

# Options for Stakeholder Engagement in UNEP

UNEP, 23 October 2013

## Disclaimer

The views expressed in the report do not represent those of the United Nations Environment Programme, nor is it an endorsement by the United Nations Environment Programme.

The report presents a compilation of options to inform the discussions with the CPR.

The document has not been formally edited, and is **work-in-progress**. It will be updated as feedback is received from Member States and major groups and stakeholders.

## Options for Stakeholder Engagement in UNEP

### Working Draft – MGSB, 17 October 2013

The document is prepared at the request of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP (CPR,) to inform the discussions on stakeholder engagement in UNEP.

The table attached presents different options for stakeholder engagement in UNEP, the current practices in UNEP, a brief assessment of those practices, one to three options of proposed new modalities for engagement and mechanisms building on existing practices, and makes a reference to the organisations within the multilateral system that apply those modalities or mechanisms, as appropriate or if they exist. The table is structured along two levels of engagement:

1. Agenda Setting
2. Decision Making

The third dimension of engagement – *Implementation*, is not addressed since the participation of Major Groups and Stakeholder in implementation is governed by UNEP's Partnership Policy and other related policies (e.g. the Indigenous Peoples Policy Guidance).<sup>1</sup> Instead, the table features an additional section on *Mechanisms for expert input and advice*. These need to be clearly distinguished from the scientific input which is provided through processes such as the foresight process, GEO, IPCC, etc.

The document also tries as much as possible to make a brief cost analysis. These costs are indicative and do not include staff costs.

The options have been drawn from the outcomes of consultations with stakeholders, member states and other UN sister organisations. They are not exhaustive. In some instances, they can be mutually supportive.

This working document has not undergone a legal review.

A timeline for the way forward is also presented:

#### Timeline for the next steps

| Description   | Document submission deadline |
|---|------------------------------|
| Options table   | 20 October                   |
| Informal brief to the CPR on the outcomes of the Expert Group Meeting | 11 November                  |
| Consultation with the CPR   | 11 November                  |
| Consultations with stakeholders (with NGLS)                           | November                     |
| Revised options table   | 30 November                  |
| Options table and draft policy on Stakeholder engagement              | 16 December                  |

<sup>1</sup> UNEP's Indigenous Peoples Policy Guidance is available at: [http://www.unep.org/civil-society/Portals/24105/documents/Guidelines/UNEP\\_Indigenous\\_Peoples\\_Policy\\_Guidance\\_endorsed\\_by\\_SMT\\_26\\_11\\_12.pdf](http://www.unep.org/civil-society/Portals/24105/documents/Guidelines/UNEP_Indigenous_Peoples_Policy_Guidance_endorsed_by_SMT_26_11_12.pdf)

## Content

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Part 1. Accreditation .....                            | 4  |
| Part 2. Participation Mechanisms at Global Level ..... | 9  |
| 3.1. Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting.....       | 9  |
| 3.2. Role of Stakeholders in Decision making.....      | 14 |
| 3.3. Mechanisms for Expert Input and Advice.....       | 21 |
| Part 3. Engagement Approach .....                      | 23 |
| Part 4. Representative Body .....                      | 26 |
| Part 5. Funding Mechanisms.....                        | 29 |

## Part 1. Accreditation

These options are based on the assumption that UNEP will continue to grant accreditation to non-governmental stakeholders:

- On a permanent basis; or
- For participation in meetings only (e.g. one time accreditation for all organisations wishing to participate in the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies meetings).

| Table 1 – Accreditation Criteria              |   |                 |
|---|---|-----------------|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b> | <p>Accreditation is granted to organisations which satisfy the below criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be an international NGO having an interest in the field of the environment;</li> <li>2. Be legally constituted and registered in a country;</li> <li>3. Have a proven non-profit-making status;</li> <li>4. Have an international scope of work (e.g. headquarters and regional offices in different countries; projects or programmes that are taking place in several countries; activities that have international implication); and</li> <li>5. Proof of a minimum of two years of activity.</li> </ol> <p>Additional useful information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership in an international network; and</li> <li>• Accreditation to other United Nations (UN) bodies and agencies, including the ECOSOC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assessment:</b><br/>There are only around 281 organizations accredited with UNEP, which is a very small number of organisations.</p> <p>The international scope of work provides a limitation to a number of national and regional level organisations working in the field of environment. Besides, the focus on environment also limits the spectrum of organisations that are accredited to the UNEP, as it excludes organisations that work on broader cross-cutting development issues. The lack of clarity in the privileges and obligations of accredited organizations has often been raised. The ECOSOC accreditation is not given strong weight in the UNEP procedures. ECOSOC grants accreditation to both national and international scope organisations, while UNEP focuses more on international scope but encourages regional and national organisations to become members of international networks.</p> <p>To facilitate participation of MGS to the GC, UNEP has granted one-time accreditation to organisations, which fully comply with the accreditation rules but have not applied for a full accreditation yet and have shown interest to participate in a specific session of the GMGSF and the GC. Over the years this has allowed more participation from observers who have brought additional expertise to specific sessions.</p> |                 |
| <b>Option 1</b>                               | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b> |

**Table 1 – Accreditation Criteria**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Proposed new criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any legally registered organisation with International <i>OR</i> national scope of work;</li> <li>Not-for-profit status;</li> <li>Work mainly but not exclusively in the environmental field;</li> </ul> <p>Organisations having accreditation with ECOSOC and/or MEAs will be automatically granted UNEP accreditation.</p>  | <p>Proposed new criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any organisation with International <i>OR</i> national scope of work;</li> <li>Not-for-profit status;</li> <li>Work mainly in the area of sustainable development;</li> </ul> <p>Organisations having accreditation with ECOSOC and/or MEAs will be automatically granted UNEP accreditation.</p>  | <p>Proposed new criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any organisation;</li> <li>Not-for-profit status;</li> <li>No specific requirement of area of work;</li> </ul> <p>Organisations having accreditation with ECOSOC and/or MEAs will be automatically granted UNEP accreditation.</p> |
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More inclusive as it would allow accreditation from national and local level organisations.</li> <li>An increase of accredited organisations working with UNEP.</li> <li>Could be applied only for meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies.</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More inclusive as it would allow accreditation from national and local level organisations, as well as informal and formal networks and umbrella organisations, e.g. Peoples movements, social movements, community-based organizations, registered associations, indigenous and local communities, etc.</li> <li>Could be applied only for meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very open approach and any organisation could be accredited.</li> </ol>  |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal registration is seen by some of the Indigenous Peoples as an imposed requirement of a legal recognition of the country they are based in. Other MEAs do not require the legal recognition in order to accept an indigenous group as observer to the COP. IPs would like to be considered as nations and therefore consider the current requirements as obstacle to their participation..</li> <li>In case of many new accreditation processes, there will be additional human resources needed to manage them.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional administrative burden on the Secretariat to review the accreditation requests.</li> <li>Less stringent due diligence could raise security concerns.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional administrative burden on the Secretariat to review the accreditation requests.</li> <li>Less stringent due diligence could raise security concerns.</li> </ol>  |
| <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>This would require additional resources to support an increase in the number of accreditation requests.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>This would require additional resources to support an increase in the number of accreditation requests.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>This would require additional resources to support an increase in the number of accreditation requests.</p>   |

