

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

---



Sixty-sixth meeting of the Standing Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 11-15 January 2016

Administrative and financial matters

Administration and finance

Administration of the Secretariat

REPORT OF UNEP

This document has been prepared and submitted by the United Nations Environment Programme<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The geographical designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat (or the United Nations Environment Programme) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The responsibility for the contents of the document rests exclusively with its author.*

## **UNEP Report to the Sixty-sixth Meeting of the Standing Committee of CITES**

### **I. Introduction**

1. In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Standing Committee of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), signed on 1 September 2011, concerning secretariat services to and support of the Convention, the Executive Director submits to each regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to one meeting of the Standing Committee each year, a report concerning the provision of and support to the secretariat, including as appropriate the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding.

2. Accordingly, the Executive Director hereby submits the present report, which summarizes the work carried out by UNEP in support of CITES. The report provides an overview of technical and scientific work, capacity-building activities and emerging issues, including relevant administrative support.

### **II. Technical and scientific support provided to CITES**

#### **A. The Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP)**

3. The Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP) worked closely with CITES throughout 2015 on a variety of projects related to the illegal trade in wildlife.

4. GRASP joined the CITES Standing Committee Working Group on Special Reporting Requirements, which conducted a review of illegal trade reporting systems and submitted a report to the 66<sup>th</sup> CITES Standing Committee. In the report, GRASP confirmed its plans to launch an apes seizure database and stated that “domestic illegal trade in great apes has a serious impact on these species, and there may have been a change in emphasis from bush meat being the main focus of illegal trade, to it becoming a by-product of the capture of animals. It was noted that there would be added value if the database that GRASP intends to create could take into account all pressures impacting on great ape populations.”

5. GRASP and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) agreed to collaborate to produce CITES documents on great apes for the CITES CoP 17 that will be held in South Africa in 2016. Those documents will include information on the national and international illicit traffic in great apes, along with updated data on wild great ape population numbers and distribution.

6. CITES holds one of the two seats representing multilateral environmental agreements (MEA) on the GRASP Executive Committee, and met four times in 2015 with the GRASP Secretariat in committee meetings. CITES also gave a presentation as part of an illegal trade session at the GRASP Regional Meeting – Southeast Asia, which was held 27-28 July in Borneo.

7. GRASP finalized plans to collaborate with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) to build the apes seizure database, and invited CITES to join the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) that will provide input and expertise to the project. In the meantime, GRASP forwarded information on specific cases of illegal trade to the CITES Secretariat for follow-up, including those in Qatar, Armenia, and India.

8. GRASP (representing UNEP) and CITES worked closely as partners in the Collaborative Partnership for the Sustainable Use of Wildlife (CPW) and helped prepare information sheets on issues such as food security, biodiversity, human-wildlife conflict, livestock and hunting. UNEP and CITES also jointly hosted a 90-minute moderated panel session during the World Forestry Congress' Wildlife Forum, "Cooperation, Legislation and Innovation," which included UNEP-DEPI director Mette Wilkie and CITES enforcement director Ben Janse van Rensburg as speakers.

## **B. Support provided to CITES by the UNEP- World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)**

9. UNEP-WCMC maintains and updates Species+ (<http://speciesplus.net/>) and the Checklist of CITES Species (<http://checklist.cites.org/>). These two online platforms were developed by UNEP-WCMC in conjunction with the CITES Secretariat and provide Parties with a resource for key species-related information required for implementing the Convention. Species+ contains taxonomic, distribution and listing information on all species listed in the CITES Appendices; it also provides details on CITES quotas and trade restrictions. The Checklist of CITES species database is linked with Species+. The Checklist is the official checklist of CITES species, in accordance with CITES Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP16). Since being launched in 2013, Species+ has had over 440,000 visits from approximately 280,000 users in over 200 countries/territories and the Checklist of CITES species has had 170,000 visits from over 114,000 users in over 200 countries/territories.

10. On 12 October 2015, CITES reported new features to the above data and information structures, developed with the UNEP-WCMC. The new features are calculated to support integration of the CITES Checklist and Species+ with national information systems, reduce duplication, eliminating mistakes and errors and improve the quality of information.

11. The CITES Trade Database is managed by UNEP-WCMC on behalf of the CITES Secretariat, and now contains over 15 million records of international trade in wildlife. The data held in the CITES Trade Database is based on the official trade statistics submitted by countries in their annual reports to CITES. The platform shares the taxonomic backbone and underlying data management structure with Species+, meaning that management of the core datasets (e.g. taxonomy, listing or distribution data) of these databases is very efficient.

12. The CITES Trade Data Dashboards are updated annually; they provide an interactive way of visualising trade data contained in the CITES Trade Database and offer a more accessible way of quickly viewing broader trade trends.

13. Data held in the Species+, the CITES Checklist and the CITES Trade Database are publically available and accessible via the web. In addition, in collaboration with Switzerland, France and Belgium, UNEP-WCMC has developed an Application Programming Interface (API), which allows national databases to link to and easily 'pull' data from Species+ into national platforms to assist Parties with the implementation of the Convention and reduce duplication of data maintenance work (CITES Notification No 2015/056).

14. Under the Review of Significant Trade (RST) process, UNEP-WCMC undertook a review of 95 species and country combinations for which trade suspensions had been in place for longer than two years. The relevant report will be discussed at the 66th meeting of the CITES Standing

Committee. UNEP-WCMC also participated in a meeting of the Advisory Working Group on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade (27 April to 1 May 2015, Shepherdstown, United States) and proposed a new methodology for the selection of species under the RST. This resulted in proposed revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) (see Annex B of PC22 Doc 11.1). UNEP-WCMC also provided input to additional Standing Committee documents, including on CITES Decision 14.78 (Rev. CoP16) on the legal trade in elephant ivory.

15. UNEP-WCMC produced two reports on animal taxonomy and nomenclature (AC28 Doc. 21.1 Annexes 4 & 9) for discussion at the 28th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC28; Tel Aviv, 30 August - 3 September 2015).

16. In preparation for the upcoming CITES Conference of the Parties, UNEP-WCMC provided input to a number of Working Groups, including those on Special Reporting Requirements, Pangolins, Sturgeons, Review of Significant Trade, the Advisory Working Group on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, Captive Bred and Ranches Specimens, Periodic Review, and the Review of Identification and Guidance Materials. For the latter, UNEP-WCMC developed options to improve the accuracy and availability of CITES identification material, which is currently under review by Parties.

17. The CITES Secretariat has sought advice from UNEP-WCMC on levels and trends in trade, as well as in scientific and technical matters (e.g. the distribution of species and nomenclature) together with support on issues relating to reporting, information management, capacity-building and training. UNEP-WCMC provided substantial input into the revision of the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports (CITES Notification No 2015/058). UNEP-WCMC also provided tailored trade overviews to the CITES Secretariat to support trade assessments, missions and capacity building work.

18. Support was provided to Ecuador to inform future wildlife trade management within the country and to ensure that trade is legal, sustainable and traceable. In collaboration with the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), UNEP-WCMC produced an analysis of Ecuador's wildlife trade and three additional reports focussed on traceability, information management, and the use of Harmonised System (HS) customs codes for wildlife trade.

19. In addition to work being carried out directly in support of the CITES Secretariat and Parties:

a) UNEP-WCMC is currently working on a host of updates and new features to further develop the Online Reporting System (ORS) to support national reporting processes to MEAs. This work is being carried out as part of Phase II of the African-Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) MEAs Project, which aims to support these countries to meet their obligations to MEAs. Updates will include: improved speed, preparing the code to become 'open-source' to facilitate further development by MEAs and partners as required, and implementation of a more intuitive user design. UNEP-WCMC is consulting with a number of MEAs (including CITES) and Parties to inform the development process. UNEP-WCMC is discussing the adoption of the tool with CITES for their implementation reports.

b) UNEP-WCMC worked with the CITES Secretariat and the Government of Switzerland to convene an Expert meeting on enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of MEA implementation: Interoperability between reporting systems for biodiversity data. The meeting took place in Geneva, Switzerland on 15-16 December 2014. The meeting made a number of recommendations for: improving and streamlining national report formats;

making technical enhancements to online reporting tools to improve usability and foster interoperability; improve the understanding of how data can be used more broadly to meet global targets; and improve communication across MEAs to foster collaboration and encourage interoperability.

c) The UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions has been working with UNEP-WCMC on the project funded by the European Union and the Governments of Finland and Switzerland concerning opportunities for enhancing synergies and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions at all appropriate levels. All relevant secretariats, including the CITES Secretariat, have been actively involved in the work in addition to representatives of a number of Parties. The Sourcebook of Opportunities for enhancing cooperation among the biodiversity-related conventions at national and regional levels was launched at the Ramsar Convention COP in June 2015, and the paper on the Elaboration of options for enhancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions is available now, but will be part of the UNEP Executive Director's report to the second session of the United Nations Environment Assembly in May 2016.

