



**Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme**

Distr.: General
18 February 2009

English only



**Twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/
Global Ministerial Environment Forum**
Nairobi, 16–20 February 2009

Ministerial consultations

Note by the Executive Director

The annex to the present note contains additional information pertaining to the organization of the ministerial consultations during the twenty-fifth session of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum. The President's summary of the ministerial consultations has been produced as part of the proceedings of the session, while reports of the each of the plenary sessions and the round-table discussions are provided in the annex. The annex has been issued without formal editing.

Annex

Organisation of the ministerial consultations and session reports

Ministers and heads of delegations from 147 United Nations Member States attended the twenty fifth session of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum in Nairobi from 16 to 20 February 2009.

The consultations were conducted under the leadership of the President of the GC/GMEF, H.E. Mr. Oliver Dulic, Minister of Environment and Spatial Planning, Republic of Serbia, with the assistance of the Vice Presidents of the GC/GMEF, H.E. Mr. Mohamed Cherif Rahmani, Algeria, Mr. Juan Carlos Cué Vega, Mexico, Mr. John Matuszak, United States of America, and H.E. Mr. Budi Bowolesksono, Indonesia, as Rapporteur.

The ministerial consultations of the 25th session of the GC/GMEF revolved around two separate but related themes:

- **‘Globalisation and the Environment – Global crises: national chaos?’**, and
- **‘International environmental governance (IEG) and United Nations reform – IEG – help or hindrance?’** – *IEG from a country perspective.*

The consultations were informed by two succinct and thought provoking background papers prepared as briefings for the participants.

Ministers noted that the crises the world faces today will not be resolved through a business as usual approach, and the ministerial consultations themselves did not adopt a business as usual approach.

The consultations were arranged in four plenary sessions and two ministerial roundtables. The Opening Plenary Session provided a brief overview of the nature and scale of current environmental and development challenges from a global and country perspective, focusing on the topics of food security, energy security and water scarcity, all within the context of climate change and the financial crisis.

The session also looked ahead to forthcoming events where multiple challenges and opportunities will be addressed, such as through the 17th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, and the forthcoming World Ocean Conference, to be held in May 2009 in Manado, Indonesia, and ministers were briefed on the recent Joint Inspection Unit report on environmental governance within the United Nations system.

The scene-setting Opening Session was followed by three plenary sessions, which explored the two overarching themes from the perspective of environment ministers. The sessions were characterised by keynote addresses, followed by an interactive moderated panel session, and interventions from the plenary. An exchange between interventions from the plenary and reflections from the panel followed, resulting in a highly interactive discussion.

Two of the morning plenary sessions were followed by facilitated ministerial roundtable discussions in the afternoon, further focussing on each topic and providing an opportunity for ministers to provide country perspectives in small discussion groups.

Facilitators of the ministerial roundtables were requested to gear discussions towards the identification of challenges and opportunities in each subject area and to develop clear messages to governments, the United Nations system, the private sector and civil society.

The sessions also had the benefit of interventions by major groups.

The promotion of gender equality and how it can support the effectiveness of a Green New Deal and IEG was considered by the High-level Gender Forum that took place as a pre-session event to the GC/GMEF on 15 February 2009. The Forum was attended by 170 delegates, including 20 Ministers, from a total of 30 countries. The outcomes of the Forum were shared through interventions during the ministerial consultations.

The tenth session of the Global Civil Society Forum held from 14-15 February 2009 to prepare the GC-25/GMEF and to refine the key statements of civil society at these events was attended by an estimated 190 participants from about 100 countries. The meeting, *inter alia*:

- issued a unanimous statement on “the Environmental Degradation in the Palestinian Occupied Territories”;
- described the global economic crisis as an opportunity to push for a stronger green recovery agenda by strengthening the regulations that will frame the markets towards social and environmental sustainability; and
- called for a radical reform of the international governance in a more inclusive and powerful way. A “G 192” instead of a “G 8”.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Plenary/Panel Sessions

Opening Plenary: ‘Global crises: national chaos?’ ‘IEG: help or hindrance?’ – *The nature and scale of current environment and development challenges and opportunities*

Monday, 16 February 2009, 3.00 p.m. - 6.30 p.m.

Keynote speakers:

- H.E. Ms. Gerda Verburg, Chair CSD 17 (Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, The Netherlands)
- H.E. Mr. Freddy Numbery, Minister for Marine and Fisheries, Indonesia
- Mr. Tadanori Inomata, Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit of the UN system

Plenary One: ‘Global crises: national chaos?’ – Towards a ‘green economy’

Tuesday, 17 February 2009, 9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Keynote speaker:

- Mr. Pavan Sukhdev, Project Leader - Green Economy Initiative, and Study Leader – TEEB, and Chairman, Global Markets Centre, Deutsche Bank, Mumbai

Panel Moderator:

- Mr. Nik Gowing, BBC

Composition of the panel:

- H.E. Mr. Byung-Wook Lee, Vice-Minister for Environment, Republic of Korea
- H.E. Mr. Hasan Mahmud, State Minister for Foreign Affairs, Bangladesh
- H.E. Ms. Jacqueline Cramer, Minister for Environment and Space, the Netherlands
- H.E. Mr. Sigmar Gabriel, Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany
- H.E. Mr. Stanislav Ananiev, Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, Russian Federation
- Mr. David Foster, Executive Director of the Blue-Green Alliance, USA
- Mr. Ernst Ulrich von Weizsäcker, co-chair of International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management

Plenary Two: 'Global crises: national chaos?' – *Coping with multiple challenges and capturing the opportunities*

Wednesday, 18 February 2009, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Keynote speakers:

- Mr. Robert Watson, Director of Strategic Development, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom
- H.E. Eng. Khalid Al-Irani, Minister of Environment, Jordan
- H.E. Ms. Ligia Castro de Doens, Minister of Environment, Panama

Panel Moderator:

- Ms. Katherine Sierra, Vice-President for Sustainable Development, The World Bank

Composition of the panel:

- H.E. Mrs. Batilda S. Burian, Minister of State for Environment, United Republic of Tanzania
- H.E. Mr. Erik Solheim, Minister of Environment and Development Cooperation, Norway
- H.E. Mr. Hilary Benn, Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom
- H.E. Mr. Jean-Louis Borloo, Ministre de l'Ecologie, de l'Energie, du Developpement durable, et de l'Amenagement Territoire
- Mr. Jos Delbeke, Deputy Director-General, Environment Directorate-General, European Commission
- Mr. Yvo de Boer, Executive Secretary, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

