

USA Comments for Chair's Summary on the Program of Work

- UNEP's budget must be grounded in reality. We support an Environment Fund budget that is based on recent levels and trends. Resources should be prioritized around mutually-agreed existing mandates.
- We do not support expanding the executive office budget. Given the cuts proposed to other subprogrammes we believe an increase in executive office budget is inappropriate. Limited resources should be dedicated to delivery UNEP's core mandates.
- We support maintaining Environment Under Review funding levels and ask that resources be reallocated from other subprogrammes and the executive office.
- We remain deeply concerned about the lack of details available for UNEP's South-South cooperation work despite assurances of transparency. In particular we do not support allocating regular budget or Environment Fund resources to activities which specifically support BRI or China-Africa Environmental Cooperation Center. We do not believe that such activities fall within UNEP's mandate. We also reiterate our strong concern about the lack of information, transparency, and member state consultation to date on this issue.
- We continue to strongly support UNEP's science-based policy work and its environmental assessments. We also affirm the importance of open access to high quality and accurate data and information.
- We do not support UNEP taking on new initiatives related to the Arctic or Antarctic. Existing scientific and environmental structures are best suited to address Arctic and Antarctic issues. UNEP's resources would be best spent addressing the critical needs of developing countries, rather than duplicating existing work.
- We have several questions and suggestions about targets and indicators throughout the PoW. Those questions and suggestions will be submitted to their respective subprogramme POCs.