### **C. Collaboration between the UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Regional Office for West Asia and the CITES secretariat during 2014–2015**

20. This section describes the activities of the UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific and Regional Office for West Asia in support of the CITES mandates during 2014–2015.

21. In support of new accessions, the CITES secretariat, in collaboration with the UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific conducted a joint scoping mission to Timor Leste on 25-27 November 2014. The mission was undertaken, in response to the request from the Government of Timor Leste, to support relevant Government offices and other stakeholders in their efforts towards the accession of Timor Leste to CITES. The representatives of the CITES secretariat and UNEP jointly provided technical support to the Government of Timor Leste and other national stakeholders, through the organization of a stakeholder workshop and bilateral meetings, by providing an overview of CITES and clarifications on further steps that need to be followed by the country to accede to the Convention.

22. On 15 January 2015, UNEP organized the Sixteenth Asia Partner' Forum on Combating Environmental Crime (ARPEC) meeting in Bangkok, Thailand. The meeting brainstormed how to apply anti-money laundering efforts to address environmental crime. The Anti-Money Laundering Office (AMLO) of Thailand shared their success story on seizing assets worth of 1,183 million baht (equivalent to US\$ 39.4 million) from a syndicate of illegal wildlife and rosewood traders, discovering a zoo used as a front for smuggling in 2014. Such financial investigation is the first of its kind in Thailand. The meeting attracted the presence of ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network, FAO, Royal Thai Police, Royal Thai Customs, Thailand' Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants, WWF and World Customs Organization. ARPEC has been to date a platform for organizations that work on environmental crime to explore the possibilities of cooperation in capacity building, information sharing in their respective fields of specialization. It also crystallized regional enforcement operations like PATROL (Partnership against Transnational-crime Through Regional Organized Law-enforcement).

23. UNEP organized the Regional Green Customs Workshop in Asia & Pacific: Enhancing the Capability of Customs Officers to Address Environmental Crime from 10-13 November 2015 in Seoul, Republic of Korea. The Green Customs Initiative (GCI) is a partnership of international organizations cooperating to enhance the capacity of Customs and other relevant enforcement

officers to monitor and facilitate the legal trade and to prevent illegal trade in environmentally sensitive commodities covered by trade-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), including CITES. The workshop aimed to strengthen the enforcement capacity of Customs and enhance long-term partnership at both strategic and operational levels, and promote the exchange of best practice in tackling illegal trade of environmentally regulated goods. The workshop was attended by 40 participants including customs officers from 20 countries in Asia-Pacific region and representatives of GCI partners including CITES.

24. To strengthen the capacity of customs officials in combatting illegal trade in environmentally regulated goods, including the wildlife regulated through CITES, and to promote exchange of experience and best practices in tracking illegal trade of environmentally regulated goods, UNEP/WCO on 6-10 April 2015 organized a joint risk management workshop on countering illegal trade in environmentally regulated goods in Malacca, Malaysia, with support from the Customs Service of the Republic of Korea. The workshop was attended by 43 participants consisting of 35 customs officers of Asia/Pacific region and 8 officers from environmental organizations including CITES Secretariat and TRAFFIC.

25. With the support of UNEP Regional Office for West Asia the Kuwait Environment Authority and the CITES Secretariat held a sub-regional workshop on the conservation of Cheetahs.

26. The “Wildlife Enforcement Network” for West Asia which was established in 2013 with help from EU and CITES to build capacity on CITES enforcement and implementation in the region assembled a committee of 4 countries (Kuwait, UAE, Jordan and Yemen) was formed to further the network activities.

27. IFAW continues to lead capacity building workshops on CITES measures in the region at the request of countries. Recently workshops were held in UAE, Iraq and Yemen.

## **D. Update on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services**

### **1. Update on progress in the Platform process**

28. In response to paragraphs (a) and (b) of decision 16.13, directing Parties to reinforce linkages between the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and CITES and inviting Parties to provide inputs to the Secretariat in regard to CITES involvement in the Platform, CITES input was further refined and the initiation for scoping for a thematic assessment on the “sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity and strengthening capacities and tools” was adopted as part of the work programme for 2014–2018 of IPBES during the third session of the Plenary of IPBES. Accordingly, a scoping document was developed by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, supported by an open access web-based consultation, or E-conference, held from 7 to 25 September 2015. The scoping document will be considered by the Plenary of IPBES at its fourth session (22-28 February 2016, Kuala Lumpur), for approval.

29. The objective of the proposed thematic assessment is to assess various approaches to sustainable use of wild species, and strengthen related capacities and tools, in line with the objectives of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Human use of biodiversity is a dominant driver of change for biodiversity, with implications for nature’s benefits to people and quality of life. Through the examples of the use of

wild species this assessment would focus on practices and measures that enhance sustainability in a broad sense, including conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Hence, it would adopt an integrative perspective on humans and their physical surroundings i.e. a system approach, recognizing the inseparable unity of nature and culture. The assessment would examine a wide range of governance regimes, practices, and approaches which have aimed at promoting sustainable use of wild species, encompassing modern technologies and indigenous and local knowledge and methods, diverse patterns of sustainable management and harvesting, and implications of State decisions and policies. The assessment corresponds to Strategic Goal B of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, which aims to reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use, so as to maintain integrity, functioning and services of ecosystems.

30. Work under CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity is of particular interest given that the aim of CITES is to ensure trade in species covered by the Convention is legal, traceable and sustainable, and that sustainable use of biodiversity is the second objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity and is explicitly referred to in the Convention's Aichi Biodiversity Targets 3, 4, 6, 7 and 18.

### **III. UNEP administrative and financial management support to the CITES secretariat**

#### **A. Delegation of authority**

31. The Delegation of Authority dated 1 October 2010 signed between the Executive Director of UNEP and the Secretary General of CITES remains effective.

32. UNEP is currently reviewing its Accountability Framework and the resulting Delegations of Authority, and is in the process of drafting a policy for Delegations of Authority, which will be in accordance with the revised Accountability Framework. UNEP confirms that the Secretary-General of CITES is accountable to the Executive Director for the management and administration of the CITES Secretariat. At the same time, the CITES Secretariat is accountable to the CITES Parties, including through the CoP and its Standing Committee, for the implementation of the CITES Costed Programme of Work and all other functions entrusted to it by the Convention and the CITES Parties.

#### **B. MOU between Standing Committee of CITES and UNEP**

33. A Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the Standing Committee of the Conference of the Parties to the CITES and the Executive Director of UNEP on 1 September 2011. The main purpose of this MOU is to highlight the provisions of secretariat services from UNEP to the Convention and its related support.

34. In accordance with para 48, which provides that the MOU will be reviewed after each meeting of the Conference of the Parties to determine whether any modifications are needed, UNEP reiterates its request for a review of the MOU, as was requested in the 64th and 65th sessions of the Standing Committee meeting. In this regard, UNEP intends to initiate a review process after the next Conference of the Parties as requested at the previous Standing Committee sessions.

#### **C. UN system-wide Enterprise Resource Planning system**

35. In accordance with UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/60/283 to harmonise the way the UN works and to increase transparency and accountability, the UN, including UNEP, and the Convention Secretariats, has been operating with the support of the new enterprise resource planning system “Umoja” since 2 June 2015.

36. Since its deployment, there have been a number of challenges faced by UNEP under Umoja, particularly for offices away from headquarters (including Convention Secretariats), primarily at operational levels. These challenges include issues on the workflows for travel, payments and user access to data in Umoja. In particular, Business Intelligence reporting functionality is incomplete and UNEP users currently do not have full access to the data they require to produce various reports for internal decision-making and communication with UNEP’s donors. These issues were discussed in detail by the Working Group for Administrative Arrangements with MEA Secretariats, and recommendations were made by the Working Group for improvements. Where possible, UNEP has begun to implement some of the recommendations, while others will remain pending until the system has fully stabilised.

37. Implementation challenges to the Umoja financial functionalities will move the UN’s preparation of financial statements to June 2016 for the end of year financial statements. In this regard, UNEP expect a delay, current estimated at two months, for financial reporting.

38. UNEP has been working together with the UN Secretariat in identifying the root cause of issues and acting swiftly to address them. UNEP is confident once the system stabilises, Umoja will provide donors with enhanced insight into UNEP’s operations, streamline its processes, and improve cost efficiency and service delivery.

#### **D. Support provided to CITES from the Programme Support Costs (PSC)**

39. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/217 and UN Rules (ST/AI/286) all trust funds are charged for programme support costs. The rate charged is approved by the General Assembly, for UNEP the rate is 13 per cent PSC. This charge is intended to ensure that the cost of supporting activities financed from extra budgetary contributions is not borne by the regular budget and/or other core resources that are central to the budget review and approval process of the United Nations Organizations. For UNEP, the term “extra budgetary resource” refers to trust funds as distinct from budgetary resources, namely the environmental fund.

40. As per UN standard procedures, the amount of resources available to the UNEP and CITES Secretariats for Programme Support in any given year is based on the income received for this purpose in the previous year. Under the current arrangement, the CITES secretariat receives 67 per cent of the programme support costs generated by the previous year’s delivery of the programme of work against its respective trust funds.

