more resource efficient and environmentally friendly products, goods and services.<sup>17</sup></p>	<p>Number of government and business organizations using tools supported by UNEP initiatives when making purchasing decisions.</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>59</p>

### Results against indicator

Sustainable consumption enabling policies, methodologies and use of tools have been strengthened. 61 countries or organizations joined the international Sustainable Public Procurement Initiative, launched at Rio+20. 4 UNEP supported countries are implementing Sustainable Public Procurement (SPP) action plans, and one country used the UNEP SPP Training Toolkit to train procurers. In the UN, the number of organizations with an official Sustainable Procurement strategy grew from none to five. In addition, mainstreaming of life-cycle approaches and methodologies is also ongoing, with a number of organizations implementing related tools: Life-Cycle Management (LCM) Guidance (25 organisations based in four countries ) and Global Guidance for Life-Cycle Analysis (LCA) databases (two organizations based in China and Chile), leading already to one country





121



developing a national LCA Roadmap. Pilots on Sustainable Building Policies in Developing Countries tools were completed, with two cities developing and adopting a local strategy.

### **Risk analysis and risk management measures**

Work to improve the sustainability of consumption patterns faces a number of challenges, including the need to look at under-consumption as well as overconsumption, and the difficulty of reaching out to many actors that should be involved in order to demonstrate impacts. UNEP focuses on sustainable consumption “enablers” (e.g. transparent, verifiable, and credible information to guide consumers) to provide incentives for governments, businesses and citizens to move away from unsustainable consumption patterns and lifestyles. The 10YFP, through its catalytic role and multistakeholder programmes offers an opportunity to address these issues in a more impactful manner, including equity related concerns.

- 16 Data from the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) is obtainable with two-year delays  
17 To measure progress on this expected accomplishment more accurately, this indicator includes a) the number of UN organizations, national governments, public organizations and cities i) using UNEP tools in their procurement practices, ii) promoting or adopting national or global ecolabelling schemes and broadening the number of product categories covered by their ecolabelling scheme, iii) adopting more stringent environmental criteria/standards in their sectoral policies (e.g. the building sector), therefore impacting the way public purchasing decisions are made, and iv) promoting the use of life-cycle related methodologies and indicators; b) the number of businesses using tools that are conducive to more sustainable consumption practices: i) life-cycle related methodologies and indicators for their products, and ii) sustainability information tools, and iii) more sustainable procurement practices; and c) the number of UN organizations adopting more sustainable procurement practices.

Planned Programme of Work Outputs	Performance
<p>Output 1: Good practices in user- or consumer-oriented tools and methodologies such as sustainability reporting, footprinting, ecolabelling, standards and certification are developed and support for their implementation is provided in target countries and industries. (Target: one global and four national interventions)</p> <p>Output 2: Progress toward sustainable lifestyles is defined and advanced through support to countries and public and private institutions in their efforts to organize awareness raising campaigns, media and advertising codes and youth education initiatives. (Target: four partnership initiatives).</p> <p>Output 3: Support is provided to United Nations and governmental institutions, including national and local governments, to develop and apply action plans and capacity-building for achieving climate neutrality and resource efficiency through changes in procurement policy and practices, buildings and facilities management and office culture. (Target: 30 action plans)</p>	<p>In the context of the 10YFP, extensive consultations have shaped the Consumer Information Programme, to be launched early 2014. Transformation of the Sustainable Public Procurement Initiative (SPPI) into a 10 YFP programme is also ongoing, along with consultations on the Sustainable Lifestyles and Education one.</p> <p>Already, the SPPI launched at Rio+20 (with 61 members and five operational working groups) is supporting stakeholders to adopt SPP practices. A Global review of SPP practices was published. Four UNEP supported countries are implementing their Sustainable Public Procurement (SPP) actions plans, and an additional country used UNEP SPP Training Toolkit to train its procurers. Agreements are under preparation with nine countries to further support work on SPP and eco-labeling and maximize the opportunities and synergies of these two instruments.</p> <p>To support the provision of transparent, credible and verifiable sustainability information, the impact categories of climate change, land use, water use and air pollutants were agreed following six international consultations on life-cycle impact assessment indicators. An extensive project on environmental footprinting strengthened capacities in 18 countries.</p> <p>The Group of Friends of Paragraph 47, which aims at providing more information to stakeholders on sustainability practices of companies, has been joined by nine Governments. It is engaging governments in related international fora such as the UN Forum on Business and Human Rights and in discussions on sustainable development goals (SDGs). It is also identifying and developing best practices for public policies on sustainability reporting.</p> <p>For the UN system, a major achievement is the finalization of the UN Milestones Framework for Environmental Management Systems (EMS); the UN now has a reference framework to implement emission reduction strategies and EMS. Results include: an increase in the number of UN agencies purchasing CER offsets from four to seven; 13 organizations with an official emissions reduction strategy; five implementing EMS; five with a sustainable procurement strategy; and 247 green practices reported on the “Greening the Blue” portal.</p> <p>The “Think.Eat.Save. Reduce Your Foodprint” campaign, which targets citizens, governments and key private sector stakeholders, has acquired in a year’s time more than 30 partners and supporters.</p>