**Table 1 – Accreditation Criteria**

**Similar practices in other organizations:**

In accordance with Article 22, paragraph 7 of the UNCCD and Rule 7 of the rules of procedure of the COP, representatives from anybody or agency, whether national or international, governmental or nongovernmental, may be admitted to participate, without the right to vote, in the proceedings of the Convention's bodies under the conditions that the organisation: (i) Is qualified in matters covered by the Convention; and (ii) Has informed the UNCCD secretariat in writing of its wish to participate. Specifically speaking about intergovernmental organisations and in conformity with Rule 6, paragraph 1 of the above-mentioned rules of procedure, also the United Nations and its specialized agencies may be represented at sessions of the Conference of the Parties as observers. Organisations complying with the above-mentioned requirements may be admitted to participate in the sessions of the COP and its Subsidiary bodies as observers, unless at least one third of the Parties present at the session object. Only accredited organisations may designate representatives to attend sessions of the Convention bodies, or may apply to hold a side event and/or an exhibit at these sessions. By its decision 5/COP.10, the COP decided to grant observer status and participation in official meetings of the governing bodies of the UNCCD to the private sector (business and industry entities) that:

- Have expressed interest in participating in meetings of the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies;
- Have specific expertise in matters relating to the Convention; and
- Participate in the United Nations Global Compact. In the case where an organization does not participate in the United Nations Global Compact, clearance prior to its accreditation shall be requested from the United Nations Procurement Division and the United Nations Ethics Office.

**Table 2 – Accreditation:  
Types of consultative status for observers**

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b></p>  | <p>Currently UNEP has only one type of consultative status, which is equivalent to the ECOSOC general status. During sessions of the GC/GMEF, organisations with observer status have the opportunity to attend the Plenary, the Committee of the Whole and the Ministerial Consultations as observers. Observing means that accredited MGS can circulate written statements to Governments through the UNEP Secretariat and make oral statements during the discussions of the GC/GMEF upon invitation by the Chairperson. In the Run-up to/aftermath of Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accredited major groups and stakeholders receive unedited working documents of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at the same time as the Committee of the Permanent Representatives.</li> <li>• Accredited major groups and stakeholders have the right to submit to the UNEP Secretariat written contributions to these unedited working documents of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, for distribution to the Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>Assessment:</b><br/>Non-governmental observers are not directly involved in the drafting of GC decisions/documents. They can submit contributions, but do not have any means of making sure these contributions are considered or integrated into the documents of the GC/GMEF. Besides, UNEP does not report back on how MGS inputs have been utilized.</p> |   |  |
| <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b>   |  |
| <p>Preserve the status quo.</p> <p>All accredited organisations have the same privileges and obligations, namely, the same access to meetings as observers, speaking rights, the same opportunities to submit written contributions, and to make oral statements at the meetings.</p> | <p>Two different accreditation statuses may be put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>General status</i>. This will be the primary status granted to civil society organisations. With this status they can attend all meetings (formal/informal) throughout the year and can circulate written statements through the UNEP Secretariat. Furthermore, they can receive and comment on unedited working documents. Finally, they can participate in the GMGSF or similar meetings of other UNEP organs and be selected as regional representatives. Any organisation interested in the work of UNEP can apply for this status.</li> <li>• <i>Roster status</i>. This will be the status of organisations with a narrow and/or technical focus. They may make occasional and useful contributions to the work of UNEA, and can attend all meetings (formal/informal) throughout the year and can circulate written statements through the UNEP Secretariat.</li> </ul>   | <p>No accreditation status, only a pre-registration and/or accreditation to meetings would be required.</p> |  |

**Table 2 – Accreditation:  
Types of consultative status for observers**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Steady increase in the number of accreditations.</li> <li>2. Proper due diligence is conducted.</li> <li>3. Overview of the distribution by MGS, regions and themes.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A differentiated treatment may help attract more environmental NGOs, working on environmental issues.</li> <li>2. Better overview of the different types of thematic and expert input that they can provide.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will attract more stakeholders.</li> </ol>   |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Still relatively low number of organisations accredited.</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This might result in an additional administrative burden for the Secretariat.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This would mean that there is no due diligence at all, and may raise security concerns.</li> <li>2. Difficult to keep track of which organisations participate.</li> <li>3. Come at the expense of quality expert input and advice from stakeholders.</li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>No additional costs applicable.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>This would require additional resources to support an increase in the number of accreditation requests.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>No additional costs applicable.</p>   |

**Similar practices in other organizations:**

There are three types of consultative status with ECOSOC, based on the type of organization: (i) General status: NGOs that represent large segments of societies in several countries and their area of work cover most of the issues on the agenda of ECOSOC and its subsidiary bodies. These tend to be fairly large, well established international NGOs with a broad geographical reach. (ii) Special status: NGOs that have a special competence in, and are concerned specifically with, only a few of the fields of activity covered by ECOSOC. These NGO tend to be smaller and more recently established. (iii) Roster status: NGOs that have a more narrow and/or technical focus and make occasional and useful contributions to the work of ECOSOC or its subsidiary bodies. Each NGO in consultative status with ECOSOC can designate representatives to obtain annual passes granting them access to UN premises. NGOs that are accredited with ECOSOC can participate in a number of events, including, but not limited to, the regular sessions of ECOSOC, its functional commissions and its other subsidiary bodies. Pre-registration is required and done by the online web-based system (CSONet event registration system). In the current setting, the review process takes 1 to 2 years as all applications have to be reviewed by a special committee composed by Member States.