41. As in previous years since COP 15 in Doha, the posts of three administrative staff directly assigned to the CITES secretariat have been funded from PSC. Those include the salaries of the Administrative and Financial Management Officer (P4), their Administrative Assistant (G6), and a Finance Assistant (G6). The P4 Administrative and Financial Management Officer retired on 31st March 2015 and a new Officer was recruited from 1 April 2015. In addition, 25 per cent of the salary of the Information Network Officer (P3) was funded from PSC. The PSC is also used to finance the part of UNEP’s central administrative functions that supports the CITES Secretariat,



including those performed by UNON, UNOG, UN Headquarters, the UN's Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and the Board of Auditors.

42. The Programme Support Costs were also used to finance Staff development training to ensure smooth implementation of new ERP system (SAP), Umoja, and assistance in preparation of the first set of IPSAS financial statements which were signed off by the Board of Auditors on 30 June 2015. Details of the PSC support can be found in the Annex I to this report.

43. All Convention trust funds continue to be administered by Executive Director of the United Environment Programme and have been extended to 31 December 2017. The Standing Committee may wish to request the Executive Director of UNEP to extend the trust fund beyond 31 December 2017 at the next meeting of the United Nations Environment Assembly.

## **E. Additional information on administrative matters for the Conference of the Parties**

44. In order to complement the efforts to strengthen the relationship between UNEP and the multilateral environmental agreements for which it provides secretariat functions, the Executive Director of UNEP established a task team comprising representatives of the secretariats of those agreements and the relevant offices of the UNEP secretariat. The Task Team commenced consultations at its first meeting, held on 3 February 2014, on the effectiveness of administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation between them.

45. The Task Team was chaired by the Deputy Executive Director and the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Migratory Species serves as Vice-Chair. Two working groups – one on administrative arrangements and the other on programmatic cooperation – were established under the task team, and were chaired by representatives of the secretariats of CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity, respectively. The Working Groups on programmatic cooperation and administrative arrangements concluded their reports and submitted them to the Task Team for final approval. The Task Team prepared a report for the consideration of the Executive Director (Task Team report attached as Annex II).

46. A final report of the UNEP Executive Director will be submitted in February 2016 to the second Open-ended meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, with a view to putting the issue before the second session of the United Nations Environment Assembly in May 2016, in accordance with resolution 1/12 of the United Nations Environment Assembly.

47. In line with recommendations made at the MEAs Management Team meeting held on 19 June 2015 in Vienna, and to further strengthen relations between UNEP and the secretariats, the Executive Director has appointed the following MEAs focal points in UNEP:

- (i) The focal point, based in the Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELIC), for supporting and strengthening programmatic collaboration with MEAs who will oversee a cultural change in the relations between UNEP and UNEP-administered Convention Secretariats that would focus on encouraging, enhancing, enabling and strengthening coordination and cooperation as well as a move towards timely, regular consultations on relevant programmatic matters. In addition, he will oversee the implementation of recommendations made by the MEAs Task Team Working Group on Programmatic Cooperation.
- (ii) The focal point, based in the Office for Operations and Corporate Services (OfO), for assistance and follow-up on operational and administrative matters. This focal point will

ensure streamlined cooperation between UNEP and MEAs, responsiveness and accountability to administrative issues in the areas of human resources, including mediation and litigation, corporate legal counsel, delegations of authority, partnerships and contributions, Umoja, procurement, travel, delegations and finance as well as training in all above areas.

48. The programmatic focal point in DELC in cooperation with the operations focal point in OfO will support the work and meetings of the UNEP-MEA Management Team (MMT) and ensure UNEP provides consolidated, appropriate and timely inputs in preparation for conferences or meetings of parties. The designation of the focal points on programmatic and administrative issues responds to the call for more streamlined processes that will lead to greater accountability, responsibility and responsiveness.

#### **IV. Status of implementation of UNEA resolution 1/3 on Illegal Trade in Wildlife**

49. In its resolution 1/3 on illegal trade in wildlife, the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) called upon the UN General Assembly to consider the issue of illegal wildlife trade at its sixty-ninth session. In its resolution 69/314 on tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife, the General Assembly reaffirmed the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, entitled “The future we want”, in which the economic, social and environmental impact of illicit trafficking in wildlife was recognized, as was the need for firm and strengthened action to be taken on both the supply and demand sides, and the importance in that regard of effective international cooperation among relevant multilateral environmental agreements and international organizations. Further, the General Assembly resolution called upon Member States to adopt effective measures to prevent and counter illicit trafficking in wildlife and wildlife product, harmonize national legislation and transnational cooperation on illegal wildlife trade, and recognized the links between wildlife crime, international organized crime and the plight of local communities, whose livelihoods are impacted by the illicit trade. The resolution is considered as an historic step forward in promoting the firm and concerted international action needed to combat IWT.

50. The recommendations adopted by the Policy Committee of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on illegal trade in wildlife and forest products on 3 February 2015 provide UNEP with a clear mandate within the United Nations system to work with the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and other United Nations entities to ensure a coherent response by the United Nations system to the illegal trade in wildlife. UNEP, in collaboration with the CITES secretariat, was requested by the Policy Committee to convene the United Nations system to develop a robust evidence base, shared analysis and consequent recommendations for an effective and coherent United Nations response to the security, political, economic, environmental and social aspects of the illegal trade in wildlife. UNEP, in collaboration with CITES and other United Nations entities, was also requested to increase United Nations advocacy to combat the illegal trade in wildlife and to encourage States Members of the United Nations to take action to implement CITES and relevant international commitments, including in relation to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC). Work is under way on these elements, guided by discussions between UNEP, CITES, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. It is anticipated that the requisite documentation will be made available by end of 2015.

51. The implementation of resolution 1/3 on Illegal Wildlife Trade is well underway, with considerable momentum now in place across the range of many activities anticipated to be

completed before UNEA 2, and through the operationalization of the Action Plan and of UNEP Programme of Work in support of Member States in strengthening national, regional and global responses to illegal trade in wildlife and benefiting from strong collaboration with UNDP, ICCWC partners (UNODC, CITES, Interpol, World Bank, the World Customs Organization) and others. It is anticipated all requests to the ED made in the Resolution will be fulfilled in advance of UNEA 2.

52. Work is under way on an analysis compiling and synthesizing available and updated information on the environmental impact of the illegal trade in wildlife and wildlife products for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly at its second session in May 2016, strengthening the evidence base for policymakers, including Governments, civil society organizations, local communities and the private sector, so that they can make informed decisions and design effective interventions to address the matter.

53. The report will build on existing knowledge, moving beyond the current attention on the poaching crisis facing African elephants and rhinos, to take into account the diverse and global nature of the challenge and to address a wider range of ecological threats from illegal harvesting and trafficking, including of timber, great apes, reptiles, bush meat, tigers, bears, coral, birds, pangolins and fish. The focus of the analysis will provide an opportunity to review the environmental dimensions of illegal trade, enhancing the knowledge base for further development of policy support tools and building capacity to secure the foundations of future projects addressing illegal wildlife trade.

54. UNEA requested the Executive Director:

**A. To provide by the second session of UNEA an analysis of the environmental impacts of illegal trade in wildlife and wildlife products:**

55. The first full draft of the analysis has been written through a desk-based study and an expert workshop (held in May), and is currently undergoing external peer review. The second draft, incorporating infographics, developed in close collaboration with UNEP-WCMC and Grid-Arendal was concluded in October 2015.

56. It is anticipated a final draft of the analysis will be submitted for editing and translation by the end of 2015, and be available in all 6 UN languages prior to the OECPR meeting in February 2016. A side event to formally launch the report is expected in the margins of UNEA-2.

57. Strongly evidence-based and drawing on considerable external expertise, the analysis is a ground-breaking body of work, compiling and synthesizing for the 1<sup>st</sup> time the evidence base on the environmental impacts (and their socio-economic consequences) of the illegal trade in wildlife. The report will complement (but be released before) the ongoing work of UNODC in relation to assessing the volumes and values of illegal trade in wildlife, and will secure UNEP's role as a credible source of evidence underpinning policy responses to the illegal trade in wildlife. It is anticipated that, subject to the availability of resources, an annual report will be compiled, to update the impacts analysis and broader areas of the evidence base on the illegal trade in wildlife.

**B. To continue and to reinforce the relevant activities of the United Nations Environment Programme in collaboration with member States and other relevant international, regional and national actors, to raise awareness about the problems and the risks associated with the supply of, transit in and demand for illegal wildlife products:**

58. UNEP is developing a phased approach to this request, which parallels the role identified through the UNSG Policy Committee Decision for UNEP to lead the advocacy and outreach elements of the UN system-wide response to illegal wildlife trade.