10YFP	Ten Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production		Chemical Weapons
AF	Adaptation Fund	OTA	Programme Support Cost
APELL	Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at the Local Level	PAGE	Partnership for Action on Green Economy
AREED	African Rural Energy Enterprise Development Programme	PCEA	Post-Crisis Environmental Assessment
CCAC	Climate and Clean Air Coalition	PEI	Poverty and Environment Initiative
CESC	Clean Energy Solutions Centre	PoW	Programme of Work
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research	POP	Persistent Organic Pollutant
CPR	Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP	PROVIA	Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Networks	REN21	Renewable Energy Policy Framework for the 21st Century
COP	Conference of Parties	REGATTA	Regional Gateway for Technology Transfer and Climate Change Action
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo	SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
EA	Expected Accomplishment	SBCI	Sustainable Buildings and Construction Initiative
EBA	Ecosystem Based Adaptation	SE4All	Sustainable Energy for All
Eco-DRR	Ecosystem approach to disaster risk reduction	SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
EMG	Environment Management Group	SIDS	Small Island Developing State
EMS	Environmental Management System	SPP	Strategic Presence Policy
EU	European Union	SPPI	Sustainable Public Procurement Initiative
EUR	Euro	SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
FACET	Finance for Access to Clean Energy Technologies	SCAF	Seed Capital Assistance Facility
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN	SEAN-CC	Southeast Asia Network of Climate Change Offices
GC	Governing Council	TAP	Technology Action Plan
GCF	Green Climate Fund	TNA	Technology Needs Assessment
GFCS	Global Framework for Climate Services	UNDA	United Nations Development Account
GE	Green Economy	UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
GEF	Global Environment Facility	UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
GFEI	Global Fuel Economy Initiative	UNCT	United Nations Country Team
GNESD	Global Network on Energy for Sustainable Development	UNEA	United Nations Environment Assembly
GSP	High-level Panel on Global Sustainability	UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management	UNDG	United Nations Development Group
IEG	International Environmental Governance	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development	UNDSS	United Nations Department of Safety and Security
ILO	International Labour Organization	UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
IRP	International Resource Panel	UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
IMIS	Integrated Management Information System	UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund	UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
IOMC	Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals	UN-REDD	United Nations collaborative programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services	UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
IUCN	World Conservation Union	UNON	United Nations Office at Nairobi
LCA	Life-Cycle Analysis	USD	United States Dollar
LDC	Least Developed Country	VIA	Vulnerability and Impact Assessment
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement	WARN-CC	West Asia Regional Network on Climate Change
MINUSMA	Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali	WCP	World Climate Programme
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action	WHO	World Health organization
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action	WFP	World Food Programme
NAP	National Adaptation Plan	WMO	World Meteorological Organization
NCP	National Cleaner Production Centre	WRI	World Resources Institute
NIE	National Implementing Entity		
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs		
ODA	Official Development Assistance		
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development		
OfO	Office for Operations and Corporate Services		
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights		
OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services of the UN		
OPCW	Organization for the Prohibition of		