## Part 2. Participation Mechanisms at Global Level

### 3.1. Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting

| Table 3 – Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting:<br>Political Forum on the Global Environmental Agenda  |   |          |
|--|---|----------|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b>  | The practice of a Political Forum on the Global Environmental Agenda does not exist in UNEP. A similar practice may be the convening of the meeting on the adoption of the summary for decision-makers of the Global Environment Outlook. This process provides significant opportunities for stakeholders input, especially from the scientific and technological community, research institutions and academia. |          |
| Option 1   | Option 2  | Option 3 |
| <p>Setting the political agenda through a Conference on the Global Environment to be held every four to five years to outline environmental trends; identify emerging issues and major environmental challenges. Such a conference will bring together political leaders, member states and non-governmental stakeholders such as the scientific community, academic researchers and institutions, political leaders and prominent figures, decision-makers, etc.</p> <p>This conference would not have a decision-making power but would support the strengthening of the science-policy interface by making proposals on priorities; and broaden the dialogue to all stakeholders, who would be in a position to influence the global environmental agenda setting. This platform would allow several interests from various groups to be expressed and be captured on the on-set into the agenda setting.</p> |   |          |

**Table 3 – Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting:  
Political Forum on the Global Environmental Agenda**

|  |                      |                      |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such a conference would allow governmental and non-governmental stakeholders to cooperate in a setting that is more open for innovative ideas and open discussions.</li> <li>Influence the global environmental agenda.</li> <li>Very inclusive: allow participation from all stakeholders, including those not captured by the nine major groups concepts, and would significantly open-up UNEP's stakeholder "constituency".</li> <li>Build on existing work of UNEP such as the GEO and foresight processes, as well as other UNEP lead processes such as the IPCC, IPBES, etc.</li> <li>Increase the legitimacy and ownership of the results of UNEP's work.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p>  | <p><b>Pros:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be considered as duplication of the UNEA or Rio+20 and very costly.</li> <li>No authority and decision-making power, and no formal linkages to other UN institutions and organs such as ECOSOC, UNEA.</li> <li>The GC in February 2013 was not interested in institutionalising such a meeting.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>Approximately USD 750,000.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> |
| <p><b>Similar practices in other organizations:</b><br/>N/A</p>  |                      |                      |

**Table 4 – Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting:  
Setting the agenda of the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies**

|   |   |                 |  |
|---|---|-----------------|--|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b>   | Such practice does not exist in UNEP. Stakeholders do not participate in the setting of the agenda of the meetings of the GC and its subsidiary bodies.   |                 |  |
| <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b> |  |
| <p><u>Contribute to agenda of the meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary organs through the Secretariat</u></p> <p>Accredited non-governmental stakeholders can submit agenda items for consideration by the bureaus of the UNEA and its subsidiary organs. This would also include the possibility to submit draft decisions for consideration by the UNEA and its subsidiary organs.</p> <p>This allows major groups and stakeholders to be directly involved in the agenda-setting process of the UNEA; and will be associated with the opportunity to make written comments to UNEA draft decisions and documents and make oral statements at meetings.</p> <p>Inputs and contributions from accredited non-governmental stakeholders can be collected and channelled through the Secretariat, thus allowing to track progress on the uptake of inputs from stakeholders.</p> <p>Seats would be allocated to the representatives, whose selection criteria and process will be left to stakeholders themselves. They will be invited by the Chair, as needed and on specific occasions to participate in meetings of bureaus and committees; and provide substantive input in developing the agenda of the UNEA and the different meetings of its subsidiary organs (e.g. SAICM/ICCM, Global fund). This would be a tripartite dialogue between Member States through the bureau members, stakeholders, and the Secretariat.</p> | <p><u>Participation in Bureau meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary organs</u></p> <p>Accredited non-governmental stakeholders are invited to participate in meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies (CPR bureau). They will provide inputs for the development of agendas, and request the inclusion of specific items in the agenda of the meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary organs. Inputs from accredited stakeholders can be collected and compiled and channelled by a <i>permanent representative civil society body</i>. During meetings, representatives of major groups and stakeholders can make written and oral interventions.</p> <p>Seats would be allocated to the representatives, whose selection criteria and process will be left to stakeholders themselves. They will be invited by the Chair, as needed and on specific occasions to participate in meetings of bureaus and committees; and provide substantive input in developing the agenda of the UNEA and the different meetings of its subsidiary organs (e.g. SAICM/ICCM, Global fund). This would be a tripartite dialogue between Member States through the bureau members, stakeholders, and the Secretariat.</p> |                 |  |

**Table 4 – Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting:  
Setting the agenda of the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies**

|  |   |                      |
|--|---|----------------------|
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More transparency of the process.</li> <li>2. Opportunity to provide substantive input and propose agenda items and decisions through the bureaus.</li> <li>3. Views of MGS, including those affected by decision can be taken into consideration.</li> <li>4. Major groups and stakeholder will be better involved in the process leading to UNEA.</li> <li>5. More ownership of the agenda from stakeholders.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MGS and Stakeholders will have the opportunity to contribute to early stages of decision making.</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires MGS physical presence in Nairobi or participation through IT and webcast options.</li> <li>2. MGS expect the opportunity to participate in all Bureau meetings.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires MGS physical presence or participation through IT and the support of the Secretariat towards the set-up of a permanent representative civil society body</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>This would require additional resources to support the participation of stakeholders in such meetings. It would depend on the number of meetings per year and the number of seats allocated to stakeholders in the Bureau. Approximately USD 30,000 per meeting.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>This would require additional resources to support the participation of stakeholders in such meetings. It would depend on the number of meetings per year and the number of seats allocated to stakeholders in the Bureau and the number of stakeholders to be sponsored to attend the meetings. Approximately USD 30,000 per per meeting.</p> | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> |

**Table 4 – Role of Stakeholders in Agenda Setting:  
Setting the agenda of the UNEA and its subsidiary bodies**

**Similar practices in other organizations:**

Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) of the Committee of World Food Security. The CFS has established an Advisory Group to share with the Bureau the expertise and knowledge of the broad range of stakeholders, contributing substantive work and advice. In particular, it assists the CFS and its Bureau to nurture and maintain linkages with different actors at regional, sub regional and local levels to enable an on-going, two-way exchange of information among these stakeholders during inter-sessional periods. In order to fulfil its roles, the members of the AG participate in joint meetings with the Bureau as invited by the CFS Chair. Members of the AG are expected to contribute to the substantive work of the CFS. They may suggest or respond to specific agenda items of joint AG-Bureau meetings and participate in ad hoc working groups formed during those meetings to progress specific issues. Decision-making, however, ultimately pertains to member States. The civil society participation in the CFS is facilitated by a self-managed Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). The CSM reaches out to hundreds of CSOs in all continents, sharing information with them on global policy debates and processes, promoting civil society consultations and dialogue, supporting national and regional advocacy and facilitating the participation of a diverse range of CSOs at the global level, in the context of the CFS.