59. Phase 1 will focus on a One UN Global Public Awareness Raising effort that aims to quickly and broadly address knowledge gaps about the scale and implications of the illegal trade in wildlife through the identification of strategic, high profile, and high impact activities -- for example in relation to airport exhibitions, transport sector outreach, use of digital media and UN wide network of goodwill ambassadors. The Terms of Reference for this communications project have been agreed by UNEP, UNDP and UNODC, joint financing has been secured, and a procurement process for implementing the work is underway. The work will be underpinned by a solid assessment of knowledge on market dynamics for high profile illegally-traded taxa, which is currently underway, leading to a strengthened evidence base for targeted communications. The first phase of research to consolidate knowledge and identify knowledge gaps has been undertaken and a report will be finalized by the end of 2015.

60. Phase 2 will focus on building the Global Public Awareness Raising effort and developing a Targeted Communications Plan to deliver the Specific Behavioural Objectives (SBO's) identified in the three main components of UNEP's overall work to address the illegal trade in wildlife and forest products: Policy Engagement and Agenda Setting; Strengthening Rule of Law and Communication for Behavioural Impact. This process will likewise be grounded in the evidence-based learning from online surveys and comprehensive studies on knowledge, attitudes and practices in those markets identified through the programmatic scoping exercise.

61. UNEP is collaborating with the African Union Commission to support the development of an African common strategy on combating illegal trade in wild flora and fauna in Africa. In this context, UNEP participated in the International Conference on Illegal Trade of Wildlife in Brazzaville from 27 to 30 April 2015. African member States at the Conference adopted a united declaration, and approved an initial strategy which, with ongoing support from UNEP, will be expounded upon and will undergo a process of more in-depth regional consultation and further consideration by the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment at its fifteenth session in March 2016 and at the African Union summit in June 2016.

**C. To work closely with the International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime, UNDP, and the Secretary-General's Rule of Law Group, notably with regard to core areas of UNEP expertise, such as environmental aspects of the rule of law, judicial training and information exchange about judicial decisions and practices:**

62. Various collaborations with ICCWC partners, UNDP and other UN entities are underway in response to this request, in addition to direct support for Member States in relation to core areas of UNEP's expertise.

63. As part of work to implement the mandate resulting from Decision PC/2015/1 of the UNSG's

Policy Committee, UNEP was requested to convene the UN system to develop a robust evidence base, shared analysis and consequent recommendations for an effective and coherent UN response to the security, political, economic, environmental and social aspects of IWT. Although the focus is on the role of the UN system, partners such as through the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCCWC) are being consulted in the process, based on the consideration that agencies are working in close collaboration with a wider range of actors beyond the UN system. Implementation of the decision is progressing and it is anticipated that by the end of the year all elements of the Decision will be submitted to the Secretary-General.

64. In October 2015, UNEP together with the office of the Chief Justice of Kenya and the Konrad Adenauer Foundation hosted a special session on illegal wildlife trade during the first Africa Environmental Rule of Law Colloquium. The special session discussed the obstacles to effective investigation, prosecution and adjudication of illegal wildlife trade from the national and regional perspectives of the participants. The discussions identified and proposed solutions on legislative challenges to investigation, prosecution and adjudication of illegal wildlife trade and, suggested mechanisms of strengthening enforcement to curb illegal wildlife trade.

65. In November 2015, UNEP and INTERPOL co-organized the second International Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Conference in Singapore. Building on the outcomes of the first conference in 2013, the Singapore conference focused on the growing connection between environmental crimes and internationally agreed development goals by identifying strategies to: Better incorporate law enforcement in the supply chain monitoring of environmental products; Promote collaboration between law enforcement and the public and private sectors and; Curb demand for illegal products.

66. In support of CITES, UNEP provided technical support in the 4th Annual training of the East African Association of Prosecutors held on 5-7 November 2015 in Kampala, Uganda by making a presentation on "Practical aspects of prosecuting environmental crimes". The objective of the training was to enhance harmonization and enhance international cooperation in the prosecution of environmental crimes. The training brought together participants from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi and South Sudan.

**D. To continue to support national Governments, upon their request, to develop and implement the environmental rule of law, and in that context to continue its efforts to fight the illegal wildlife trade and to continue to promote actions including through capacity-building:**

67. UNEP provided technical support to the African Union/Republic of Congo International Conference on illegal wildlife trade in wild flora and fauna (April 2015). The support included the preparation of the elements of a declaration affirming Africa's commitment to combatting illegal wildlife trade and; the preparation of a draft strategy titled "African Common Strategy on Combatting Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora". UNEP is also supporting finalization of the common strategy.

68. UNEP has been supporting Botswana and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in their follow-up initiatives to the African Elephant Summit held in Gaborone in December 2013 and the London Conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade held in London in February 2014. UNEP provided technical support to the preparations of the Kasane Conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade held in Kasane, Botswana, in March 2015, including contributing to the development

of the Kasane statement, the main outcome of the Conference. UNEP will continue to collaborate with and support countries in the implementation of the commitments emanating from those meetings.

69. On July 28-29, 2015, in Nairobi, Kenya, UNEP and the Conservation Council of Nations along with experts in the prosecution of international crime hosted an East Africa Regional Judiciary and Law Enforcement Workshop on Wildlife / Environmental Crime. The workshop strengthened judicial, prosecutorial, and support sectors in the fight against wildlife crime, and identified challenges and strategies to address Priority Issues in the sub-region including: Increasing cross-border cooperation through formal and informal avenues; streamlining the capacity of judiciary, prosecutors, and law enforcement to combat wildlife crime and develop strategic training programs; Strengthening policy and legislation to better facilitate the capacity of judiciary, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials to combat wildlife/environmental crime; Utilizing international resources available to support/add value to efforts to combat wildlife/environmental crime; Expanding efforts to sensitize judges, prosecutors, agents, policymakers, and local communities on the value of wildlife and the implications of wildlife crime; Prosecute corruption which undermines all efforts at all levels to combat wildlife crime and; Holding training programs with judiciary, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials from supply, transit, and demand countries to strengthen collaboration on international trade cases and education/sensitization initiatives.

70. UNEP is supporting the Kenya Magistrates and Judges Association develop a training manual on environmental law with a component on illegal wildlife trade. The Manual will be tested in October during a train the trainers workshop.

71. UNEP is working with the CITES Secretariat on a flagship initiative to support countries strengthen their national legislation to control illegal wildlife trade (the National Legislation Project). The project is a high profile initiative within the CITES Convention, and includes: Providing legal advice and technical assistance to 17 countries that require attention as a priority on the development of appropriate measures for effective implementation of the CITES Convention; legislative guidance for the drafting of national legislation with a special focus on optimal penalties to deter illegal wildlife trade; compiling best examples of existing national legislation to regulate international wildlife trade and combat wildlife crime, including criminal law provisions to treat illegal wildlife trade as a serious crime and to deal with organized crime and corruption as well as the criminal liability of all the actors involved in the illegal wildlife trade chain in origin, transit and destination countries; training of CITES authorities, legal drafters, policy makers, the judiciary, parliamentarians and other relevant government officials responsible for the formulation and adoption of CITES-related legislation.

**E. To take a proactive role in UNEP administration of the African Elephant Fund (AEF) to ensure its contribution to the implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan:**

72. The African Elephant Action Plan is the only document negotiated under the auspices of CITES that was agreed upon by all 37 African elephant Range States. UNEP has had the role of Secretariat of the AEF for the implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan since February 2013. Support to the AEF during that time has strengthened considerably:

(a) **Staffing:** The Secretariat's capacity has been enhanced with additional staff that joined the team in July 2015, making the fund fully functional and fast-tracking services to all Range States. The efficiency of the newly revamped Secretariat has been recognized at

the just concluded 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AEF Steering Committee, held in Addis Ababa 11-12 September 2015.

(b) **Resource Mobilization:** On top of its own support directly to the fund in the form of Human Resources and money to develop communications materials, UNEP has mobilized additional funding, including: 500,000 Euros from Germany, 120,000 Euros from the Netherlands, and 50,000 Dollars from Belgium. These new contributions have doubled the budget of the fund within a period of six months.

(c) **Administration of the fund:** To-date, 30 projects totaling almost USD 2 million have been funded and are under implementation. Activities funded under the AEF are focused primarily on the objectives of the African Elephant Action Plan, namely reducing illegal killing of elephants and illegal trade in elephant products, maintaining elephant habitats and restoring connectivity and reducing human-elephant conflicts. Additional measures under the project include advocacy, training, awareness raising, and capacity building.

(d) **Visibility and awareness raising:** In addition to various promotional materials, which have provided more visibility for Range States and donors to the fund, UNEP has also supported the fund with a revamped website: [www.africanelephantfund.org](http://www.africanelephantfund.org)

(e) **Next steps:** To further advance on the opportunities that the AEF offers for the conservation of African elephants, Member States need to be encouraged to channel more funding to the AEF, rather than support bilateral or other alternative initiatives.

## V. Update on the Implementation of Outcomes of the 2013 UNEP-INTERPOL Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Conference

73. The First International Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Conference took place on 6 November 2013 in Nairobi, Kenya. Convened by the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the meeting was attended by over 300 participants including national enforcement officials, government representatives and representatives from nongovernmental organizations, international organizations and civil society.

