



CPR-Subcommittee Meeting, 4 June 2020 – Statement of Switzerland

Programme Performance Review

Performance Overview

- We're grateful for the informative presentations and the comprehensive, substantial report. This allows the CPR to assume its key role to provide oversight to UNEP's activities.
- We congratulate UNEP on the overall positive results achieved over the biennium under review, which was to some extent a bumpy road with the change of the Executive Director. We recognize the efforts to thoroughly implement the OIOS recommendations. We commend UNEP's management and staff for the achievements and for the progress made.
- On the report: We commend UNEP for placing UNEP's flagship assessments, that are the GEO 6 and all the thematic assessments, at the forefront. They bridge the gap between science and policy and are key for UNEP's programme performance and UNEP's delivery on the PoW/B.
- The first 10 pages are setting the scene for programme performance per subprogramme. While we appreciate to read about the many activities of UNEP, we find the listing somewhat unbalanced: on the one hand we are highlighting an entire process like the post-2020 framework on biodiversity and on the other hand we are given equal space to a project that is being implemented. Moreover, delegations may feel left out that their specific project of interest is not reflected in this compilation. A way out could be to focus the highlights on the implementation of the outcomes of UNEA (e.g. ministerial declaration etc) to guide the Secretariat's selection for this chapter
- During a certain biennium subprogrammes are being evaluated between 41 and 59 times. Who is performing the evaluations and who is deciding how many times subprogrammes are evaluated and which set of programmes are evaluated (p. 11)?

Subprogramme Climate Change

- This subprogramme attracts increased earmarked funding – an impressive USD 166.4mio. It would be interesting to better understand where UNEP sees its “niche” or added value compared to other UN agencies or programmes, to ensure that this money is invested most impactfully.
- Where are UNEP's strengths in comparison with other UN agencies or programmes such as UNDP, and which areas of its programme of work are considered to be most successful. How do you ensure coordination with other UN agencies or programmes such as UNDP?
- UNEP works directly with countries, among others, to build up technical capacities and to develop national action plans. Based on what criteria does UNEP select the countries it works with?
- To what extent is the topic of fossil fuel subsidies part of the ongoing project portfolio of the Secretariat?

Subprogramme Healthy and Productive Ecosystems

- The Secretariat focuses on two areas, one of which is the “Cross-sector and transboundary collaboration frameworks” (p 37) through which you are supporting countries in education and monitoring. In the framework of monitoring, are you also providing support on reporting

on ecosystems and to what extent are you are applying synergies among the biodiversity related conventions? Where do you see further potential to explore the synergies?

- Please update the language on the post-2020 framework for biodiversity negotiations on page 49 as COVID-19 has changed the timeline.

Subprogramme Resilience to Disasters and Conflicts

- We're encouraged to read that the UN Reform has a triggered more demand for environmental support and expertise by the UN Resident Coordinators. We're interested to get more information in future meetings of this Committee on results of the current review mentioned on p.34 and on UNEP's overall engagement in the context of the UN Reform.
- The Nexus Environmental Assessment Tool (NEAT+) (p. 34) has been introduced and applied. NEAT+ is a user-friendly environmental screening tool for humanitarian contexts, which combines environmental data with site-specific questions to automatically analyze and flag priority environmental risks. How does it relate to the World Environment Situation Room (WESR)?

Subprogramme Environmental Governance

- Several UN system-wide sustainability approaches progressed with UNEP engagement (p. 55). In the list there is no notion of the work on the system-wide framework of strategies on the environment.
- Could you provide us with the latest update on the work on the system-wide framework of strategies on the environment?
- It is news to us that Strategy for Sustainability Management in the UN system 2020-2030 has been developed. Could you elaborate on the role of UNEP in this strategy? How does it relate to the system-wide framework of strategies on the environment?
- Switzerland strongly supports UNEP's work on synergies for coherent implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). We also supports UNEP's efforts to develop a new data reporting tool, which will make national reporting more efficient and less burdensome.
- The programme performance report extensively speaks about the support of member states at the national level for developing their capacities in international environmental law. However, the report hardly mentions UNEP's own Montevideo Programme. What is the role of the new Programme cycle as adopted at UNEA 4?
- In our view, this subprogramme together with UNEP's work on science is at the core of UNEP's mandate. Yet, even though it has one of the smallest budgets, it is still underfunded, whereas other subprogrammes have large surpluses thanks to earmarked funding. What measures do you envision to provide adequate funding to this programme?