UNEP also have similar mechanisms under SAICM/ICCM. Non-governmental participants can request the SAICM secretariat to include specific items in the provisional agenda. At the beginning of each session, the governmental participants shall, after consulting the intergovernmental participants and non-governmental participants, adopt the agenda for the session on the basis of the provisional agenda and any supplementary items proposed in accordance with rule 6 of the ICCM Rules of Procedure. The participants shall make every effort to reach agreement on all matters of substance and procedure by consensus. If a consensus is not achieved, the decision shall be taken by a two-thirds majority vote of the governmental participants or by a majority vote of the governmental participants. De facto, decisions are almost always taken by consensus and it is very unlikely that Major Groups representatives are asked to leave the room.

### 3.2. Role of Stakeholders in Decision making

| Table 5 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision making:<br>Modalities for participation in meetings of the UNEA and subsidiary bodies  |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b>   | <p>During the sessions of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF) observers have the opportunity to attend the Plenary, the Committee of the Whole and the Ministerial Consultations as observers, including the Ministerial Roundtables as full participants. major groups and stakeholders can circulate written statements to Governments through the UNEP secretariat and make oral statements during the discussions of the UNEP GC/GMEF on the invitation of the chairperson; the <i>Global Major Group and Stakeholders Forum</i> that is associated to the GC/GMEF and its preparatory <i>Regional Major Groups and Stakeholders Consultation Meetings</i> (RCM) in the regions; the Ministerial Roundtables of the GMEF, to which selected representatives of major groups and stakeholders can participate; all UNEP meetings and conferences both at global, regional and national levels.</p> <p>During the development of policy documents to be adopted at the GC/GMEF, accredited organizations have the possibility to receive unedited working documents of the GC/GMEF and submit to the UNEP Secretariat written contributions to these unedited working documents, for onward transmission to the CPR.</p> <p><b>Assessment:</b><br/>Currently, stakeholders do not participate in the CPR meetings. They are therefore not able to be part of the deliberations and in the early stages of preparations of the GC.</p> |  |
| Option 1  | Option 2  | Option 3   |
| <p><u>Participation in all meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary organs</u></p> <p>Representatives of stakeholders will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attend all official meetings of the UNEA and its subsidiary organs;</li> <li>• have access to all official information and documents;</li> <li>• intervene in official meetings upon invitation;</li> <li>• submit documents and present written and oral contributions;</li> <li>• make recommendations; and</li> <li>• organize side events and round tables, in cooperation with Member States and the Secretariat.</li> </ul> | <p><u>Joint daily hearings between Member States and stakeholders on selected issues during the UNEA</u></p> <p>One hour meetings to be held daily during the UNEA session on selected emerging environmental issues, open to both Member States and Stakeholders.</p> <p>These hearings may deal with process and substance depending on an agreed agenda between the Bureau of the UNEA, the Secretariat and the stakeholders.</p> <p>They will inform the substantive discussions to be held at the UNEA.</p>  | <p><u>Participation in the meetings of the CPR</u></p> <p>Participation of stakeholders in all the CPR public meetings will be systematic. They will participate in the thematic debates, the regular CPR meetings, the subcommittee meetings, and the Open-ended CPR to be held every two years.</p> <p>Stakeholders will pre-register for these meetings and selected hubs will be connected via ICT.</p> <p>The CPR will announce its public meetings as a part of the yearly workplan of the CPR early enough to facilitate stakeholder preparation.</p> |

**Table 5 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision making:  
Modalities for participation in meetings of the UNEA and subsidiary bodies**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follows the HLPF format.</li> <li>Open door approach that can further facilitate dialogue.</li> <li>Potential to attract influential stakeholder organisations working on the environment and sustainable development</li> <li>MGS input on specific themes enrich the discussion and provide new views, including from groups affected by a decision.</li> <li>A full implementation of GC 27/2, which calls for MGS participation in the UNEA and its subsidiary organs.</li> <li>MGS will not participate in all meetings, but only in those which are relevant and where their input is needed.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MGS will not participate in all meetings, but only in those which are relevant and where their input is needed.</li> <li>Additional opportunity for exchanges of perspectives on thematic issues, and from regional and sectoral perspectives.</li> <li>This option could be combined with option 1.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open door approach that can further facilitate dialogue.</li> <li>MGS input on specific themes enrich the discussion and provide new views, including from groups affected by a decision.</li> <li>A full implementation of GC 27/2, which calls for MGS participation in the UNEA <b>and its subsidiary organs</b>.</li> <li>MGS will not participate in all meetings, but only in those which are relevant and where their input is needed.</li> <li>The CPR will have the flexibility to define public and non-public meetings.</li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modalities for identifying the best suitable organisations for the best meetings, etc. may be challenging.</li> <li>Requires MGS physical presence in Nairobi or participation through IT.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modalities for identifying the best suitable organisations for the best meetings, etc. may be challenging.</li> <li>Requires MGS physical presence in Nairobi or participation to IT.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires MGS physical presence in Nairobi or participation through IT.</li> <li>CPR meetings might get longer, because of MGS interventions.</li> <li>MGS expect the opportunity to participate in all CPR meetings.</li> </ol>   |
| <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>This would require additional resources to support the participation of stakeholders in the UNEA. Approximately USD 400,000. The current cost for stakeholder participation amounts to USD 250,000 which includes the GMGSF meeting costs and participation in GC, for about 30 participants. Additional funds are needed to bring more organisations from developing countries to the meetings.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>No supplementary costs to those proposed under the different options.</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>This would require additional resources to support the participation of stakeholders in the CPR meetings. It would depend on the number of meetings per year (average 15 per year). Approximately USD 500,000. This will cover both physical participation and costs for virtual participation, especially for participants from developing countries.</p>   |

**Table 5 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision making:  
Modalities for participation in meetings of the UNEA and subsidiary bodies**