ANNEX 1: 2009–2013 CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNEP'S ENVIRONMENT FUND (IN USD)

	Country	2009 Pledges	2009 Paid	2010 Pledges	2010 Paid	2011 Pledges	2011 Paid	2012 Pledges	2012 Paid	2013 Pledges	2013 Paid
1	A.T. Kearney K.K					2,983	2,983				
2	Afghanistan					2,450	2,450	1,225	1,225	1,000	1,000
3	Albania			1,728	1,728						
4	Algeria	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000					10,000	10,000
5	Andorra	39,681	39,681	36,582	36,582	42,192	42,192	39,474	39,474	39,291	39,291
6	Angola	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	2,400	2,400	1,200	1,200
7	Antigua and Barbuda					1,000	1,000				
8	Argentina			54,475	54,475	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	50,000	50,000
9	Armenia	1,300	1,300	1,500	1,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
10	Australia	674,974	674,974	839,971	839,971	1,167,502	1,167,502	1,201,645	1,201,645	1,124,007	1,124,007
11	Austria	524,000	524,000	570,000	570,000	550,140	550,140	523,520	523,520	536,800	536,800
12	Bahamas	2,500	2,500							3,500	3,500
13	Bangladesh	574	574	653	653	574	574	653	653	653	653
14	Barbados			2,500	2,500	5,000	5,000	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
15	Belarus	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
16	Belgium	5,471,134	5,471,134	4,488,538	4,488,538	4,809,494	4,809,494			5,929,105	5,929,105
17	Belize			900	900	900	900	950	950	950	950
18	Bhutan	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450		
19	Bosnia/Herzegovina							12,000	12,000		
20	Botswana			6,000	6,000					7,000	7,000
21	Brazil	227,500	227,500	280,000	-						
22	Bulgaria			8,712	8,712	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
23	Burkina Faso	6,837	6,837			6,540	6,540	5,646	5,646		
24	Burundi					640	640				
25	Cambodia					2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
26	Cameroon			2,257	2,257			22,573	22,573	9,948	9,948
27	Canada	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,968,780	2,968,780
28	Cape Verde									3,073	3,073

	Country	2009 Pledges	2009 Paid	2010 Pledges	2010 Paid	2011 Pledges	2011 Paid	2012 Pledges	2012 Paid	2013 Pledges	2013 Paid
29	Chile	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	40,000	40,000			20,000	20,000
30	China	250,000	250,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
31	Colombia	30,000	30,000	40,000	40,000	36,448	36,448	50,000	50,000	22,971	22,971
32	Comoros	760	760								
33	Congo					850	850			2,000	2,000
34	Costa Rica	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	4,054	4,054	3,243	3,243	7,179	7,179
35	Croatia	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
36	Cuba										
37	Cyprus	33,500	33,500	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000
38	Czech Republic	222,197	222,197	38,038	38,038	38,038	38,038	49,845	49,845	59,377	59,377
39	Denmark	3,906,250	3,906,250	3,508,772	3,508,772	4,568,212	4,568,212	4,371,852	4,371,852	4,602,187	4,602,187
40	Djibouti					900	-				
41	Dominica					1,000	1,000				
42	Ecuador	3,200	3,200	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	7,600	7,600	4,500	4,500
43	Egypt	20,000	20,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
44	El Salvador	3,200	-	3,200	-	3,200	-				
45	Eritrea	900	900	900	900	900	900				
46	Estonia					13,974	13,974			26,302	26,302
47	Ethiopia	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000			1,600	1,600		
48	Fiji	4,480	4,480	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,481	4,481		
49	Finland	4,876,280	4,876,280	4,161,600	4,161,600	4,556,340	4,556,340	4,402,886	4,402,886	4,364,240	4,364,240
50	France	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,440,000	5,440,000	5,440,000	5,440,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
51	Gambia					1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000		
52	Georgia					2,200	2,200	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
53	Germany	7,884,740	7,884,740	9,819,747	9,819,747	10,496,639	10,496,639	9,696,293	9,696,293	9,889,998	9,889,998
54	Greece	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000					250,000	250,000
55	Grenada	700	700								
56	Guatemala			2,900	2,900					5,823	5,823
57	Guyana			1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,005	1,005	995	995
58	Honduras			1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000			1,140	1,140
59	Hungary	100,000	100,000	50,000	50,000			10,000	10,000	9,975	9,975