Plenary Three: 'IEG – Help or hindrance?' – *IEG from a country perspective*

Thursday, 19 February 2009, 9:00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Keynote speaker:

- H.E. Mr. Marthinus Van Schalkwyk, Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Republic of South Africa, and President of AMCEN

Panel Moderator:

- Mr. Kamallesh Sharma, Commonwealth Secretary General

Provisional composition of the panel is the following:

- H.E. Mr. Andreas Carlgren, Minister for the Environment, Sweden
- H.E. Mr. Faumuita Tiatia Liuga, Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa
- H.E. Mr. John Michuki, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Kenya
- H.E. Mr. Roberto Dobles Mora, Minister of Environment and Energy, Costa Rica
- H.E. Ms. Ana Maria Sampaio Fernandes, Brazilian Ambassador to Kenya, and Permanent Representative of Brazil to UNEP
- Mr. Kevin Conrad, Executive Director, Coalition for Rainforest Nations

Roundtables

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE "TOWARDS A GREEN ECONOMY"

Tuesday 17 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

GROUP A Room 10: Flame Tree

English and Spanish interpretation

Chair:

- United States of America

Rapporteur:

- United States of America

Facilitator:

- Mr. Nik Gowing, BBC

GROUP B Room 3: Cedar

English and French interpretation

Co-Chairs:

- Algeria
- Japan

Rapporteur:

- Canada

Facilitator:

- Mr. Pavan Sukhdev, Project Leader - Green Economy, and Study Leader – TEEB, and Chairman, Global Markets Centre, Deutsche Bank, Mumbai

GROUP C Room 4: Camphor

English, Arabic, Russian and Chinese interpretation

Chair:

- Iraq

Rapporteur:

- Yemen

Facilitator:

- Mr. Ricardo Melendez, Chief Executive, International Center for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE "IEG FROM A COUNTRY PERSPECTIVE"

Thursday 19 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

GROUP A Room 10: Flame Tree

English and Spanish interpretation

Co-Chairs:

- Germany
- Peru

Rapporteur:

- Indonesia

Facilitator:

- Ms. Julia Marton-Lefevre, Director-General IUCN

GROUP B Room 3: Cedar

English and French interpretation

Co-Chairs:

- France
- United Kingdom

Rapporteur:

- Switzerland

Facilitator:

- Mr. Mark Halle, Director, Trade and Investment, IISD

GROUP C Room 4: Camphor

English, Arabic, Russian and Chinese interpretation

Chair:

- Ethiopia

Rapporteur:

- Barbados

Facilitator:

- Ms. Maria Ivanova, Assistant Professor, College of William and Mary; Project Director, Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations**Report****Opening Plenary: ‘Global crises: national chaos?’ ‘IEG: help or hindrance?’ – *The nature and scale of current environment and development challenges and opportunities***

Monday, 16 February 2009, 3.00 p.m. - 6.30 p.m.

Keynote speakers:

- H.E. Ms. Gerda Verburg, Chair CSD 17 (Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, The Netherlands)
- H.E. Mr. Freddy Numbery, Minister for Marine and Fisheries, Indonesia
- Mr. Tadanori Inomata, Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit of the UN system

The plenary was opened with three keynote speeches by H.E. Ms. Gerda Verburg, Minister for Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, the Netherlands, H.E. Mr. Freddy Numbery, Minister for Marine and Fisheries, Indonesia, and Mr. Tadanori Inomata, Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit for the UN system, which highlighted the food and economic crises facing the world today. The keynote speakers noted that progress towards MDG goals such as on food security and price stability is further away than originally thought, and the significant impact of climate change on the world's oceans. There are competing claims on the use and management of natural resources such as meeting livelihood needs and for food production and security versus biofuel production. Management of natural resources requires addressing these competing claims and this may require for example putting in place measures that include social safety nets for the most vulnerable, a voluntary set of criteria for biofuel production, improved market access by all including small scale farmers and fishermen. A holistic approach to environment and sustainable development is needed where the division of labour between development agencies, UNEP and the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) is clear and documented within a system wide medium term strategy. Such a holistic approach will also require an integration of MEA implementation at the national level, through Common Country Assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks.

1. Major points of discussion:

1. Impacts of climate change are a major concern to many countries such as in Africa and low lying states. As a result, many countries are organizing international conferences on the subject.
2. Many of the problems and solutions are already known, what appears is a lack of willingness and weaknesses in ability to implement.
3. Technology support and capacity building is key in helping countries deal with climate change impacts and other environmental management actions
4. Carbon markets can be an opportunity but only if social safeguards are taken into account as well as understanding the risks to other international and national goals on food security and price stability
5. Countries access to carbon markets is a key issue for consideration
6. Sustainable agriculture is also a key issue for most developing countries amid concerns of food security and increased investment in sustainable agriculture is crucial
7. The ability for UNEP to support developing countries on environmental measures given its current status in the UN

2. Challenges:

1. Both economic and social viability of new approaches are critical otherwise they may have unintended negative impacts e.g. DDT phase out resulting in an upsurge in malaria if alternatives are not effective; the promotion of biofuel resulting in food insecurity worldwide despite some countries having a balance between biofuel and food production.
2. How local carbon technologies will be transferred to developing countries: a multilateral fund?
3. Effective developing countries' participation in multiple international environmental processes is a challenge and synergy between these processes must be realized to enable effective participation.
4. While MEAs proliferate, the funding stays the same.
5. The environment will always take a 'back-seat' when people need to put food on the table, unless environmental measures help countries achieve this.
6. When does the international community promote biofuel production versus other renewables such as hydrogen or solar power that do not impact on food production?