74. Participants at the conference discussed: recent trends in violations of international environmental law and the impacts of such violations on sustainable development and the implementation of internationally-agreed environmental goals; possible solutions to battle environmental crime; and the impact of new and existing tools in combating these violations. They also discussed and agreed on outcomes and future action points aimed at strengthening collaboration in combatting crimes and other violations of environmental law.

75. The conference further invited the United Nations Environment Assembly and the INTERPOL General Assembly to initiate a debate on the issue, given the serious implications of the illegal activities discussed during the conference on environmental sustainability, sustainable development and security overall.

76. The future action points from the conference included:

a) **National Environmental Security Task Force (NEST):** To promote a multidisciplinary approach for collaboration, communication and cooperation to address

obstacles and opportunities at all levels;

b) **Information & Intelligence Assessment/Analysis:** To facilitate intelligence and assessments to identify threats, transfer information, support investigations and extend current databases into other related crime areas;

c) **International Capacity Building Platform:** To operationalize an international or regional capacity-building platform to facilitate the effective delivery of capacity development initiatives, materials and activities;

d) **International Environmental Security Task Force:** To establish an international task force to harmonize approaches for addressing environmental crimes, strengthening legislative/legal framework, connecting countries and fostering inter-agency communication.

77. UNEP has made significant efforts in the past two years that have contributed to the implementation of action points (b) and (c) as follows:

## **A. UNEP's work on "Information & Intelligence Assessment/Analysis"**

### **i. Rapid Response Assessment Reports**

78. UNEP in collaboration with INTERPOL developed the following rapid response assessment reports specifically on issues related to illegal wildlife trade and waste crime:

#### **(i) A rapid response assessment on the Environmental Crime Crisis**

79. In June 2014, UNEP and INTERPOL launched a rapid response assessment report on the *Environmental Crime Crisis – Threats to Sustainable Development from Illegal Exploitation and Trade in Wildlife and Forest Resources*. The report was released at UNEA-1, significantly raised awareness on the need to focus attention on emerging areas. The assessment focuses on the consequences of IWT, highlighting policy responses and recommendations to address this issue.

#### **(ii) A rapid response assessment on Waste Crime**

80. UNEP and INTERPOL launched a rapid response assessment on *Waste Crime – Waste Risks: Gaps in Meeting the Global Waste Challenge* in May 2015. The assessment examines the current legal framework governing cross-border movement and management of wastes at the international, regional, and national levels; on-going initiatives to prevent and combat the illegal traffic of hazardous wastes and other wastes; and policy recommendations to address this challenge.

### **ii. Review of the environmental impacts of illegal trade in wildlife**

81. In response to the UNEA resolution on IWT that requested the ED to provide an analysis of the environmental impacts of IWT, an assessment report on "*Review of the environmental impacts of illegal trade in wildlife*" is being prepared, which will be completed in February 2016. The report will highlight environmental dimensions of IWT (e.g. impacts of IWT on targeted species, incidental impacts on non-target species, loss of ecosystem function, etc.), and enhance the knowledge base



for further development of policy support tools.

### **iii. Feasibility study to determine the status of illegal trade in West Asia**

82. UNEP and the CITES Secretariat have conducted a Feasibility Study to determine the status of illegal trade in West Asia with a view to establishing a regional mechanism for the coordination of enforcement of laws regulating wildlife trade in the region. The study gave a useful background on gaps and challenges that face effective implementation of law enforcement efforts on wildlife trade control in West Asia at the national and regional level and developed recommendations.

## **B. UNEP's work on "International Capacity Building Platform"**

### **i. Training**

83. UNEP has been undertaking a series of capacity building initiatives to empower, build skills, equip and enhance, at the international, regional and national level, the capacity of key stakeholders (enforcement officials, prosecutors and judges), and dealing with environmental crimes.

84. In order to assist parties with CITES implementation, UNEP has continued to provide capacity building support for judges and prosecutors as follows:

a) Programme to strengthen the capacity of prosecutors in the East African Region, implemented in collaboration with the Institute for Security Studies. The training in November 2015 brought together participants from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and South Sudan.

b) Judicial training and Compliance and Enforcement training in Malawi and Zimbabwe, and a workshop on Institutional and Trans-boundary cooperation for Lake Malawi in 2014.

c) UNEP together with the office of the Chief Justice of Kenya and the Konrad Adenauer Foundation hosted a special session on IWT during the first Africa Environmental Rule of Law Colloquium in October 2015, which has contributed to promoting efforts of the judiciary, prosecutors and enforcement officials to combat IWT in the African Region.

d) On 28-29 July 2015, in Nairobi, Kenya, UNEP and the Conservation Council of Nations along with experts in the prosecution of international crime hosted an East Africa Regional Judiciary and Law Enforcement Workshop on Wildlife / Environmental Crime. The workshop sought to strengthen judicial, prosecutorial, and support sectors in the fight against wildlife crime, and identified challenges and strategies to address Priority Issues in the sub-region

### **ii. Regional & cross-border cooperation**

85. UNEP has facilitated and promoted regional cooperation and networking among enforcement officials dealing with environmental crime.

#### **a) Regional Enforcement Network – REN:**

86. UNEP has been implementing a regional enforcement networking project since 2002 to combat environmental crime. Since 2007, the project has been expanded to include hazardous

waste, pesticide and permanent pollutants, in addition to ODS. The project networked customs officers and environmental officers to address illegal trade through information exchange, enforcement operation, cross border cooperation and capacity building. The project initiated Operation Sky Hole Patching to combat illegal trade in ozone depleting substances and hazardous waste in Asia, and Partnership against Transnational Crime through Organized Law Enforcement in Greater Mekong Sub-region.

**b) Asia Partners Forum on Combating Environmental Crime (ARPEC):**

87. On 15 January 2015, UNEP organized the Sixteenth Meeting of Asia Partners Forum on Combating Environmental Crime (ARPEC) at the UN Convention Center in Bangkok, Thailand. There were 26 representatives at the meeting from the UNEP's partner organizations and entities, including UNODC, WWF and Freeland foundation. The meeting brainstormed how to apply anti-money laundering efforts to address environmental crime. The Anti-Money Laundering Office (AMLO) of Thailand shared their success story on seizing assets worth of 1,183 million baht (equivalent to US\$ 39.4 million) from a syndicate of illegal wildlife and rosewood traders, and discovering a zoo used as a front for smuggling in 2014. Such financial investigation is the first of its kind in Thailand. The meeting attracted the presence of ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network, FAO, Royal Thai Police, Royal Thai Customs, Thailand' Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plants, WWF and World Customs Organization. ARPEC has been to date a platform for organizations that work on environmental crime to explore the possibilities of cooperation in capacity building, information sharing in their respective fields of specialization. It also crystallized regional enforcement operations like PATROL (Partnership against Transnational-crime Through Regional Organized Law-enforcement).

**c) Asia Pacific Roundtable on Environmental Rule of Law for Sustainable Development:**

88. The Roundtable was held in May 2015 back to back with the 1<sup>st</sup> Forum of Ministers and Environment Authorities of Asia Pacific, and was attended by Chief Justices, legislators, police, customs and other enforcement officials from the region. UNEP also launched the Asian Environmental Enforcement Award in 2014, to encourage countries, organizations and individuals in the Asia Pacific region to combat environmental crime and to reward excellence in enforcement efforts.

**iii. Technical support for strengthening legislation to control IWT**

89. UNEP is working with the CITES Secretariat on an initiative to support countries strengthen their national legislation to control IWT, through providing legal advice and technical assistance to 17 countries for effective implementation of the CITES Convention.

**iv. Guidance materials and e-learning tools**

90. UNEP has also developed a series of guidance materials and e-learning tools to support national level efforts in combatting environmental crime.

91. In 2014, UNEP published a guide on Enforcement of Environmental Law Good Practices from Africa, Central Asia and ASEAN Countries. The guide is intended to share a set of good practices generated by experts from selected countries in the African, ASEAN and Central Asian regions.

92. UNEP is supporting the Kenya Magistrates and Judges Association (KMJA) to develop a training manual on environmental law with a component on IWT.

93. UNEP has also launched in 2014 an e-learning portal (<http://e-learning.informeia.org>) that provides training courses to support government officials, including enforcement officials, in the implementation of MEAs on issues such as biodiversity, ozone, chemicals, and climate change. As at June 2015, the e-learning portal had over 650 registered users and well over 200 course certificates issued.