	Country	2009 Pledges	2009 Paid	2010 Pledges	2010 Paid	2011 Pledges	2011 Paid	2012 Pledges	2012 Paid	2013 Pledges	2013 Paid
60	Iceland					34,000	34,000	38,000	38,000		
61	India	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	51,578	100,000	50,000	100,000	-
62	Indonesia	30,000	30,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	59,000	59,000		
63	Iran (Islamic Republic of)					41,286	41,286			60,908	60,908
64	Iraq	2,300	2,300	2,700	2,700			6,500	6,500	3,800	3,800
65	Ireland	456,956	456,956	422,973	422,973	432,008	432,008	470,000	470,000	470,000	470,000
66	Israel	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000			20,000	20,000	140,000	140,000
67	Italy	4,518,072	4,518,072								
68	Jamaica	3,080	-								
69	Japan	2,963,807	2,963,807	2,963,807	2,963,807	2,818,436	2,818,436	2,779,194	2,779,194	2,779,194	1,269,095
70	Jordan					3,500	3,500			5,000	5,000
71	Kazakhstan			17,469	17,469	22,975	22,975	22,975	22,975	31,950	31,950
72	Kenya	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
73	Kuwait	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	-
74	Kyrgyzstan	760	760					950	950	950	950
75	Lao People's Democratic Republic	2,000	2,000					2,000	2,000		
76	Latvia	13,500	13,500								
77	Lebanon									7,000	7,000
78	Lesotho			9,975	9,975	9,975	-	10,228	10,228		
79	Liechtenstein	7,600	7,600	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
80	Lithuania	14,000	14,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000
81	Luxembourg	878,800	878,800	700,280	700,280	704,225	704,225	660,313	660,313	638,570	638,570
82	Madagascar	1,000	1,000	907	907			999	999		
83	Malawi	760	760	900	-	900	-				
84	Malaysia	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
85	Maldives			2,000		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
86	Mali	1,500	1,500			1,500	-				
87	Malta	13,000	13,000								
88	Mauritania	1,500	-	1,500	-	6,183	-				

	Country	2009 Pledges	2009 Paid	2010 Pledges	2010 Paid	2011 Pledges	2011 Paid	2012 Pledges	2012 Paid	2013 Pledges	2013 Paid
89	Mauritius	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	12,998	12,998	5,000	5,000
90	Mexico	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
91	Micronesia (Federated States of)	600	600					760	760		
92	Moldova			900	900	900	900	950	950	950	950
93	Monaco	28,053	28,053	26,749	26,749	28,781	28,781	26,437	26,437	26,152	26,152
94	Mongolia					1,000	1,000	8,938	8,938		
95	Montenegro	1,000	-	1,000	-						
96	Morocco			12,000	12,000	11,617	11,617	15,621	15,621	16,000	-
97	Mozambique	760	760			900	900				
98	Myanmar	1,000	-			2,391	2,012				
99	Namibia					1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750		
100	Netherlands	12,731,000	12,731,000	12,901,000	12,901,000	10,368,800	10,368,800	10,017,600	10,017,600	10,248,000	10,248,000
101	NEW 38TH Floor Production					5,000	5,000				
102	New Zealand	195,000	195,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000			260,000	260,000
103	Nicaragua							1,000	1,000	1,706	1,706
104	Niger	760	760	814	814	900	-				
105	Nigeria	40,000	-								
106	Norway	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,078,125	3,078,125	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
107	Oman	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000					28,000	28,000
108	Pakistan	9,884	9,884	10,968	10,968	10,981	10,981	10,964	10,964	10,949	10,949
109	Panama	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
110	Papua New Guinea							1,000	1,000		
111	Peru			15,000	15,000			19,000	19,000	10,000	10,000
112	Philippines	1,333	1,333	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
113	Poland	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
114	Portugal	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000			50,000	50,000	50,000	-
115	Republic of Korea	193,041	193,041	201,325	201,325	221,722	221,722	307,931	307,931	391,719	391,719