3. Opportunities:

1. The Global Green New Deal is an opportunity for countries to diversity their economies.
2. Green economy discussions open the door for discussions between environment and economic development/finance ministries

4. Main messages:

1. Environmental information delivered by UNEP and environmental management measures promoted by UNEP or other institution must be examined first by these entities to identify to countries what it means for their economies and development
2. Biofuel production should be carried out and promoted only when it does not impact food security and price stability on a global scale
3. Environmental sustainability and economic development need to consider drivers of energy and food security
4. MDGs at risk of non-achievement if ecological and economic crises are not tackled
5. Building synergies between the work of UNEP and MEAs must be carried out foremost at country level and a 'bottom-up' approach needs to be taken
6. Discussions on IEG must go hand in hand with discussions on financing. One country for instance suggested that Rio +20 should include both environment and finance ministers
7. UNEP should be given the authority in the UN system with adequate financing to set the agenda on environmental issues, enhancing the scientific basis of UN work on environmental issues and address social and equity issues in this context
8. The GMEF should convey clear messages to other meetings, such as the CSD and the International Oceans Conference, and the importance of UNEP in assisting countries with implementation was stressed by some
9. Public-private partnerships are necessary to raise sufficient funding.
10. Local and regional market access is necessary to enhance sustainability of agriculture
11. The role of women needs to be recognised and their participation in decision-making guaranteed
12. Access to the world agricultural markets must be improved for developing countries

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

<p>Plenary One: ‘Global crises: national chaos?’ – Towards a ‘green economy’ Tuesday, 17 February 2009, 9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.</p>
<p>Keynote speaker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Pavan Sukhdev, Project Leader - Green Economy Initiative, and Study Leader – TEEB, and Chairman, Global Markets Centre, Deutsche Bank, Mumbai
<p>Panel Moderator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Nik Gowing, BBC
<p>Composition of the panel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. H.E. Mr. Byung-Wook Lee, Vice-Minister for Environment, Republic of Korea 2. H.E. Mr. Hasan Mahmud, State Minister for Foreign Affairs, Bangladesh 3. H.E. Ms. Jacqueline Cramer, Minister for Environment and Space, the Netherlands 4. H.E. Mr. Sigmar Gabriel, Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany 5. H.E. Mr. Stanislav Ananiev, Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, Russian Federation 6. Mr. David Foster, Executive Director of the Blue-Green Alliance, USA 7. Mr. Ernst Ulrich von Weizsäcker, co-chair of International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management

1. Major points of discussions:

1. How to communicate green economy (GE) to the public?
2. How to convince the skeptical countries?
3. Green investment appears to be a sensible thing, but why it is not happening as much as it should be?
4. What are the political risks for governments to advocate green economy?
5. Where is the funding for implementing green economy in developing countries?

2. Challenges:

1. Lack of policy frameworks and market rules will prevent progress of green economy
2. Actions must be taken immediately at national and international level to operationalise green economy
3. UNEP must formulate a set of targeted green economy choices for major country groupings within a month and articulate them at major forums
4. To sell the concept of green economy is relatively easy – good life for everyone, but the execution of the concept is much more complex
5. Transition from brown to green economy can be difficult

3. Opportunities:

1. Unprecedented awareness of climate change and other environmental challenges
2. In some green products, private sectors can already succeed without subsidies
3. Until the recent credit crunch, private sector funding has been driving the growth of green sectors – funding will not have to all come from the public sector
4. Removing perverse subsidies can reduce fiscal pressure while providing a level play ground for green sectors
5. Green economy will help raise the skills of the labour force through investing in education systems, building up skills, and creating national engineering systems

4. Messages:

1. Not making green investment now could lead to high prices of increasingly scarce vital resources, resulting in loss of competitiveness
2. Environmental ministers to become ministers of economic success
3. Green economy actions should be targeted – things that can be implemented quickly
4. Individuals and communities (not only governments and business) also have a role in green economy
5. If people are convinced of green economy, political risks will be reduced for politicians.
6. Transfer, not sell, technology to developing countries
7. Jobs created should have a social purpose (e.g. jobs in rural electrification)
8. Sustainable farming be made an explicit part of green economy
9. Funds and technology transfer not enough; need policy framework and market rules
10. Need to give people a vision of a prosperous and new society for them to get on board.
11. Green economy requires a global approach and cooperation among countries
12. Need to understand different motivations of different countries to embrace green economy

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE “TOWARDS A GREEN ECONOMY”	
Tuesday 17 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
GROUP A Room 10: Flame Tree	
English and Spanish interpretation	
Chair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United States of America Rapporteur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United States of America 	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Nik Gowing, BBC

1. Major points of discussion:

1. Who will bear the cost of making the transition to a green economy?
2. Why obvious solutions not achieved?
3. Responsibility of politicians
4. Need of Financing to achieve Green Economy
5. Need of transfer of clean technologies
6. Role of governments in setting goals and providing enabling investment climate

2. Challenges:

1. Politicians are facing competing demands and priorities, and have to take decisions in order to reflect to their constituency and to build constituencies for the GE
2. Take into account transition costs and communicate transition plans
3. GE should be integrated into existing economy
4. Countries should honour commitments made

3. Opportunities:

1. New financial mechanisms, may motivate developing countries go green their economy
2. Some measures of Green Economy, don't require additional funding, such as reforming fossil fuel subsidies which will save money and achieve energy efficiency

4. Main messages:

1. Expand partnerships among NGOs, civil society, and private sector
2. Articulate better how the Green Economy looks like for the different parts of the world (“One size doesn't fit all”)
3. Need for capacity building, clean and leading (cutting edge) technology not old outdated technology, and financing and proven economic feasibility of green economy.
4. Political motivation can come from civil society using media and communication to show the gains from GE
5. Importance of education, training and capacity building to achieve GE
6. GE is consistent with other policy priorities, especially in securing food
7. Give agriculture a distinctive place in GE
8. GE has to be reflected in aid flow or development assistance
9. Going green is a global task and global community should do it together, with partnerships
10. Developing countries need investment, not only donations
11. Need to keep markets open to developing countries green products and no protectionism
12. Taken women into account
13. GE report to take production and consumption patterns into account
14. We need practical and feasible approaches to achieve the GE
15. Importance to get the buy in from the World Bank and the IMF in the GE

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE “TOWARDS A GREEN ECONOMY”	
Tuesday 17 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
GROUP B Room 3: Cedar	
English and French interpretation	
<p>Co-Chairs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algeria • Japan <p>Rapporteur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canada 	<p>Facilitator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Pavan Sukhdev, Project Leader - Green Economy Initiative, and Study Leader – TEEB, and Chairman of Global Markets Centre, Deutsche Bank, Mumbai

1. Major points of discussion:

1. There are real win-wins that can be achieved, but very little is being done to secure them so there is an urgent need to develop an action plan/list.
2. Need to change policy framework, to tilt the playing field toward the Green Economy. Some part of this needs to be done at national level, and some part at global level.
3. The economic crisis will end before the environmental crisis – we need to take advantage of the economic crisis, and the stimulus packages and policy reforms being constructed as responses to tackle the longer term environmental crisis.
4. Establishing food, energy and water security must be priorities in the new Green Economy.
5. Markets are not likely to deliver what governments are not willing to support through clear policy signals and enabling frameworks.