Fund	Code	Description	2012	2013	2014	Total
QTL	1850	Exchange gain/loss	89.09	1,594.60	589,272.34	590,956.03
QTL	6310	Expenditure	4,246,829.05	2,534,388.36	1,256,680.26	8,037,897.67
QTL	6320	Programme Support Cost	370,049.79	268,420.20	244,773.04	883,243.03
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>4,616,967.93</b>	<b>2,804,403.16</b>	<b>2,090,725.64</b>	<b>9,512,096.73</b>

Fund	Code	Description	2012	2013	2014	Total
CTL	1850	Exchange gain/loss	10,520.59	1,406.06	11,487.76	23,414.41
CTL	6310	Expenditure	4,500,105.45	4,698,818.59	4,677,331.96	13,876,256.01
CTL	6320	Programme Support Cost	663,537.03	638,325.31	637,050.56	1,938,912.90
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>5,174,163.08</b>	<b>5,338,549.96</b>	<b>5,325,870.28</b>	<b>15,838,583.32</b>

Fund	Code	Description	2012	2013	2014	Total
EAP	1850	Exchange gain/loss		0.00	(1,582.54)	(1,582.54)
EAP	6310	Expenditure		56,821.18	49,000.00	105,821.18
EAP	6320	Programme Support Cost		4,492.68	18,986.25	23,478.93
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>61,313.86</b>	<b>66,403.71</b>	<b>127,717.57</b>

Code	Description	2012	2013	2014	Total
1850	Exchange gain/loss	10,609.68	3,000.65	599,177.56	612,787.90
6310	Expenditure	8,746,934.50	7,290,028.13	5,983,012.22	22,019,974.86
6320	Programme Support Cost	1,033,586.82	911,238.19	900,809.85	2,845,634.86
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>9,791,131.00</b>	<b>8,204,266.98</b>	<b>7,482,999.63</b>	<b>25,478,397.61</b>

Programme Support Cost	1,033,586.82	911,238.19	900,809.85	2,845,634.86
67%	692,503.17	610,529.59	603,542.60	1,906,575.36

67% Allocation	692,503.17	610,529.59	603,542.60	1,906,575.36
----------------	------------	------------	------------	--------------

Staff Costs	676,722.95	631,501.00	598,042.33	1,906,266.28
Other Costs	943	57.5		1,000.50
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>677,665.95</b>	<b>631,558.50</b>	<b>598,042.33</b>	<b>1,907,266.78</b>

(Overexpenditure) Underexpenditure against 67% allocation      14,837.22      (21,028.91)      5,500.27      (691.42)



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement    Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente  
Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде    برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة

联合国环境规划署



**Annex II**  
**to the Report of UNEP to the Sixty-sixth meeting of the Standing Committee**  
**of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna**  
**and Flora**

# **Report of the UNEP Task Team on the Effectiveness of Administrative Arrangements and Programmatic Cooperation between UNEP and UNEP-administered Convention Secretariats**

## **1. Summary**

This Report is the result of the work by the UNEP Task Team on the Effectiveness of Administrative Arrangements and Programmatic Cooperation between UNEP and UNEP-administered Convention Secretariats. The Task Team was established by the Executive Director of UNEP in February 2014 in order to conduct an internal review of the recommendations provided by past consultations between UNEP and the secretariats for those multilateral environmental agreements for which the Programme provides the secretariat ('the Convention Secretariats')<sup>1</sup>, their follow-up, and the current state and level of effectiveness of the administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation.

The relationship between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats has been the subject of many consultations in the past. These consultations have been focused primarily around administrative arrangements although some have addressed programmatic cooperation as well. Such consultations have also considered the role and function of service providers for such conventions, such as UNON, UNOG and UNOV, and their inter-relationship with UNEP.

The Task Team found that a significant amount of fruitful programmatic cooperation already exists between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats. Such cooperation should be further pursued and strengthened at various levels and on numerous issues. Possible areas for renewed and strengthened cooperation – with mutual benefits for UNEP and the Convention Secretariats in the future – include: timely coordination on programmatic matters, including preparation of work programs, support to governments and technical assistance at the national level, regional delivery as well as communications and outreach. Tables 1 and 2, attached, include possible areas for collaboration, in areas that are generally applicable to all of the Convention Secretariats, and areas that are applicable to specific conventions, respectively. Given possible cost and staffing implications, future joint consultations should evaluate cost-effective actions and priority setting in these areas. Moreover, any activities undertaken by UNEP and the Convention Secretariats must be well within their respective mandates and priorities, which can and do change over time.<sup>2</sup>

The administrative and programmatic relationships between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats are separate and distinct and the administrative relationship does not give rise to automatic implications for the programmatic relationship.

In considering how to improve programmatic cooperation, the Task Team also considered the different mandates and roles of UNEP and the Convention Secretariats. UNEP and the Convention Secretariats are different in their legal nature and their functions. UNEP is the leading global environmental authority

---

<sup>1</sup> This language (i.e. 'provides' the Secretariat) has been taken from UNEA Resolution 1/12 but it should be noted that using one common phrase for ease of reference does not change the precise legal nature of the relationship between any particular MEA and UNEP. The relationship between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats is different depending on the specific language of the legal instrument and the nature of any agreements in place.

<sup>2</sup> Such activities must also be consistent with any written agreements between individual conventions and UNEP.

that sets the global environmental agenda, promotes the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the UN system, and serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment. Its Secretariat is headed by the Executive Director of UNEP. MEAs are legally-binding agreements which make significant contributions to sustainable development and which coordinate and cooperate with each other as well as with the United Nations system in the field. The roles and functions of the Convention Secretariats are set out in the text of the conventions, as well as through resolutions and decisions of the Parties. Each of the Convention Secretariats has an executive head. The role of UNEP or its Executive Director in connection with the provision of the Convention Secretariats is also set out in the text of the conventions, resolutions and/or decisions by the Parties and related decisions of the governing body of UNEP.<sup>3</sup> The roles and functions of the Convention Secretariats vary quite considerably, but common to all of them is assisting their Parties in achieving the objectives and commitments contained in the respective agreements. Generally speaking, the work of the Convention Secretariats is to provide convening authority and other kinds of support (technical, policy, etc.) to Parties to achieve their commitments, although some of the Convention Secretariats have an active role in monitoring and assisting compliance, reviewing implementation, drawing matters to the attention of the Parties, and commenting on draft amendments, resolutions and decisions. While specific activities may change, generally speaking the overarching programmatic goals remain aimed towards the same end over a long period of time, although the role of some secretariats has evolved considerably over time.

UNEP and many other UN as well as other entities partner with the Convention Secretariats and offer support to countries in the implementation of obligations enshrined in MEAs. These partners may be environment-related bodies, but they are also often partners with very different types of mandates and expertise, dealing with development, natural resources, or trade. UNEP serves as one of the executing agencies of the GEF and also as one of the implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. In that role, UNEP assists Parties to MEAs in implementing their treaty obligations, where they fall under the GEF or the Multilateral Fund. By contrast, the Convention Secretariats are not generally tasked to assist UNEP in implementing its programme of work. In addition, the Convention Secretariats may have goals and interests which are shared with UNEP and have thereby assisted UNEP in achieving its mandate through actions within the area of their specialized expertise.

One of the most important actions to improve programmatic cooperation would be for UNEP to incorporate the priorities of the conventions into its own programme, insofar as they relate to the mandate of UNEP. A process for determining these priorities, and for facilitating UNEP's consideration of these priorities, in order to build them into its programme of work, would enable better alignment between convergent priorities. UNEP and the Convention Secretariats should each bring to this discussion what they see as relevant priorities and projects, through an open and transparent process that allows both sets of entities to build stronger and more aligned cooperation.

With respect to administrative arrangements, UNEP needs to consult on a regular basis with the Convention Secretariats. Written and agreed administrative arrangements with the relevant governing bodies, and delegations of authority between the Executive Director of UNEP and the executive heads of the Convention Secretariats, help to clarify the administrative relationship between them. However,

---

<sup>3</sup> As per UNGA Resolution 2997

more work to clearly outline the administrative relationship between UNEP, UNON, UNOG, UNOV and the Convention Secretariats should be undertaken, particularly in light of the changeover to Umoja.

While UNEP provides<sup>4</sup> the secretariats for these MEAs, the primary accountability of the Convention Secretariats is to the governing bodies of their respective MEAs. This fact needs to be taken into account. UNEP and each secretariat should work together to develop custom-fit arrangements for the delivery of needed administrative services in line with UN regulations, rules, and core values and UNEP's and MEAs' accountability requirements (noting that written agreements are in place between some conventions and UNEP). Such joint efforts should involve a review of the nature and sufficiency of existing service agreement frameworks which impact on the Convention Secretariats.

There remain areas of uncertainty in relation to the implementation of Umoja that affect UNEP and the Convention Secretariats. As more information and details become available regarding how Umoja will be changing the way business is done for the entire UN Secretariat, including UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, there need to be discussions and assistance provided in order to ensure the most effective and efficient delivery of services to the Convention Secretariats.

Overall, the Task Team recommends that, for its efforts to result in a change in organizational culture, there first needs to be a change in the business processes of UNEP and the Convention Secretariats in terms of how interaction between them occurs. Building on the significant progress that has already been made in recent years – and noting the current administrative service delays and transaction costs caused by the transition to Umoja, an iterative, consultative process should be established to ensure that areas and activities for more effective administrative arrangements and strengthened programmatic cooperation will be further discussed, developed and prioritized.