**Similar practices in other organizations:**

The CSD used to have multi-stakeholders dialogues. Starting with the Earth Summit+5, CSD has convened different segments constructed around a multi-stakeholder dialogue concept. Different formulae have been experimented with since. In most recent time, the space for multi-stakeholder dialogue contracted considerably, and in the last CSD sessions only a few hours were designated for a thematic dialogue that included only Member States and major groups. In that format, representatives from major groups were invited to present short interventions, followed by an interactive discussion held in the plenary to exchange views on the positions presented. A similar segment was held during the high-level segment of CSD as well. Each major groups sector selects its own representatives to deliver the statements, which are developed according to various consultative processes determined by each sector. The Rio+20 preparatory processes invited all stakeholders in sustainable development to submit inputs directly to the Conference Secretariat on priorities for the Rio+20 outcome. All these submissions are online along those of Member States and UN system entities. These inputs were taken into account in developing the compilation document that informed the first draft of the outcome document. In addition, major groups and other stakeholders submitted paragraphs per paragraph changes to the negotiating text which was also made available online and to Member States.

The recently established High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF)<sup>2</sup> is a universal intergovernmental body whose mandate is to: “Provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development, follow up and review progress in the implementation of sustainable development commitments, enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in a holistic and cross-sectoral manner at all levels and have a focused, dynamic and action-oriented agenda, ensuring the appropriate consideration of new and emerging sustainable development challenges”. The Forum is convened, both, under the auspices of the General Assembly and of ECOSOC. The HLPF will “promote transparency and implementation by further enhancing the consultative role and participation of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders at the international level in order to make better use of their expertise, while retaining the intergovernmental nature of discussions, and in this regard decides that the forum will be open to the major groups, other relevant stakeholders and entities having received a standing invitation to participate as observers in the General Assembly, building on arrangements and practices observed by the Commission on Sustainable Development, including Economic and Social Council decision 1993/215 of 12 February 1993 and Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, which will be applicable to the forum. (...) decide in this regard, that, while retaining the intergovernmental character of the forum, the representatives of the major groups and other relevant stakeholders will be allowed:

- To attend all official meetings of the forum
- To have access to all official information and documents
- To intervene in official meetings
- To submit documents and present written and oral contributions
- To make recommendations
- To organize side events and round tables, in cooperation with Member States and the Secretariat of the United Nations”

The resolution calls for effective, broad and balanced participation by region and by type of organization, and for the expansion of the stakeholders from Major groups identified in Agenda 21 and other stakeholders, such as private philanthropic organizations, educational and academic entities, persons with disabilities, volunteer groups and other stakeholders active in areas related to sustainable development.

This section of the resolution refers to paras 43 and 52 of the Rio outcome document which lists a number of “other relevant stakeholders”.

<sup>2</sup> Resolution A/67/L.72 of the United Nations General Assembly adopted on 27 June 2013 on the *Format and organizational aspects of the high-level political forum on sustainable development*.



**Table 6 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision making:**  
**Half day multi-stakeholders dialogue during the high level segment of the UNEA**  
*(Options proposed in this table focus on the format of the multi-stakeholders dialogue)*

|   |   |  |                     |
|---|---|--|---------------------|
| <p><b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b></p>  | <p>The current practice at UNEP is to invite MGS to participate in the Ministerial roundtables, which are part of the GMEF, since they have been initiated in 2007. Four seats are regularly allocated to MGS who can participate in an interactive dialogue with Ministers on two themes. The summaries of the Ministerial Roundtables feed into the Summary of the President of the GC. In February 2013, the GMGSF featured one multistakeholder dialogue on stakeholder participation with a number of countries and stakeholders, for the first time.</p> <p><b>Assessment:</b><br/> This scheme has provided a meaningful opportunity for MGS to influence the policy debate at the highest level possible, although no decision is taken in these dialogues. Besides, the Chatham House rules do apply in these dialogues, and MGS have used this opportunity and privilege in a responsible and constructive manner so far.</p> |  |                     |
|   | <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b>  | <b>Option 3</b>     |
|   | <p>As per paragraph 5(e) of the GC Decision 27/2, UNEP will convene a half day multi-stakeholders dialogue (3 hours) during the high level segment of the UNEA.</p> <p>During the half day multi-stakeholder dialogue, non-governmental stakeholders will participate with full speaking rights and have the opportunity to provide written input in advance and prepare information papers.</p> <p>The format of the <b>current Ministerial Roundtables</b> could be continued, <b>with a topic set by the Secretariat in consultation with the UNEA Bureau.</b></p>   | <p>As per paragraph 5(e) of the GC Decision 27/2, UNEP will convene a half day multi-stakeholders dialogue (3 hours) during the high level segment of the UNEA.</p> <p>During the half day multi-stakeholder dialogue, non-governmental stakeholders will participate with full speaking rights and have the opportunity to provide written input in advance and prepare information papers.</p> <p>The multi-stakeholder dialogue <b>agenda/theme, will be determined by stakeholders and co-moderated by them and the President of the UNEA.</b></p> |                     |
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Direct exchange between high level representatives of member states and non-governmental stakeholders.</li> <li>2. Active and effective participation of non-governmental stakeholders in political agenda setting and direct influence in political process of decision making.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Direct exchange between high level representatives of member states and non-governmental stakeholders.</li> <li>2. Active and effective participation of non-governmental stakeholders in political agenda setting and direct influence in political process of decision making.</li> </ol>   |  | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p>   | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>   |  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> |