2. Challenges:

1. GDP growth is the not a good measure of economic growth and development – it does not connect to human welfare or the environment.
2. Markets are not perfect, they need regulation or some form of intervention. For example, there is a need to ensure that renewable energy sources are not more expensive than non-renewable and high carbon energy sources.
3. There is an urgent need to reduce the prevalence of obsolete, inefficient and polluting technologies in developing countries.
4. There is a need to establish inter-ministerial processes to build a Green Economy – this cannot be achieved by the Environment Ministry alone.
5. In constructing policy measures governments must avoid negative impacts of adjustment measures on the poor – this requires good governance at national and international levels.
6. Support needs to be provided for the transition to a Green Economy in the form of training, institutional capacity building and social safety nets.
7. Incentives for sustainable agriculture and land management are particularly important. Defining clear property rights, as well as removing subsidies which damage soils and degrade water resources have key contributions to make to building a Green Economy.
8. We urgently need measures to adapt to climate change impacts, and make economies more resilient to them, for example, coastal protection measures.
9. There is a clear and urgent need for agreement on the second phase of the Kyoto Protocol, including to address the specific adaptation challenges of some countries and regions.

10. Education and awareness raising are crucial for moving towards a Green Economy and more sustainable consumption patterns.

3. Opportunities:

1. Investment in ecological infrastructure offers major win-win opportunities. For example creating a green wall of trees from Dakar to Djibouti will halt desertification, sequester carbon, and create jobs too (similarly, reforestation of 6 million ha of degraded lands in India will create many jobs). International cooperation, technical assistance and public private partnerships will be critical in achieving such win-wins.
2. Clean energies offer income generation and clean development opportunities. For example, microfinance for solar panels offers a decentralized energy source, producing a surplus for the owners which can pay off the loan for installation.
3. South-south cooperation has a key role to play at both global and regional levels to establish a green and social economy.
4. The environmental technology sector is a major growth opportunity. In some countries it is growing by 12% per year.

4. Messages:

1. Creating a Green Economy must be consistent with sustainable development. It must be a green *and* social economy, creating jobs and alleviating poverty.
2. Who will pay? National budgets, international assistance and making the polluter pay provides a combination of three solutions to deliver the necessary investment.
3. What can UNEP and the international community do to help developing countries most? Enhance access to technologies or at least reasonably priced technologies, and help reduce the risk of investing in innovative, resource efficient but new and untried technologies.
4. If every body takes the risk, then there is no risk. We should simultaneously launch our efforts to establish a Green Economy.
5. There is no "one size fits all" solution to building a Green Economy. We must listen more closely to the planet – it is complaining.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE “TOWARDS A GREEN ECONOMY”	
Tuesday 17 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
GROUP C - Room 4: Camphor	
English, Arabic, Russian and Chinese interpretation	
Chair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iraq Rapporteur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yemen 	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Ricardo Melendez, Chief Executive, International Center for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)

1. Major points of discussion:

1. The participants commended UNEP for the Green Economy Initiative and expressed their support to the initiative. It was recognized that the green economy could be an effective vehicle to address national and international crises. Developed countries need to take the lead and demonstrate how green investment can address multiple crises.
2. Green economy is not necessarily a new concept: it is making the case for the environment, linking it to job creation, employment, trade, development and poverty reduction – in one word, linking it to sustainable development.
3. Green economy should be seen as an effective vehicle to mainstream environment and socio-economic aspects in development plans, programmes and policies.
4. The importance of such an initiative was noted, and that momentum should not be lost but rather be sustained: as it represents a tremendous opportunity that should not to be missed.

2. Challenges:

One of the key challenges lie in the opportunity to appreciate the full potential of the Green economy at the national level, as well as using the regional space for enhancing efforts to move towards a green economy. Other key challenges include:

1. What role can environment ministers play in the shaping of a green economy?
2. How can ministers kick off a process of mainstreaming, and provide their governments with the conceptual and analytical tools to move onto a green economy pathway?
3. How can they work effectively with other parts of government to articulate their own sectoral policies in a green economy paradigm?
4. How can low hanging fruits be picked so that the case for green economy can be made and demonstrated quickly – quick wins – given the urgency of the action needed, as governments are already putting in their economic recovery policies?
5. What would environment ministers need from UNEP and the international community to succeed in influencing the green economic policies at the national level?
6. How can we fend off perverse “economic nationalism” and “beggar thy neighbour” policies, and address potential negative impact of action in the industrialized countries on developing countries and the global economy?
7. How can we influence actions at the domestic level, the bilateral cooperation level and international cooperation?
8. How do we include women and give them a more prominent role?

Some country specific challenges relate in particular to the smallness, vulnerability and particular challenges of small island states – where the transformation to a green economy is simply a matter of survival.

3. Opportunities:

1. The role of technical assistance and development cooperation in the development and/or adaptation, demonstration and deployment of effective technological solutions, including technologies for commercialisation and market.
2. Use the current opportunity to leap-frog from the energy cheap, natural capital-consuming and pollution free, knowledge scarce economy to the energy efficiency, sustainable natural capital use and pollution internalised, knowledge abundant economy.
3. While developed countries view green economy as an opportunity to address the current financial crisis, developing countries need to use it as an opportunity to promote environment and sustainable development, and alleviate poverty.
4. Green economy promotes achieving environmental, social, and economic development. It promotes the generation of wealth and economic growth as proven by experience in a number of developed countries.