	Country	2009 Pledges	2009 Paid	2010 Pledges	2010 Paid	2011 Pledges	2011 Paid	2012 Pledges	2012 Paid	2013 Pledges	2013 Paid
116	Republic of Moldova	900	900								
117	Romania	52,000	52,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	95,000	95,000		
118	Russian Federation	500,000	500,000	900,000	900,000	899,970	899,970	900,000	900,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
119	Rwanda			900	900	900	900	950	950		
120	Samoa	760	760	450	450	450	450			793	793
121	Saudi Arabia			132,752	132,752					133,005	133,005
122	Senegal	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000						
123	Serbia			14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
124	Seychelles	1,200	1,200					1,200	1,200		
125	Sierra Leone	760	760	620	620	140	140	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
126	Simon Frazer University					3,001	3,001				
127	Singapore	15,000	15,000	30,000	30,000	40,000	40,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
128	Slovakia	46,000	46,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
129	Slovenia	72,000	72,000	86,000	86,000	86,000	86,000	63,000	63,000	98,000	98,000
130	South Africa	54,000	54,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000
131	Spain	4,301,088	4,301,088	1,847,300	1,847,300	1,723,115	1,723,115	456,225	456,225	152,650	152,650
132	Sri Lanka			5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	-
133	St Lucia									931	931
134	St Kitts & Nevis							475	475	475	475
135	Suriname	760	760	900	900	900	900	1,000	-		
136	Swaziland										
137	Sweden	3,900,000	3,900,000	4,928,295	4,928,295	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,882,142	4,882,142	4,793,101	4,793,101
138	Switzerland	3,850,541	3,850,541	4,035,719	4,035,719	4,744,591	4,744,591	4,358,546	4,358,546	4,661,023	4,661,023
139	Syrian Arab Republic			3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500				
140	Tajikistan	310	310								
141	Thailand	22,164	22,164	23,046	23,046	25,000	25,000	24,487	24,487	25,000	25,000
142	Timor-Leste	760	760	450	450	450	450	950	950	950	950
143	Togo			900	900	900	900				



	Country	2009 Pledges	2009 Paid	2010 Pledges	2010 Paid	2011 Pledges	2011 Paid	2012 Pledges	2012 Paid	2013 Pledges	2013 Paid
144	Trinidad and Tobago			444	444	10,000	10,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	-
145	Tunisia	7,500	7,500	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700				
146	Turkey	250,000	250,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
147	Turkmenistan			3,300	-						
148	Tuvalu					900	900				
149	Uganda	1,600	1,600	1,850	1,850	5,000	5,000	12,669	12,669		
150	United Arab Emirates							40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
151	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	8,452,963	8,452,963	8,572,758	8,572,758	8,210,871	8,210,871	5,707,440	5,707,440	5,571,360	5,571,360
152	United States of America	5,825,050	5,825,050	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,587,000	6,587,000	6,247,000	6,247,000
153	Uruguay			10,000	10,000						
154	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	40,000	40,000								
155	Vietnam							7,500	7,500		
156	Zambia	2,167	2,167					2,000	2,000	4,413	4,413
157	Zimbabwe							1,000	1,000		
	Misc Income					1,698	1,698	252,219	252,219	352,357	352,357
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>85,599,446</b>	<b>85,549,666</b>	<b>81,731,674</b>	<b>81,441,774</b>	<b>80,786,661</b>	<b>80,714,302</b>	<b>72,414,355</b>	<b>72,363,355</b>	<b>79,775,999</b>	<b>77,881,800</b>