Subprogramme Environment under Review

- The science/policy interface is at the core of the mandate of UNEP. Policy makers need to base their decision on sound scientific data. Yet, it is stunning to see how low the budget for this subprogramme is compared to other subprogrammes. This stands in contrast to the underlying core function it has. We call on member states to look into this issue and on UNEP to allocate sufficient Environment Fund funding to this subprogramme.
- Within the context of the Agenda 2030, times and again it has been mentioned that there are not sufficient data for environmental indicators available. Yet, you overachieve that PoW/B indicator with almost 400%. Could please explain? Is there a data concern in the realm of the environmental dimension of the SDGs, or not? (p. 96, 97)
- The para on Science-Policy interface on p. 97 merely talks about the Voluntary National Reviews at the HLPF and the Science-Policy-Business Forum. In our understanding, science-policy is much more than that. In fact, UNEP's mandate and core strength is to work on the science-policy interface through ALL its subprogrammes. In our view this subprogramme and/or the Science Division should take on a leading role in establishing

this culture across all subprogrammes. How do you assure that science-for-policy is an intrinsic motivation for all subprogrammes?

- We are pleased to see the further development of the World Environment Situation Room (p. 100). Please ensure that internationally agreed environmental goals of the MEAs are not left behind with respect to the SDGs. The latter end in 2030 and are voluntary in nature the former stay and are in most instances legally binding. How could you best link the GEO or Future of GEO process with this process?

Subprogramme Chemicals, Waste and Air Quality

- Next year will be a crucial year for chemical and waste management with the development of a new post-2020 regime. We call on UNEP to continue its strong involvement in the SAICM process and contribute to an ambitious, robust, comprehensive and coherent post-2020 regime.
- The complex scheme on the different consequences of plastic use shows the importance to better coordinate the work on plastic within UNEP and among the different stakeholders. We understand that UNEP applies a transversal approach on this topic. While you report on the use of plastic in this sub-programme, it should also be a topic for the Subprogrammes on Resource Efficiency, on Ecosystems or even on Environmental Governance. Can you briefly indicate how you tackle this issue within UNEP?
- How can you explain the almost three times higher earmarking with respect to the budgeted earmarking? Is it due to the marine litter and (micro-)plastics work?
- On budget: please update the total amounts of this subprogramme on p. 78

Subprogramme Resource Efficiency

- We applaud that UNEP has engaged all actors across the value chain to co-design the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment with the Ellen MacArthur Foundation (p. 81). The engagement with the private sector on this is remarkable. Could this network of companies be engaged on the ongoing work on Marine Litter and Microplastics? And if so, how? So far, there has been little engagement of the private sector with the Ad Hoc Open Ended Expert Group on Marine Litter and Microplastics?
- We commend UNEP on its important work on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns – also as custodian of SDG 12. Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns are fundamental for sustainable development both in developing and developed countries.
- The Sustainable Consumption and Production Hotspot Analysis Tool mentioned on p.81 is a user-friendly, interactive tool for the development of national Sustainable Consumption and Production Policies. We encourage member states to look into this accessible tool that works at the interface of science and decision-making.
- UNEP continued to support local governments and cities to measure their resource profiles and report on the sustainable management of resources (p. 84). Could you please explain how UNEP is working directly at the local level, i.e. city level? Wouldn't it be more efficient, if the engagement with cities was channeled through the One Planet Network and its specific Programmes?

Budget Performance

- The analysis does not provide evidence on the distribution of Environment Fund (EF) and earmarked funding per subprogramme. During the last performance review (ASC 2019) 5 of the 7 subprogrammes received more funding due to higher levels of earmarking. Donors expect that their earmarked funds are spent accordingly despite the available (HR) capacities at UNEP.
- How does the secretariat handle the excess income due to more earmarking, in particular in Climate Change and Ecosystems where the surplus is over \$100M? (e.g. more contracting?)

- Is the actual income from the EF sufficient to supplement subprogrammes which do not receive enough funding (assuming UNEP does supplement with EF funding) and/or to assure consistency in activities from year to year (while earmarking fluctuates)?
- How does the considerable difference between the underestimated income from earmarked funds and the overestimated income from EF affect the actual implementation of the subprogrammes?