4. Messages:

1. Sharing of experiences, including through partnerships between countries more advanced on green economy transformation and those lagging behind.
2. It is necessary to set-up frameworks for monitoring progress in implementation; and to determine a number of indicators towards achieving a green economy (e.g. renewable energy and energy efficiency targets).
3. The role of women in the green economy needs to be emphasized.
4. There is a need to assess and evaluate the implications of green economy at the national level, for different groups of countries and by sectors, and to clearly articulate the concept of green economy for different groups of countries.
5. Achieving green economy through tax policy, for instance by shifting the burden of taxation from income to GHG and natural resource use.
6. *Technology transfer was identified as a main impediment for promoting green growth.* The meeting advocated not only facilitating transfer of technology, and making them affordable to countries, but also enhancing domestic capacities to develop green technologies and associated training, skills development.
7. Ensure that green economy measures do not constitute new distortions to trade. *Environmental standards should be used not as an impediment to market access, on the contrary to promote trade and market especially for the developing countries.*
8. Enhancing national capacities including through education, awareness raising, information, and developing the right communication packages to different target groups is important to promote green economy at the national level.
9. Further action needs to be taken at the national level by ministries of environment, as the decision-making process lies beyond the realm of their ministries, and need to engage ministries of finance, trade, agriculture, tourism.
10. Role of private sector, business, NGOs: public participation at the early stages of promoting the concept of green economy is essential to secure the involvement of the different stakeholders' groups and their contributions. *Consultative process at the national level, including youth, business, women, science, NGOs, etc.* Guiding principles for green economy may include public participation, equity, proper management of natural resources, green procurement, promoting sustainable production and consumption, including undertaking at the regional level assessments of production and consumption patterns.
11. Make use of different levels of international cooperation, bilateral assistance, regional integration and multilateral frameworks; e.g. use the NEPAD Peer Review Mechanism mainstream green economy guiding principles into the national development frameworks, and hence to monitor and drive green economy approaches.
12. The green economy needs to acknowledge the very different contributions from different sectors of the economy, in particular the informal economy. *In the case of e-waste recycling the majority of workers are women, who suffer health effects and are not well remunerated. It is necessary to upgrade these sorts of jobs, so that people work in healthier conditions, and alleviate poverty, and make them win-win situations.*

13. Environment and economic policies can be complementary: we need to use market mechanisms, supported by command and control mechanisms, to promote new investments in green technology.
14. Need to work with sub-national and local authorities to effect change in urban economy.
15. Provide incentives, including tariffs reductions to promote the development and transfers of technology.
16. Development assistance should be geared towards supporting more developing countries in achieving green economy.

Recommendations to UNEP:

1. UNEP should have a definition of green economy in particular in relation to low-carbon economy and circular economy.
2. UNEP to produce a Year Review of Green Economy to keep track of progress and promote best practices.
3. UNEP should undertake a comprehensive study on the implications of green economy and conduct campaigns to raise awareness on green economy, and to continue such initiatives such as the Resource Panel and the Marrakech process.
4. UNEP should develop goals, targets and indicators that are time bound with regard to green economy, and provide support governments to articulate those targets into their policies and vertically integrate them into their programmes.
5. UNEP can provide forum to engage other sectoral ministries to ensure that they buy-into the green economy.
6. UNEP to support capacity building efforts at the national level.
7. UNEP to promote policies and innovations in the face of challenges facing different regions.
8. UNEP to promote best practices around the world and promote it at the national level for strategic planning.
9. UNEP to develop assessment and evaluation tools to identify the policies that are impeding green economy and the ones which are promoting it and need up-scaling.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

Plenary Two: 'Global crises: national chaos?' – *Coping with multiple challenges and capturing the opportunities*

Wednesday, 18 February 2009, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

The keynote speakers:

- Mr. Robert Watson, Director of Strategic Development, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom
- H.E. Eng. Khalid Al-Irani, Minister of Environment, Jordan
- H.E. Ms. Ligia Castro de Doens, Minister of Environment, Panama

Panel Moderator:

- Ms. Katherine Sierra, Vice-President for Sustainable Development, The World Bank

Composition of the panel:

1. H.E. Mrs. Batilda S. Burian, Minister of State for Environment, United Republic of Tanzania
2. H.E. Mr. Erik Solheim, Minister of Environment and Development Cooperation, Norway
3. H.E. Mr. Hilary Benn, Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom
4. H.E. Mr. Jean-Louis Borloo, Ministre de l'Ecologie, de l'Energie, du Developpement durable, et de l'Amenagement Territoire
5. H.E. Ms. Ligia Castro de Doens, Minister of Environment, Panama
6. Mr. Jos Delbeke, Deputy Director-General, Environment Directorate-General, European Commission
7. Mr. Yvo de Boer, Executive Secretary, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

1. Major points of discussion:

1. Interconnectedness (both from scientific and policy) between climate change, biodiversity, land degradation, air pollution.
2. For a transition to low carbon economy technological solutions are not enough. Behavioral changes are necessary as well.
3. It is crucial to involve all major stakeholders in a transition to a low carbon "green" economy, including small farmers, and to send the right signals and stimulus to the private sector, both small and large; need to bring in private sector – government cannot solve problems alone.
4. The need to acknowledge and determine the value of the ecosystems and the services they provide.
5. The importance of a similar mechanism for biodiversity as IPCC is for climate change.
6. Financial crises can be an opportunity if developed countries change the path of development.
7. The importance of environmental regulations/enforcement and the incorporation of environment in other governmental sectors as they also stimulate innovation and the creation of markets for the private sector.
8. The need to better define what we mean by Green Economy and to engage public opinion, building political support and explaining the social opportunities such as creation of new jobs and renewed development.

2. Challenges:

1. The of capacity (both human and institutional) of poor and developing nations to take advantage of existing technological solutions and financial support towards a green economy.
2. The fulfillment of the international financial obligations by developed countries in support to the transition to sustainable development and a green economy. Financial mechanisms are central to international agreements on Climate Change.
3. The need to involve society at large and establish bottom up approaches to the transition to a green economy. The process should involve labour, farmers, business and cities (and the local authorities) have a large role to play in a green economy. The need to translate pragmatic responses to the public. Politics of making the changes are quite difficult.
4. The need to devise concrete responses to the simultaneous crisis and to communicate to the public their importance in term of employment, access to water, access to food and energy...
5. The solutions for the financial crisis based on business as usual will keep environment and social issues in the backseat.
6. Stimulus packages should not be to the detriment of the most vulnerable; transition to a green economy will see new jobs and businesses created, but others will disappear. Avoid negative social responses to the necessary changes.
7. The politics of making these changes are very difficult; cannot just be the government telling people it must just happen. Opens up the political space to change when society is engaged.
8. Modalities for moving to a green economy will differ amongst countries and across regions – no one size fits all.
9. Differentiated role of women needs to be brought into the discussion to ensure equity in a changing economy.