**Table 6 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision making:  
Half day multi-stakeholders dialogue during the high level segment of the UNEA**  
*(Options proposed in this table focus on the format of the multi-stakeholders dialogue)*

|  |  |                      |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>If UNEP continues the practice to support MGS participation in the Governing Body of UNEP, in including a Global Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum, no additional costs are anticipated. Additional costs might apply, if a special effort is done to bring organisations from developing countries, approximately USD 8,000 per organisation.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>If UNEP continues the practice to support MGS participation in the Governing Body of UNEP, in including a Global Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum, no additional costs are anticipated. Additional costs might apply, if a special effort is done to bring organisations from developing countries, approximately USD 8,000 per organisation.</p> | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> |
| <p><b>Similar practices in other organizations:</b><br/>As part of its stocktaking at “Earth Summit+5” in 1997, the United Nations General Assembly directed the CSD to strengthen its high-level policy debate through more extensive interaction with representatives of Major Groups. In response, the CSD integrated two-day multi-stakeholder dialogue segments into its annual sessions. The stated purpose of the multi-stakeholder dialogue was to inform the inter-governmental decision making process, through equal-level and direct exchanges of views and experiences between Major Groups and governments (...).Based on the practices of the Commission on Sustainable Development, a number of multi-stakeholder dialogue segments were organized as part of the preparatory committee meetings for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002. The outcome of the dialogues was a Chair’s summary, which was submitted to the preparatory committee and incorporated into its records. A half-day multi-stakeholder dialogue was also planned for the Summit itself. (...)These dialogues proved a successful format because of the way they were scheduled and organized. They enjoyed a great level of governmental attendance and participation because they were scheduled between the official start of CSD and the high level (ministerial) segment, rather than before the start of CSD or in conflict with other sessions. Their clear substantive focus on an economic sector (such as tourism, agriculture, or energy) linked with the agenda of the annual session of the Commission made them particularly relevant.<sup>3</sup></p> <p>Since the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002), CSD has convened different segments constructed around a multi-stakeholder dialogue concept. Over time, the space for multi-stakeholder dialogue contracted considerably, and in the most recent sessions of CSD only a few hours were designated for a thematic dialogue that included only Member States and major groups. In that format, representatives from major groups were invited to present short interventions, followed by an interactive discussion held in the plenary to exchange views on the positions presented. A similar segment was held during the high-level segment of CSD as well. Each major groups sector selects its own representatives to deliver the statements, which are developed according to various consultative processes determined by each sector.</p> <p>Rio+20 preparation brought another wave of opening with all citizens called upon to submit input to the Secretariat on what they wanted to see coming out of Rio+20. All these interventions are online along those of member states and agencies. These inputs were taken into account in developing the compilation document that informed the first draft of the outcome document. In addition, major groups and other stakeholders submitted para per para changes to the negotiating text which was also made available online and to member states.</p> |  |                      |

<sup>3</sup> Abstracts from UNDESA, Dialogue, Debate, Dissent, Deliberation: Strengthening Public Participation For Sustainable Development, by Barbara Adams and Lou Pingeot, June 2013

**Table 7 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision Making:  
Stakeholder Forum**

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b></p>   | <p>UNEP convenes a global Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum (GMGSF) prior to the GC. The GMGSF enables major groups and stakeholders to exchange with UNEP and one another and to prepare for the GC/GMEF. It is preceded by RCMs which also enable major groups and stakeholders to exchange with the UNEP Regional Offices and one another and to produce statements for the GC/GMEF.</p> <p><b>Assessment:</b><br/>The GMGSF is an event, not a process. The statements coming out of the meetings could be stronger. The GMGSF should be a continuous instead of a six-month process and it should be closely linked to the above mentioned permanent body. This could be achieved through the establishment of an (email) consultation process prior to the meetings to ensure a real outcome. An online consultation mechanism like the one used for Rio+20 should be set up to collect input from the regions.</p> |   |  |
| <p><b>Option 1</b></p>   | <p><b>Option 2</b></p>   | <p><b>Option 3</b></p>  |  |
| <p>Prior to every session of the UNEA <b>and</b> the open-ended CPR, UNEP will facilitate the organisation of a two days Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum that will provide an opportunity to major groups and stakeholders to meet, discuss and consolidate their views and prepare their inputs to the UNEA and the open-ended CPR.</p> <p>The meetings will be largely self-organised with UNEP providing logistical support.</p> | <p>Prior to every session of the UNEA, UNEP will facilitate the organisation of a two days Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum that will provide an opportunity to major groups and stakeholders to meet, discuss and consolidate their views and prepare their inputs to the UNEA.</p>   | <p>Prior to every session of open-ended CPR, UNEP will facilitate the organisation of a two days Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum that will provide an opportunity to major groups and stakeholders to meet, discuss and consolidate their views and prepare their inputs to the UNEA and the open-ended CPR.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major Groups and Stakeholder will have the opportunity to coordinate their positions and to prepare for their input into the UNEA</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major Groups and Stakeholder will have the opportunity to coordinate their positions and to prepare for their input into the UNEA</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major Groups and Stakeholder will have the opportunity to coordinate their positions and to prepare for their input into the CPR</li> </ol>   |  |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Costs</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major Groups and Stakeholder will not have the opportunity to contribute to the open ended CPR, where most decisions are shaped for final approval at the UNEA.</li> <li>2. Reduced opportunities for participation by MGS, no implementation of GC 27/2</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MGS will not have the opportunity to contribute to the UNEA, where decisions still might be changed/adjusted.</li> <li>2. Reduced opportunities for participation by MGS, no implementation of GC 27/2</li> </ol>                                     |  |

**Table 7 - Role of Stakeholders in Decision Making:  
Stakeholder Forum**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>This would mean hosting two meetings in the same year. However, this would be cost neutral because instead of hosting the forum every year, UNEP will be hosting it every two years. Approximately: USD 500,000. The amounts will increase in case there are more meetings of the UNEA and/or the Open-ended CPR.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>A cost saving, approximately: USD 250,000 every two years (currently 250,000 per year).</p> | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>Less cost than under the current system, where there was one meeting per year. Under this option, there will be only one meeting every two years. To facilitate the participation of stakeholders in the high level segment of the UNEA, funding would still be required. Approximately: USD 500,000.</p> |
| <p><b>Similar practices in other organizations:</b><br/>The <u>UNCCD</u> process ensures the full participation of the CSOs at its official meeting through two half-day Open Dialogue Sessions between the Parties and the representatives of the civil society organizations during the official sessions of the Conference of the Parties and one half-day Open Dialogue Session during the inter-sessional meetings of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention. The sessions are entirely organized by the CSO representatives, which decide the agenda and structure of the same. Outcomes of the sessions are included in the final report of the COP and CRIC.</p> |  |  |