The Task Team recommends implementation of certain time-sensitive items amongst its recommendations as a matter of priority, and agrees that the areas that need urgent attention are:

Programme:

- a) developing the new UNEP Medium Term Strategy for 2018 – 2021 with inputs from UNEP and the Convention Secretariats on shared priorities; and
- b) providing inputs, including shared priorities, to UNEP's Programme of Work for 2018– 2019 and related projects with involvement of the Convention Secretariats where relevant.

Administration:

- a) assessing and addressing the implications of Umoja and ensuring the effective and efficient provision of custom-fit administrative services to the Convention Secretariats, including with the purpose of better informing the Parties to those multilateral environmental agreements for which UNEP provides the secretariat about any specific implications which Umoja will have for the operations and work of the Convention Secretariats. In that respect, the Task Team further

---

<sup>4</sup> See footnote 1 above.



recommends that delegations of authorities to managers that were temporarily amended for the purpose of the Umoja ramp-down and go-live be restored at the most opportune time.

The Task Team furthermore noted the importance of strengthening cooperation at the regional and sub-regional levels, particularly through UNEP regional MEA focal points.

Finally, highlighting the productive and consultative process leading to this Report and to ensure that its recommendations are utilized and acted upon, the Task Team recommends that UNEP maintain a mechanism for ongoing consultation between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, which would be long-term in nature. Such a consultative mechanism could, as a priority, monitor the implementation of the Task Team's recommendations, including through the continued examination of ways to improve the effectiveness of administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation.

## **2. Background**

In February 2014 the Executive Director of UNEP established a Task Team to carry out an internal review of the recommendations provided by past consultations between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, their follow-up, and the current state and level of effectiveness of the administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation in view of pertinent new UN system-wide and UN Secretariat-wide administrative requirements as well as the desire to continuously improve the results-based delivery of UNEP.

The Task Team comprised representatives of the Convention Secretariats and the relevant offices of the UNEP Secretariat. The Task Team was chaired by the Deputy Executive Director and the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Migratory Species served as Vice-Chair.

The first objective of the Task Team was to provide the Executive Director with recommendations for more cost-efficient, effective, and quality-driven administrative arrangements between UNEP, UNON, UNOG and the Convention Secretariats.

The second objective of the Task Team was to provide the Executive Director with recommendations for strengthened programmatic cooperation between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats.

The Task Team commenced its consultations on 3 February 2014 and met thereafter for six times. The second meeting took place on 24 July 2014, the third on 8 September 2014, the fourth on 26 February 2015, the fifth on 27 May 2015 and the sixth meeting took place on 10 June 2015.

At its first meeting the Task Team established two working groups – one on administrative arrangements and the other on programmatic cooperation. They were chaired by representatives of the secretariats of CITES and the CBD, respectively.

The Task Team, as well as its two working groups, considered a number of relevant processes and documents in their deliberations, such as:

- UNEP/EA.1/INF/8 “Report of the Executive Director on the Relationship between the United Nations Environment Programme and multilateral environmental agreements”<sup>5</sup>;
- UNEP/EA.1/2/Add.3 “Enhancing the coordinating role of the UNEP in the UN system on environmental matters: process to prepare a UN system-wide strategy on the environment”<sup>6</sup>;
- UNEA Resolution 1/12 “Relationship between the United Nations Environment and Programme and multilateral environmental agreements”<sup>7</sup>;
- UN Joint Inspection Unit “Post-Rio+20 Review of Environmental Governance within the United Nations System” (2014)<sup>8</sup>;
- UNEP options paper "Outcomes of the first multi-stakeholder expert meeting on elaboration of options for synergies among biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements";
- UNEP “Draft Sourcebook of Opportunities for Enhancing Cooperation among the Biodiversity-related Conventions”<sup>9</sup>;
- Various resources and guidance material on Umoja and IPSAS;
- Relevant decisions by Conferences of the Parties to MEAs.

In the course of the work of the Task Team a number of Conferences/Meetings of the Parties to MEAs took place at which updates on the work of the Task Team were provided in accordance with UNEA Resolution 1/12. Updates on the work of the Task Team were also provided to the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP.

#### **a) The Working Group on Administrative Arrangements**

The Working Group on Administrative Arrangements was chaired by a representative of the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), and it included members from UNEP, UNON and the secretariats of the following multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs): Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (BRS Conventions); Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Ozone Secretariat), together with the Multilateral Fund for implementation of the Montreal Protocol; Regional Seas Conventions; Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians (Carpathian Convention) and Framework Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Caspian Sea (Tehran Convention).

The Working Group on Administrative Arrangements was requested to consider the following aspects of the Task Team’s terms of reference:

---

<sup>5</sup> UNEA Information documents are available online at [http://www.unep.org/unea/information\\_documents.asp](http://www.unep.org/unea/information_documents.asp)

<sup>6</sup> UNEA Working documents are available online at: [http://www.unep.org/unea/working\\_documents.asp](http://www.unep.org/unea/working_documents.asp)

<sup>7</sup> UNEA Resolution 1/12, *op. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> Online at: [https://www.unjiu.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU\\_REP\\_2014\\_4\\_English.pdf](https://www.unjiu.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU_REP_2014_4_English.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> The sourcebook is part of UNEP project “Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among biodiversity-related conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies”. The final sourcebook is available on the project website: <https://nationalmeasynergies.wordpress.com/the-sourcebook>

1. Clarifying the administrative relationship between UNEP, UNON, UNOG and the Convention Secretariats;
2. Identifying the range of administrative services required by the Convention Secretariats and indicating whether they are all currently provided;
3. Identifying the respective service providers for specific services and the funding sources for procuring these services;
4. Reviewing the quality and cost-efficiency of administrative services currently provided by UNEP, UNON and UNOG to the Convention Secretariats;
5. Identifying the new UN system-wide administrative requirements (namely the adoption of the international public sector accounting standards (IPSAS)) and the new UN-Secretariat-wide enterprise resource-planning system (namely Umoja) and the options for, and implications of, implementing these requirements for the Convention Secretariats; and
6. Developing a draft framework for determining the roles and responsibilities of different service providers in providing effective and efficient administrative support through UNEP to the Convention Secretariats, including a) the roles and responsibilities of the Office for Operations and Corporate Services, b) the roles and responsibilities of UNEP's substantive divisions, and c) the roles and responsibilities of UN service providers (and in particular UNON, as well as UNOG).

The Working Group on Administrative Arrangements worked primarily through electronic means, complemented by several face-to-face meetings in Geneva between certain members. A variety of views were expressed in the Working Group in relation to past and current experience with administrative arrangements between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, and expectations related to IPSAS and Umoja. A draft report by the Working Group was prepared by the Chair of the Working Group and submitted to the Chair of the Task Team on 5 June 2015. To allow proper validation of the report by the members of the Working Group, the Task Team agreed at its meeting on 10 June 2015 that the Working Group be given additional time to finalize its report and recommendations. The Working Group completed its work with the submission of its final report to the Chair of the Task Team on 31 August 2015.

#### **b) The Working Group on Programmatic Cooperation**

The Working Group on Programmatic Cooperation was chaired by a representative of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and included members from UNEP and the secretariats of the following multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs): Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Ozone Secretariat); and the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal; Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade; and Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (BRS Conventions). Recommendations relevant to the Minamata Convention on Mercury (Minamata Convention) and Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (RSCAPs) were also included in some cases.

The Working Group on Programmatic Cooperation was requested to consider the following aspects of the Task Team's terms of reference:

1. Identification of priority areas for programmatic cooperation;

2. Directions from governing bodies, such as decisions of Conferences of the Parties (COP) and/or UNEP's governing body, including UNEP's and conventions' strategic and planning documents (COP resolutions or decisions, Medium Term Strategies, Programmes of Work, etc.);
3. Resolutions and recommendations with a global character, such as the outcomes of Rio+20 and reports from UN internal oversight bodies, such as the Joint Inspection Unit Reports on the Management Review of Environmental Governance within the United Nations System and relevant Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) audits; and
4. A framework for better programmatic cooperation between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, including the identification of thematic and functional areas for potentially greater synergies and programmatic cooperation in light of their respective general and specific mandates.

The Working Group on Programmatic Cooperation had several teleconferences, videoconferences, and email exchanges. In addition, members had an opportunity to informally exchange ideas on the margins of other meetings, such as a meeting of the UNEP project "Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among the biodiversity related Conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies" held in Interlaken, Switzerland from 26 to 28 August, 2014. As part of this consultative process, and taking into account directions from governing bodies, resolutions and recommendations as well as the work of previous task teams and working groups on this subject, the Working Group initially identified thematic and functional areas in which cooperation was either ongoing or for which additional potential synergies and programmatic cooperation could be achieved.

For these areas, members of the Working Group provided examples of programmatic cooperation between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats as well as ways in which such cooperation could be strengthened. The Working Group then identified the most urgent areas for improving programmatic cooperation, which are taken on board in the Task Team's recommendations. It completed its work and submitted its final report to the Chair of the Task Team on 24 February 2015.