3. Opportunities:

1. This is the biggest crisis for many generations, but no generation has been so well suited to face it.
2. There is no better time to save energy and resources, for business.
3. A wide range of technological solutions in the area of energy and use of natural resources already exists – deployment and incentives are opportunities.
4. Convergence of views on the role of state and the need to have smart regulation for markets.
5. Bring the debate to finance and economic decision-makers – strong role for environmental leadership in achieving this.
6. Many recovery packages are already addressing the move towards a “green economy”.
7. The existence of resources to finance a transition as can be seen from the financial recovery packages.

4. Messages:

1. Current crises offer opportunities to bring the environment to the heart of the economic recovery.
2. Solutions exist; transfer of know-how particularly during transition period is critical to success.
3. Strong leadership and the willingness to act are called for.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

<p>Plenary Three: ‘IEG – Help or hindrance?’ – <i>IEG from a country perspective</i> Thursday, 19 February 2009, 9:00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.</p>
<p>The keynote speaker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.E. Mr. Marthinus Van Schalkwyk, Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Republic of South Africa, and President of AMCEN
<p>Panel Moderator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Kamallesh Sharma, Commonwealth Secretary General
<p>Provisional composition of the panel is the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. H.E. Mr. Andreas Carlgren, Minister for the Environment, Sweden 2. H.E. Mr. Faumuita Tiatia Liuga, Minister of Natural Resources and Environment, Samoa 3. H.E. Mr. John Michuki, Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Kenya 4. H.E. Mr. Roberto Dobles Mora, Minister of Environment and Energy, Costa Rica 5. H.E. Ms. Ana Maria Sampaio Fernandes, Brazilian Ambassador to Kenya, and Permanent Representative of Brazil to UNEP 6. Mr. Kevin Conrad, Executive Director, Coalition for Rainforest Nations

1. Major points of discussion:

1. There was general agreement on the difficulty in finding consensus on IEG and that the debate on IEG has been going on for nine years since the Malmo declaration without any concrete results or conclusions, and that not only is the system that is fragmented, but so is the debate about system.
2. There was a strong sense of achievement on what has been accomplished at the global and local levels. But there was also frustration among countries on the lack of incremental reform and implementation of what has already been agreed under the Cartagena Package and the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP).
3. There was a desire to move forward on IEG especially because of its relationship to survival prospective and security of future generations. However, the deficit in implementation was noted and there were concerns over a lack of political will to fully and effectively integrate the environment pillar of sustainable development (SD) into macroeconomic and other priorities.
4. There have been many ad hoc achievements at the country-level, while at the global-level the scale of action does not reflect the urgency indicated by science.
5. Emphasise was placed at linking the ability to implement the environmental considerations of sustainable development to countries’ capacity, highlighting that the discussions on IEG must ensure full consideration of developing country needs and challenges and the need to build capacity and scientific knowledge. In addition, developed countries need to honour their commitments to ODA and commit to transfer technology to developing countries on preferential terms.
6. Financial mechanisms and adequate funding for the IEG was a key theme, with general agreement that more needs to be done to bolster the financial mechanisms for the IEG system in a coherent manner.
7. A lot of reference was made to the fact that the role of UNEP in IEG cannot be overstated and that UNEP should set and spearhead the global agenda for the environment pillar of sustainable development as the leading UN authority, and promote coherent implementation of the environment dimensions of sustainable development.
8. There was strong support for strengthening the IEG system within the framework of the UN and many voices on the need to upgrade UNEP, particularly in terms of its ability to assist countries in the implementation of MEAs.

9. The status quo was seen as not being acceptable and a call to demonstrate boldness and big thinking on the issue of IEG was made. There is a need for a new approach to reform based on agreed principles and goals, and in which consideration is given to a wider group of stakeholders, such as the private sector, other ministries, etc.
10. Key guiding principles for reform should be: legitimacy, fair representation, responsiveness, flexibility, transparency and accountability, effectiveness, and measurement of performance.
11. Any IEG process should be inclusive and generate universal ownership on final outcomes. The process to move forward must continue even if the outcomes are not yet agreed.
12. We have greater challenges than we ever thought 17 years ago at the first conference in Rio but we also have greater expectations. Adding economic troubles, the world delivery creating a green economy but the global tools to deliver are not in place.
13. The importance of bringing high-level political guidance back into the process and setting clear milestones in the next three years before Rio+20 in 2012 was reiterated with emphasis placed on the need to make a fresh start in the discourse and inspire a new generation of thinkers to achieve sustainable development.

2. Challenges:

1. How can the impasse on IEG be overcome? One of the key challenges is the pessimism and cynicism that now surrounds the IEG debate. There is a fatigue about continuing discussions without making headway and a general feeling that results must emerge.
2. There was a desire to move forward on IEG especially because of its relationship to survival prospective and security of future generations. However, the deficit in implementation was noted and there were concerns over a lack of political will to fully and effectively integrate the environment pillar of sustainable development (SD) into macroeconomic and other priorities.
3. How can we build trust? There is a mutual lack of trust between developed and developing countries. Developing countries are asking why developed countries have not delivered on their promises while at the same time a feeling is shared by many developed countries that developing countries use every opportunity to widen the gap in trust.
4. How can we define a new way of thinking and produce new solutions? There is a challenge to use the next 3 years before Rio+20 in 2012 to define a new paradigm of collective action and to ask questions about the desired future and ways for achieving the principles and objectives of IEG with environmental finance.
5. How can institutional obstacles be overcome? Other sectors are reluctant and/or resistant to real reform of environmental governance. This is why we must show the strength of environmental ministers and the green sector.
6. How can the financing needs of the IEG system be met in the light of the current financial crisis?
7. How best to carry forward the reform agenda spring-boarding from this forum?

3. Opportunities:

1. The current financial crisis provides an opportunity to change the paradigm of production and consumption and to promote the green economy.
2. This is the first chance in many years to make headway through climate change negotiations. There is an opportunity to build trust in Copenhagen that can be taken forward to 2012.
3. With everything that is now known, it is now possible to unleash environmental possibilities if there is the will to do so.
4. There are excellent opportunities for South-South cooperation, as many countries are experiencing similar conditions, which they can mitigate by sharing experiences and not just resources.
5. Progress could be made through a decision in this forum to convene a small open-ended group of environmental ministers to identify key proposals for improving IEG.