### 3.3. Mechanisms for Expert Input and Advice

| <b>Table 8 - Expert Input and Advice:<br/>Thematic clusters for expert input and advice</b> |  |                 |  |
|---|--|-----------------|--|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b>   | <p>Currently, each Division of UNEP engages with stakeholders on the basis of partnerships, or for implementation of projects and programmes. MGS are either executing or implementing partners.</p>   |                 |  |
|   | <p>At the programmatic level, UNEP delivers its programme of work through projects and activities mainly implemented through partnerships with stakeholders – governmental and non-governmental, civil society and the private sector. Those partnerships include a number of well-known initiatives such as the Partnership on Labour and the Environment, the Green Economy Initiative, the Clean Fuel Partnership, the Finance Initiative, and Great Apes Survival Partnership to name but few. These partnerships are key in so far as they contribute to leverage more support and visibility for the UNEP.</p>   |                 |  |
|   | <p>UNEP has also adopted a number of policies, such as the Gender Policy, the Tunza Strategy, the Partnerships Policy and the Indigenous Peoples Policy Guidance. For example, the latter covers the programmatic and the policy level engagement of UNEP with one particular major group. The purpose of the Policy Guidance is to initiate and support a process to enhance practices in UNEP for engaging indigenous peoples as an important partner in environmental policy development and implementation on a continuous and organized basis. The Tunza Strategy facilitates youth engagement in stakeholder decision making processes through regular and systematic regional and global conferences, competitions, a youth magazine and website, social networking, and direct interaction with the Tunza Youth Advisory Council comprising youth representatives from all regions of the world. This involvement by young people ensures transparency, access to information and participation in the development of policy.</p>          |                 |  |
|   | <p>An additional way for MGS to engage with UNEP is through independently established National Committees. About 31 National Committees exist so far; although they are not very active since the end of 2010 when UNEP decided to revisit its policy and approach to working with National Committees. The Committees regroup a number of civil society organisations at the national level, active in the field of environment, but that do not necessarily have accreditation with UNEP. These Committees have provided support to UNEP in terms of outreach and public information at the national level.</p>  |                 |  |
|   | <p>UNEP also has a key role to play in promoting transparency and effective engagement of civil society outside its own structures, as evidenced by the “Guidelines for the Development of National Legislation on Access to Information, Public Participation and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters”. UNEP has been engaged in related activities, in particular through the non-binding “Guidelines for the Development of National Legislation on Access to Information, Public Participation and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters”, which were adopted by UNEP’s GC in Bali in 2010. The application of the Guidelines is seen as an important pre-condition to allow citizens and civil society to participate in a regulated fashion in decision making processes at the national level, and has been further reiterated in Paragraph 99 of the Rio+20 Outcome Document, which directly refers to strengthening the application of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration at regional, national and sub-regional levels.</p> |                 |  |
| <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b>  | <b>Option 3</b> |  |

**Table 8 - Expert Input and Advice:  
Thematic clusters for expert input and advice**

|   |  |                      |
|---|--|----------------------|
| <p>Thematic clusters and/or expert consultations with member states and stakeholders would provide further opportunities to address key sustainability challenges. They would provide a systematic entry point for expert input and advice to the UNEA, the CPR and other subsidiary organs of the UNEA. They would allow selected groups and interests to be raised per thematic cluster, e.g. SCP, IPBES, GEO, UNEP FI, the International Resource Panel.</p>   | <p>Partnerships with major groups and stakeholders to support specific topics.</p>   |                      |
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Participation rights would be enforced in all parts of UNEP</li> <li>2. Also provide support to agenda setting as well as science-policy interface.</li> <li>3. Can be applied both at regional and global levels, and allows cross fertilisation with other MGS and regions. Solely based on expertise.</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Targeted input to specific themes will be made possible</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p>   | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>N/A</p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>N/A</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> |
| <p><b>Similar practices in other organizations:</b></p> <p>The <a href="#">International Resource Panel</a> was established in 2007 to provide independent, coherent and authoritative scientific assessment on the sustainable use of natural resources and the environmental impacts of resource use over the full life cycle. By providing up-to-date information and best science available, the International Resource Panel contributes to a better understanding of how to decouple human development and economic growth from environmental degradation. The information contained in the International Resource Panel’s reports is intended to be policy relevant and support policy framing, policy and programme planning, and enable evaluation and monitoring of policy effectiveness.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Green Economy Coalition</a> is an example of such partnerships to support one or several areas of work of the organization. While they remain independent, they will provide a good entry point for stakeholder participation, as well as expert input and advice.</p> |  |                      |

### Part 3. Engagement Approach

| Table 9 - The Engagement Approach             |  |                 |
|---|--|-----------------|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b> | <p>UNEP uses the Major Group approach, as <i>noted</i> in decision SSII.5 of 15 February 2002, which states that “civil society encompasses major groups, that is farmers, women, scientific and technological community, children and youth, indigenous peoples and their communities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, non-governmental organisations.” As UNEP started applying it, the concept was often criticized for leaving out groups of civil society such as the education community, faith-based groups, the elderly, disabled people, etc. Therefore, since 2004, UNEP uses the terminology major groups and stakeholders to be more inclusive.</p> <p><u>Assessment:</u><br/>To date, the approach has led to a degree of rigidity and gate keeping, defeating the purpose for which it was created. It can be argued that the list of Major Groups should be modified and possibly expanded as they do not entirely represent civil society. For example, representatives of the education community, religious community, parliamentarians, and elderly could be added to the list.<sup>4</sup> Finally, some of the groups included feel that they belong elsewhere, such as the local authorities. Three of the nine Major Groups are particularly challenging:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NGO Major Group is an entity with no real identity,<sup>5</sup> a misleading category that is often seen as a group that absorbs all those who do not fit into the other categories.</li> <li>• The Business and Industry Major Groups differs very strongly from the other Major Groups in so far that it is organized in corporations, rather than individuals. Additionally, most other Major groups feel that business and industry already have a significant impact on global decision-making processes and therefore do not need to be further strengthened. It is also often criticised that this Major Groups rather presents for-profit interests and not environmental interests.</li> <li>• Finally, local authorities have few in common with the rest, because of their partly governmental nature. They can make a relevant impact on global environmental matters. Given the line of governmental implementation from the national, subnational to the local levels, the role of local authorities is of a different nature than that of business or civil society, and consequently should be considered as such.<sup>6</sup></li> </ul> |                 |
| <b>Option 1</b>                               | <b>Option 2</b>  | <b>Option 3</b> |

<sup>4</sup> CIVICUS/UN-NGLS: [http://www.un-nxls.org/spip.php?page=arioplus20&id\\_article=3781](http://www.un-nxls.org/spip.php?page=arioplus20&id_article=3781).