### **3. Overarching recommendations by the Task Team**

Based on the reports by the two Working Groups of the Task Team and subsequent discussions and deliberations by the Task Team itself, as well as guidance provided to the Task Team through a consultative meeting between the Executive Director of UNEP and the executive heads of the Convention Secretariats on 19 June 2015 in Vienna, Austria, at which time a draft Task Team Report was considered, the following overarching recommendations are made by the Task Team to the Executive Director of UNEP in line with its mandate:

- **Recommendation 1: Changing the processes for consultation and interaction between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats**

Building on the significant progress and positive change that has been achieved in recent years – while noting the current administrative service delays and transactions costs caused by the transition to Umoja, a further change in the business processes of UNEP and the Convention Secretariats in terms of how interaction between them occurs is recommended to accelerate the move from an ad hoc model of

consultation to a more routine approach. Such a change would focus on enhancing the benefits of consultation by encouraging, enabling and further strengthening consultation as well as by moving towards satisfactory, timely, regular and two-way consultations on all relevant programmatic and administrative matters, noting that these issues are already specifically addressed in the MoUs between UNEP and some conventions.

This could be achieved by further reporting on actions taken to make administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation more effective, recognizing and disseminating success stories, and integrating consultation as a routine into planning and performance tools, with the ultimate goal of improving implementation, delivery and services to governments (as Parties to MEAs and UN Member States alike). The importance of consultation and adherence to agreed MoUs, as well as their benefits would need to be fully acknowledged and embraced by all staff levels in both UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, commencing with the policy and management level all the way to day-to-day administrative and programmatic activities.

Likewise, within the confines of their mandates, the Convention Secretariats could establish procedures to strengthen cooperation and partnerships with UNEP in areas of UNEP's substantive expertise.

- **Recommendation 2: A clear process to bring Conventions' priorities into the programmatic planning processes of UNEP**

A solid basis for strengthening programmatic cooperation between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats should include better reflection of the objectives, work, and priorities of the conventions in UNEP's programme at a political, policy and strategic level, and better cooperation with this focus at the programme and project level to ensure that shared priorities are targeted, synergies tapped and duplication avoided.

While recognizing that some UNEP-administered convention secretariats have very diverse partnerships and cooperation, including with development, enforcement, natural resources and trade entities, there are those UNEP-administered convention secretariats that desire to have a stronger process for integrating their work into UNEP's MTS and POW. Reflecting the conventions' priorities in this manner would be in line with UNEP's mandate and core objectives of playing a leadership role in environmental matters across the UN and promoting coherence and coordination, including among MEAs, while recognizing that some MEAs have deeper programmatic relationships with other programmes within and outside the UN, as well as their wider contribution towards each dimension of sustainable development. This will also allow an exchange among UNEP and the Convention Secretariats about mutually beneficial areas of cooperation.

At the programmatic and project level, efforts could be made to better plan and coordinate activities and projects between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats. This effort is already ongoing but is rather ad hoc, although it is addressed in some MoUs between UNEP and certain conventions. One example in this regard is the effort that has begun recently with respect to ozone-related projects. The Ozone Secretariat is now invited to review and provide inputs to projects that have relevance to ozone layer protection, atmospheric science, ozone depleting substances and their substitutes (some of which are very potent greenhouse gases). As such, the relevance of the ozone layer protection issue cuts across many sub-programme areas and topics such as climate change mitigation, sustainable production and

consumption, green economy as well as health and environment. Another example is the fact that the CITES Secretariat has been contracting UNEP-WCMC for many years to maintain the CITES trade database on its behalf, to perform trade monitoring work and to provide analytical products based on trade data. Another example is the MEA Information and Knowledge Management Initiative (MEA IKM). It brings together a large number of global and regional MEAs as well as UNEP and other convention-hosting entities like FAO, UNESCO and IUCN.

In addition, as the Convention Secretariats plan their own proposed work programmes for submission to their Parties, they should seek ways for UNEP to contribute to relevant activities, and vice-versa. Possible areas for such cooperation have already been identified in Tables 1 and 2.

• **Recommendation 3: Strengthening regional and sub-regional support for programmatic cooperation**

One of the priority areas for strengthening programmatic cooperation between UNEP and the Convention Secretariats is to enhance linkages between the Convention Secretariats and UNEP's regional and sub-regional offices, in order to facilitate improved implementation of MEAs at the national level as well as information/intelligence sharing and to support the interaction with regional bodies, where needed and relevant.

Such an effort is already ongoing for example in the case of the Montreal Protocol whereby UNEP's regional offices in coordination with the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) host staff who are responsible for supporting the implementation of the Protocol and for providing compliance assistance at the regional and national level.

Another example is the establishment of regional focal points, subject to availability of funds, who will assist MEAs and are linked to the relevant Division. These focal points for MEAs would have stable posts as well as full-time responsibilities dedicated to supporting the MEAs.

• **Recommendation 4: Assisting in the implementation of Umoja**

There remain areas of uncertainty in relation to the implementation of Umoja that affect UNEP and the Convention Secretariats. As more information and details become available regarding how Umoja will be changing the way business is done for the entire UN Secretariat, including UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, there need to be discussions and assistance provided in order to ensure the most effective and efficient delivery of services to the Convention Secretariats and to afford the Convention Secretariats as much autonomy as possible. In this connection, roles and responsibilities in the Delegations of Authority to executive heads of Convention Secretariats that were temporarily centralized for the purpose of the Umoja ramp-down and go-live (along with those of all UNEP Managers) should be restored at the most appropriate time, albeit reflecting the overall changes Umoja brought for the entire UN.

Following the deployment of Umoja, additional collaborative work between UNEP, UN service providers and the Convention Secretariats must be undertaken to clarify the administrative relationship between them and to analyze the service quality and cost-effectiveness. UNEP should thereafter agree with the

relevant Convention Secretariats if any changes are needed in those service agreements and, if so, how they should be implemented. As envisaged under certain existing administrative arrangements, UNEP should<sup>10</sup> consult with the Convention Secretariats, and in some cases governing bodies (through the Executive Director), in advance of negotiating any future service agreements with UNON, UNOG, UNOV or other service providers.

The framework on administrative service requirements<sup>11</sup> should be further revised in light of Umoja and could then be used for further analysis and clarification of the requirements for the Convention Secretariats, the service providers responsible for fulfilling those requirements, whether they are satisfactorily fulfilled and, if not, how service provision could be improved (e.g. by removing unnecessary administrative steps and/or by using service providers that are physically close to client conventions).

• **Recommendation 5: Continuation of a UNEP-MEA Consultative Mechanism**

One of the most important steps that UNEP and the Convention Secretariats should take is to ensure that a consultative mechanism is established and maintained, which would (beyond the current mandate and timelines of the Task Team) provide a platform for joint periodic planning, coordination, discussion and information-sharing on key crosscutting administrative and programmatic issues of common interest and for the identification of opportunities for mutual supportiveness.

Having a permanent consultative mechanism in place would ensure that the recommendations for programmatic cooperation included in Table 1 are reviewed, refined, prioritized and acted upon. It would also provide an opportunity to develop a more proactive, strategic, systematic and participatory approach towards cooperation. Note that Table 2, which is MEA-specific, would be more effectively addressed in bilateral discussions between UNEP and individual MEAs. Finally, a permanent consultative mechanism would provide a forum in which UNEP and the Convention Secretariats could develop, review and adjust, as needed, administrative arrangements which, *inter alia*, ensure that optimum benefits are obtained from Umoja.

The consultative mechanism could concern itself with the following issues in relation to achieving more effective administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation:

- Implementation of the recommendations of the Task Team;
- Planning of inputs to meetings of UNEP and MEA governing bodies;
- Upcoming events (such as regional ministerial consultations);
- Communication opportunities; and
- Identification of emerging issues.

One option for such a consultative mechanism might be to revitalize the MEA Management Team (MMT), and to create a working group under the MMT to continue the work of the Task Team on a routine basis.

---

<sup>10</sup> The written agreement between CITES and UNEP requires such consultation.

<sup>11</sup> See Annexes, Table 3.

#### **4. Issues identified by the Task Team as requiring action in the short term**

The following issues, or sets of issues, were identified by the Task Team as requiring follow-up action in the short term:

##### **Administration:**

1. Short-term implications of Umoja for the provision of administrative services to the Convention Secretariats;
2. Returning roles and responsibilities in the Delegations of Authority to the executive heads of Convention Secretariats (which were temporarily suspended for the purpose of the Umoja ramp-down and go-live, along with all other UNEP Managers) to the previous state and level of delegation, albeit reflecting the overall changes Umoja brought for the entire UN;
3. Reduction of the significant delays in recruitment of staff, including consultants;
4. Improved training opportunities for staff in the Convention Secretariats; and
5. The provision of information to Parties to multilateral environmental agreements about specific implications which Umoja will have for the operations and work of the Convention Secretariats.

##### **Programme:**

6. Inputs from UNEP and the Convention Secretariats, including shared priorities, in the development of UNEP's next Medium Term Strategy (MTS) and Programme of Work (PoW).