ANNEX 2: TOP 15 DONORS TO THE ENVIRONMENT FUND FOR 2011–2013 (IN USD)

	Country	2011 pledges		Country	2012-Pledges	Country	2013 Pledges
1	Germany	10,496,639	1	Netherlands	10,017,600	Netherlands	10,248,000
2	Netherlands	10,368,800	2	Germany	9,696,293	Germany	9,889,998
3	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	8,710,871	3	United States of America	6,587,000	United States of America	6,247,000
4	United States of America	6,000,000	4	France	5,850,000	France	5,850,000
5	France	5,440,000	5	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	5,707,440	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	5,571,360
6	Belgium	4,809,494	6	Sweden	4,882,142	Sweden	4,793,081
7	Switzerland	4,744,591	7	Finland	4,395,180	Switzerland	4,661,023
8	Denmark	4,568,212	8	Denmark	4,371,852	Denmark	4,602,187
9	Finland	4,556,340	9	Switzerland	4,358,546	Finland	4,364,240
10	Sweden	4,200,000	10	Canada	3,000,000	Norway	3,000,000
11	Norway	3,078,125	11	Norway	3,000,000	Canada	2,968,780
12	Japan	2,818,436	12	Japan	2,779,194	Belgium	5,929,105
13	Canada	2,800,000	13	Australia	1,201,645	Japan	2,779,194
14	Spain	1,723,115	14	Russian Federation	900,000	Russian Federation*	1,500,000
15	Australia	1,167,502	15	Luxembourg	660,313	Australia	1,124,007
	<b>Total Contribution by Top 15</b>	<b>75,482,125</b>		<b>Total Contribution by Top 15</b>	<b>67,407,205</b>	<b>Total Contribution by Top 15</b>	<b>73,527,974</b>

ANNEX 3: TOP CONTRIBUTORS (ENVIRONMENT FUND, TRUST FUND AND EARMARKED CONTRIBUTION)

	Donor	ENVIRONMENT FUND	TRUST FUNDS DIRECTLY SUPPORTING UNEP POW	EARMARKED CONTRIBUTIONS	2012-2013 TOTAL	%
1	Norway	6,000,000	68,671,906	16,155,642	90,827,548	16.7%
2	European Union	-	67,481,660	21,848,785	89,330,445	16.4%
3	Germany	19,586,290	5,591,807	43,758,838	68,936,935	12.7%
4	Sweden	9,675,243	15,074,651	2,451,825	27,201,719	5.0%
5	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11,278,800	10,771,238	3,939,476	25,989,514	4.8%
6	Canada	5,968,780	16,954,196	2,490,375	25,413,351	4.7%
7	Denmark	8,974,039	3,348,243	12,500,721	24,823,004	4.6%
8	UNDP - Headquarters	22,980	17,933,689	6,326,353	24,283,022	4.5%
9	Netherlands	20,265,600	1,299,178	1,135,745	22,700,523	4.2%
10	United States of America	12,834,000	3,125,000	3,706,248	19,665,248	3.6%
11	Finland	8,759,420	4,541,962	3,128,260	16,429,642	3.0%
12	France	11,700,000	1,402,382	1,783,715	14,886,097	2.7%
13	Switzerland	9,019,569	1,787,989	3,644,447	14,452,004	2.7%
14	Japan	5,558,388	4,592,784	2,343,223	12,494,396	2.3%
15	Brazil	-	-	6,700,814	6,700,814	1.2%
16	Others	22,547,243	19,536,534	17,950,849	60,034,627	11.0%
	Grand Total	152,190,353	242,113,218	149,865,317	544,168,888	

\* UNDP is not a donor but act as a channel of multidonor trusts funds.