4. Messages:

1. IEG is neither a help nor a hindrance – it is an imperative.

2. The debate on IEG has been going on for nine years since the Malmo declaration without any concrete results or conclusions, meaning that it is not only the system that is fragmented, but also the debate about the system.
3. There was wide agreement on the reform of UNEP, as well as the need to strengthen its regional organisations. UNEP, as the leading organisation in the environment within the UN system, should be given the authority and resources to act while continuing to show strength and a desire to act now.
4. There needs to be a legitimate, effective and inclusive process based on the principle of sustainable development.
5. We now have three years before Rio+20 in 2012 to produce an ambitious and fundamental reform of IEG.
6. There is wide agreement that the current IEG system cannot meet the development challenges we are facing today.
7. Focus needs to be placed on the ability of countries to meet the goals and objectives of IEG through by providing access to technology, resources, and capacity building – based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibility
8. Priority needs to be attributed to bringing high-level political guidance back into the process and to setting clear milestones in the next three years until Rio+20 in 2012. Emphasis should be placed on the need to make a fresh start in the discourse and to inspire a new generation of thinkers to achieve sustainable development.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE “IEG FROM A COUNTRY PERSPECTIVE” Thursday 19 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
GROUP A Room 10: Flame Tree	
English and Spanish interpretation	
Co-Chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Germany • Peru Rapporteur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indonesia 	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Julia Marton-Lefevre, Director-General IUCN

1. Major points of discussions:

Coherence at the international level can only exist if we have coherence at the national level.

1. Environmental governance at the international level:
 - a. Fragmentation of environmental issues (there are too many MEAs, although some coordination among them exists).
 - b. Some mechanisms address concrete problems (Ozone). We need a vision of the problem we want to address. Not talk about structure, without knowing what the problem is.
2. Environmental governance at the national level:
 - a. There is a lack of capacity building
 - b. Funding is lacking to implement MEAs
 - c. There are institutional problems at the national level due to the fragmentation of environmental governance (different ministries deal with different issues)
 - d. There is a need for coordination at the national level.
3. Recommendations for the international environmental architecture
 - a. The creation of an environmental system where all the issues of environment and MEAs are discussed. The example of Colombia could be replicated at the international level (UNEP could lead this system).
 - b. The international environmental architecture is broader than governance (at the national and the international level). There is a need of clear definitions and understanding of the problems.
 - c. The most important MEAs should be under an umbrella organization, including the UNFCCC.

2. Challenges:

1. Fragmentation does not allow moving forward, especially the independence of MEAs is a challenge.
2. The instruments should be revised to make them easier to implement.
3. Need to start at national level
4. Regroup themes which are related.
5. UNEP to systematise the list of MEAs and to regroup the themes.
6. Institutional problems due to fragmentation of environmental governance
7. There is a lack of inclusiveness in the IEG. No one is listening to the developing countries
8. Discussion on reform should not be a pretext for inaction
9. There needs to be good communication and cooperation among institutions

3. Opportunities:

1. Revising MEAs to make them easier to implement.
2. Creation of an environmental system where all issues of the environment and MEAs are to be discussed.
3. Rio+20 is an opportunity to present a solution (deadline).
4. New international structure to be discussed in the next year by a small group of countries.

4. Messages:

1. Need to coordinate among MEAs at the secretarial level.
2. UNEP to continue working in systematizing information about MEAs, to regroup the subjects under the MEAS and to better link the topics under the MEAs
3. UNEP country presence is needed, because environmental issues are not seen as important by countries.
4. Secretary General to establish a commission to implement a New Green Deal
5. Secretary General to appoint a group of experts to find a solution for the environmental governance architecture, including funding. The group would have to make a proposal in Rio+20 in 2012.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE “IEG FROM A COUNTRY PERSPECTIVE” Thursday 19 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
GROUP B Room 3: Cedar	
English and French interpretation	
Co-Chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • France • United Kingdom Rapporteur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Switzerland 	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Mark Halle, Director, Trade and Investment, IISD

1. Major points of discussion:

1. The current IEG set up is not suitable to respond to today’s challenges. There are multiplicities of environmental agreements that are not well joined up, the institutional structure is fragmented and needs strengthening and coordination between the organizations is not working well (including between UN agencies at the country level).
2. For many developing countries there are a number of preconditions for IEG. IEG must be multi-thematic (environment-agriculture-development) and based on fairness and equity and full participation of stakeholders and rights holders (including indigenous peoples groups). It must also recognize the primary need for development in developing countries.
3. It is important to understand why IEG has evolved in the fragmented way it has. The environment is tackled in a task oriented manner and this continues with discussions on creating new regimes on mercury etc.
4. Defining the role of UNEP in the IEG debate is important, including the normative versus operational balance and the role of the UNEP Governing Council versus the role of the GA in the IEG debate itself. Should UNEP have a role in reviewing the MEA system to identify what is and isn’t working? Can UNEP help countries share best practices?

2. Challenges:

1. The process of environmental governance reform is slow, in spite of the comprehensive Swiss/Mexican led initiative in the GA. What would be needed to reach agreement on a political statement on the goals and objectives of IEG and by 2012? And how can we reach agreement on a full package on IEG reform by this date?
2. We need a governance system that matches the issues that are emerging. This includes the inter-connected nature of environmental challenges from ecosystem services to climate change, as well as the inter-connectedness between environment and development.
3. Can reform take place within the current regime or do we need a new regime? There may be a need for a stronger IEG regime – for example a world environment organization – with carrots and sticks to help steer longer term economic development. But other options also exist to strengthen synergies and collaboration of the institutions and processes that already exist. Any transformation should also take a more long term and gradual view, and its financial implications well thought through.
4. The way financial resources flow through the system is an important part of any reform of IEG. Any new regime would need incentives to ensure coordination and funding may be the key.

5. There is a need to streamline reporting requirements under the MEAs particularly where capacity is limited in developing countries. Yet a reform of MEAs for greater coherence is feared to slow down IEG processes and may require renegotiation of MEAs and the role of their governing bodies.
6. Equity between developed and developing countries within IEG remains contested. While developing countries are inclined to use their natural resources for fuelling their economies developed countries wish to conserve natural resources for global benefits (e.g.: forests, land use).
7. Current IEG does not respond to country needs. This applies in particular to the SIDS and least developed countries while it is less of an issue for more developed states.

