EUROPEAN UNION

Annual Subcommittee meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to the UNEP

(Nairobi, 7-11 October 2019)

Agenda item 4. Follow-up of the UNEA-4 – Implementation of resolution UNEP/EA.4/Res.22: Implementation and follow-up of United Nations Environment Assembly resolutions

Comments by the European Union and its Member States

Oral statement

General comments

- EU/MS thank UNEP for the clear options provided for the follow-up of implementation of the resolution (UNEP/EA.4/Res.22) as well as their useful comparison.
- EU/MS recognize the challenges of the current reporting framework described in the document.
- EU/MS in general support a proposal for a reporting mechanism that fulfils the mandate of UNEP/EA.4/Res.22 while avoiding an unnecessary added reporting burden for UNEP secretariat, and makes use of existing structures, where possible.
- EU/MS believe that the design of the monitoring and reporting mechanism should be built upon existing data collection systems, and it should be ensured that the results will be used to guide future decisions by both UNEP and the Member States to improve and guide future implementation.

Improved framework for reporting on the implementation of UNEA resolutions

- EU/MS note that – as also mentioned in the document – the follow-up of this resolution should be seen in conjunction with the decision UNEP/EA.4/2 and should be implemented simultaneously in an iterative process.
- EU/MS believe the implementation of UNEA resolutions and implementation of the PoW should be considered in conjunction, including with a view of providing further guidance for preparation of resolutions in a manner that will facilitate their consecutive follow-up. We believe that thematic resolutions intended to guide the PoW should be integrated into the PoW/B itself to the extent possible and their reporting should be in line with the reporting of

the PoW/B. That said, we recognize that there are different types of resolutions and some are not meant to directly be linked to PoW or include new subjects and elements that could be added to the PoW sometime in the future.

- The report states that "Unlike the Programme of Work, UNEA resolutions are adopted without metrics for progress reporting." Adding considerations of monitoring and evaluation to the resolutions could be beneficial, and could also improve the planning and negotiations of resolutions. Reporting could be made easier by e.g. using SDG and MEAs indicators.
- However, we see scope for improvement of the document in describing how the different options respond to the 4 key challenges identified[1]. We would welcome UNEP to provide further clarifications on this, both in the ASC meeting and in the follow up of the document.
- We reiterate that the reference to Briefings is misleading. It should remain a prerogative of the CPR/Bureau to request various briefings (whether or not on the implementation of resolutions). Hence, these elements should not feature as a method distinguishing between proposed options.

Monitoring mechanism

- Tentatively, EU+MS support option two: rationalisation. However, we would like to have more information on how in practice the monitoring mechanism will be organized, with a view to respond to the challenges identified. EU+MS underline the need to integrate the work on the monitoring mechanism (as specified in para 3 and 4) and work on the reporting framework (para 5). There is also a need to develop a comprehensive calendar for consulting the CPR on all related work-streams. We would also like to know how the work on the monitoring mechanism is to be incorporated in the different scenarios.
- EU+MS agree that it will be very useful to enable reporting also by Member States, other UN organisations and stakeholders, and to take this into account when designing the monitoring mechanism. Member States that have implemented resolutions could be spotlighted on the website, showing UNEP's impact.
- However, we need to be realistic with the expectations of reporting by others than UNEP. We therefore propose to take a stepwise approach where UNEP starts building the mechanism with readily available information, including the possibility to link the mechanism with other reporting frameworks such as related to the implementation of the SDGs and MEAs.
- We welcome that the mechanism is envisaged to build on the Programme Information and Management System (PIMS). We hope that this functionality will allow over time for accessing individual activities or projects, ideally through an on-line browsing tools.
- EU+MS thank UNEP for having included in the document its further plans to develop the website that would host the monitoring mechanism. Indeed, a dedicated website which links the different sub-programmes to the implementation of resolutions was central to the request by MS in UNEP/EA.4/Res.22 with it OP 4 setting out clearly terms of reference of such a web-based monitoring mechanism[2]

---

[1] In particular in chapter 4 (page 6): integrating and rationalizing the relationship between the mandate in resolutions or the Ministerial Declaration with the activities in the PoW; lack of a standardized process/procedure for monitoring and encouraging/facilitating reporting by other stakeholders, improved feedback and guidance on reports on implementation of past resolutions; and improved guidance on financial implications of resolutions beyond the PoW/B.

[2] Identifies existing linkages between each resolution and the Programme of Work and Budget; d. Provides links to existing reports related to UNEA resolutions; e. Provides the opportunity for Members States to voluntarily report on

- The document states that the landing page would provide links to the status of implementation of the mandates of the ED. This should include available information on specific challenges that have hindered implementation efforts as specified by UNEP/EA.4/Res.22(4f) and clear visualizations (e.g. figures, tables) of the implementation status of resolutions and the requests included thereof.
- It is very important that the design of the website addresses Member States' information requirements regarding UNEP's work and absorbs the capacity of all reports that are available.
- Whereas in the proposal the website is organised on the basis of different resolutions, EU+MS suggest that that the PoW and SPs should be put more centrally. The website would then provide an overview per SP indicting which resolutions are linked to it (change the hierarchy between resolutions and PoW). This way all reports and other information that are relevant for a specific SP would be easily accessible for all.
- Lastly, EU+MS appreciate UNEP's estimate of additional resources needed. We find this web-based monitoring tool essential for MS to be able to follow-up in an efficient manner how UNEP's PoW and resolutions are implemented. Given it is essential for adequate monitoring and reporting, should not it therefore be funded through core resources?