3. Opportunities:

1. The time is right. The move towards a green new deal and green economy provides an opportunity to better integrate the existing regimes. The Rio+10 summit provides an opportunity to put a full package on IEG reform on the table by 2012.
2. The lack of progress at the GA passed on as opportunity for UNEP and the GC/GMEF to find a solution. Bottom up action and early wins can be garnered by adjusting to current system to provide momentum for reform and improve delivery and reaching out to new actors and civil society.
3. The recent JIU report does provide a lot of good recommendations for creating more effectiveness within the IEG. "Don't throw out the baby with the bathwater".
4. Examining the use of finances may provide for opportunities to gain efficiencies within the existing system.
5. The success stories of some conventions and treaties may be used as example for others.

4. Messages:

1. There is scope for change and improvement of the existing system. There is a need for greater coordination and coherence, especially in the implementation of decisions. However, a lot is working and the current system is serving countries. We must ensure that reform does not harm what is already working (don't throw out the baby with the bathwater!).
2. Any reformed environmental governance system will need to learn from other sectors and processes. We can look towards successes such as the Montreal Protocol (the success of the MP is due to the clarity of purpose and the science based processes and negotiations and that a business solution was quickly found). The collaboration between the different Chemicals regimes also provides an alternative to the creation of an overarching body.
3. Environmental sector to be reformed to better contribute to socio-economic development. Many developing countries are the first victims of global environmental change and any reformed IEG system must be designed to respond to the needs of these countries.
4. Practical next steps are emerging that can be supported including: Compiling environmental commitments and examine; creating a group of environmental Ministers; and setting a clear timetable leading to a political statement by 2010 and a package of reform by 2012.

GC25/GMEF Ministerial Consultations

Report

MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE “IEG FROM A COUNTRY PERSPECTIVE” Thursday 19 February 2009, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	
GROUP C Room 4: Camphor	
English, Arabic, Russian and Chinese interpretation	
Chair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethiopia Rapporteur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barbados 	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Maria Ivanova, Assistant Professor, College of William and Mary; Project Director, Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy

1. Major points of discussion:

1. The word governance has now become a common lexicon, which was not the case in previous years.
2. As previously mentioned in other forums, this debate has been going on for a long time, but this morning showed, like never before, a strong, articulate, ambitious consensus on the part of ministers
3. The goal is to reinvigorate the debate, raise issues that need to be discussed and openly discuss the convergences and divergences, and find a chance to move on.
4. Three main questions that still persist and focus our discussions: what is the problem, what is to be done and how do we get there?
5. Main messages from the morning session – global environmental problems are exacerbating; the institutions designed to deal with them are not doing so; improved tools and institutions are urgently necessary; environmental ministers have a leadership role to play in the current political climate; we need to think big, inspire and make a difference.

2. Challenges:

1. What is UNEP's role in the complex web of institutions that deal with environment?
2. What do environmental ministers envision a new IEG system to be that is effective and addresses the global nature of the environmental problems?
3. How do we focus on country perspectives?
4. UNEP has much less funding than other institutions like the WTO and UNDP. How do we reconcile the global nature of problems that UNEP has to deal with versus the financing available?
5. Should we be revisiting UNEP's mandate? Does the founding and mandate of UNEP go hand in hand with increased environmental challenges or has it stagnated?
6. Strength of other organizations might be because they are focused unlike environment issues which are much broader. How do we overcome this? Why are governments giving more money to UNDP, UNICEF and others? Do we need to value the environment and convince countries that environment can pay dividends?
7. There is a continual call to 'think big' on IEG. History is littered with the carcasses of 'think big' approaches? What is to stop this process from going down that road?
8. How do we engage other ministries in environmental governance?
9. The question of what the problem is has been answered. Another question is what do we need, i.e. what functions do we want a UN environmental governance system to perform?

10. It is stated repeatedly that there is a lot of information available on the problems; but is it relevant for decision-making

3. Opportunities:

1. There is new momentum in the IEG debate as witnessed by the strong statements coming from ministers of environment, which can be translated into concrete actions if acted upon.
2. There is a strong desire to move on from the old points of divergence and to develop a vision for the way forward.

4. Messages:

1. Taking a cue from what the environment minister from South Africa said in the morning session, "as we reassess, review and rethink the starting point should be principles, objectives and priorities for IEG, with environmental financing taking centre stage. Only once we are clear of where we want to go, should we ask the intuitional questions relating to format and structure. Form must follow function."
2. Ministers of environment have a key role to play in these discussions. However, we have heard that it would need to involve other actors. If we have a discussion here without those actors do we not run the risk of coming up with something that is purely environment? How do you see bringing ministers of finance into the discussions? How do you bring social development ministers to bear on this debate when the operative word in IEG is "environment"?
3. Stressed that UNEP is meant to be a coordinator but UNEP is still where it was years ago. If one wants compete in beauty contest you must first check if you have the right attributions. In order for UNEP to reinvigorate itself, it has to examine where it is in the current landscape and then define what it is capable of.
4. How to enhance the role of UNEP: strengthen the role of the GMEF, participation level is very high thus it should play a more important roles in giving policy advice to extend its impact further; the S&T capacity of UNEP should be strengthened so that it becomes the most important organ in the UN system; policy guidance of UNEP to GEF should be strengthened so that it can provide further support to GMEF – UNEPs role in GEF is quite limited; advantages of UNEP at global and regional level should be used more to help countries with NSDS; financial situation of UNEP should be improved – member countries should gradually increase the contributions, without strong financial base UNEP cannot be effective.
5. Useful to discuss IEG at country level because that is where the real impact will come from. "The engine of change will come from the national level." It would be useful to undertake further analysis on financial flows to developing countries in environmental programmes. Need to analyze and identify the most effective channels for the funds (through UNEP, bilateral, multilateral or FDI), and the relevance of programmes tied to the finances to developing countries.
6. No unifying framework for environmental governance in each country and perhaps if a framework was developed it would go a long way to addressing this problems
7. Emphasized that everyone needs and wants a strengthened UNEP, but we have to think about how to create better coherence between finance and mandate of UNEP.
8. Useful that UNEP has compiled a list of global environmental goals and challenges but the list should be further narrowed to focus on a few questions.
9. We should be governing ecosystem, not the environment. We first need to have a proper definition of environmental governance. If we want to strengthen the role of UNEP we need to be thinking on the sub-regional and ecosystem level and then link to that the regional offices. We can perhaps re-channel financing to regional offices.
10. Resources are not the only thing we need to consider, we need an optimal structure to properly use the resources. The time from ideas to implementation takes so long that ideas become outdated.