<sup>5</sup> Jeffrey Barber, Integrative Strategies Forum: [http://www.unep.org/civil-society/Portals/59/Documents/Guidelines\\_Revision\\_2011/Comments%20from%20Jeffrey%20Barber.pdf](http://www.unep.org/civil-society/Portals/59/Documents/Guidelines_Revision_2011/Comments%20from%20Jeffrey%20Barber.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> ICLEI: [http://www.unep.org/civil-society/Portals/59/Documents/perspectives/ENVIRONMENT\\_PAPERS\\_DISCUSSION\\_2.pdf](http://www.unep.org/civil-society/Portals/59/Documents/perspectives/ENVIRONMENT_PAPERS_DISCUSSION_2.pdf).

**Table 9 - The Engagement Approach**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Building on the nine major groups approach, UNEP includes other relevant Stakeholders such as the education community, religious groups, the Elderly, disabled people, consumers, etc., determining in close consultation with civil society its own set of relevant Major Groups.</p>  | <p>UNEP will stick to the Major Groups approach but incorporates legitimate improvements. UNEP will introduce six regional Civil Society Advisory Committees. The number of seats in each committee varies and is proportional to the population in the respective region. However, the smallest committee has nine seats. There will be core and additional Major Groups. Core major groups are key constituencies and stakeholders in UNEP’s agenda and will be automatically present in every regional committee. They take 5 seats in the smallest committee or 60 % in every other. The composition of the additional major groups will differ from region to region, reflecting relevant major groups in the respective region. They will take 4 seats in the smallest committee or 40 % in every other. There are no differences in responsibilities or rights what so ever between core and additional major groups. The seats in each committee will be equally allocated among the nine major groups. Where this is not possible, additional seats will be added to the committee. Both core and additional major groups will be determined by civil society itself during a dialogue process facilitated by regional divisions of UNEP. In this process, UNEP does not have any decision making powers. The composition of core and additional major groups will be reviewed by civil society on a regular but delayed basis. The major group representatives of all six regions form a new permanent advisory civil society body consisting of 54 representatives in total, with a secretariat, representing the body towards UNEP.</p> | <p>UNEP will shift away from the major groups and stakeholders approach and instead encourage a self-managed Civil Society Assembly. The assembly will be open to any interested not-for-profit actor interested in working with UNEP and living its principles and values, regardless scope of work or legal recognition. The assembly will facilitate the development of common positions where possible but equally communicate diversity in case of no consensus. It will equally send a specific number of civil society representatives to participate in all meetings. Slots should be allocated considering gender and regional balance, as well as capacity to make valuable inputs. The representatives should reflect the diversity of civil society. Some representatives may be assigned for long-term assignments (covering up to 2 years), while others may serve periodically or exceptionally on specific agenda items. A small independent Secretariat will organize the assembly, facilitate circulation of information and receive a fixed budget from UNEP’s regular budget.</p> |
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The UNEP approach would follow the approach of partner organisations, such as DESA</li> <li>2. In line with the Rio + 20 outcome document and the approach at the HLPF</li> <li>3. Disadvantaged groups get an institutionalised opportunity to participate</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More involvement and representativity from Major Groups from the Region</li> </ol> <p>Regional Committees can work with UNEP Regional Offices on issues relevant for the region.</p>  | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A strong emphasis on self-organisation</li> <li>2. UNEP will spend less time on “organising Civil Society”</li> <li>3. Civil Society will be better able to apply expertise in a flexible manner</li> </ol>   |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emphasis on representativity rather than on expertise</li> <li>2. Environmental NGOs are disadvantaged</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Includes the creation of new bodies</li> <li>2. The representative body will have 54 members</li> <li>3. Additional Costs</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UNEP will give up the 9 Major Groups approach that was re-confirmed in “The Future We Want”</li> </ol>  |



**Table 9 - The Engagement Approach**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>Additional costs if number of Major Groups increases.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>Increased costs for the participation of the members of the civil society advisory body in UNEP's Governing Body. Currently UNEP funds 18 members of the MGFC and 12 Regional Representatives (30), under this option, UNEP would fund 54 members.</p> | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>It is not anticipated that there will be additional costs.</p> |
| <p><b>Similar practices in other organizations:</b><br/> <u>HLPE</u> which has just been created calls for more inclusiveness and the resolution A/67/L.72 calls for effective, broad and balanced participation by region and by type of organization, and for the expansion of the stakeholders from Major groups identified in Agenda 21 and other stakeholders, such as private philanthropic organizations, educational and academic entities, persons with disabilities, volunteer groups and other stakeholders active in areas related to sustainable development.<br/> The <u>UNFCCC</u> does not apply the Major Group approach. The NGOs represent a broad spectrum of interests, and embrace representatives from business and industry, environmental groups, farming and agriculture, indigenous populations, local governments and municipal authorities, research and academic institutes, labour unions, women and gender and youth groups.</p> |   |   |

## Part 4. Representative Body

**Table 10 - Stakeholder representative body at global level**

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b></p>  | <p>The Major Group Facilitating Committee (MGFC) has been established in 2007 to facilitate exchanges and inputs to and from the nine major groups. They act as advisors to the organisation through the Major Groups and Stakeholder Branch/DRC and provide strategic information on the views and perspectives of the MGS on different issues. They further strengthen and support the partnerships with MGS, e.g. the partnership with workers and trade unions, and have also strengthened their participation in the Green Economy initiative; Indigenous Peoples; local authorities, etc. the MGFC also supports a more systematic engagement of all nine major groups in the GC/GMEF. A set of guidelines have been adopted in 2009 to facilitate the engagement of major groups in policy design, and provide a firm background for the work of the MGFC.</p> <p><b>Assessment:</b><br/>Through the MGFC, UNEP constantly stays in touch with major groups and stakeholders (MGS) and keeps abreast of their views and demands. Yet, the MGFC is a purely consultative body without any decision-making powers and only represents a few accredited the organisations and MGS accredited to UNEP, and therefore cannot claim to represent a broad range of civil society organisations. Additionally, the role and functions of regional representatives that are selected at the regional level (two per region) currently serving as observers on the MGFC have to be redefined and made more explicit. The main limitations of such a body are: its legitimacy and representativity, the scope of its responsibility, and its lack of formal accountability mechanism.</p> |  |  |
| <b>Option 1</b>   | <b>Option 2</b>   | <b>Option 3</b>  |  |
| <p>With the Major Groups Facilitating Committee (MGFC) an advisory civil society body is already in place. It is composed of 2 representatives from each of the nine Major Groups and 2 representatives from each of UNEP's six regions. The former are appointed for two years after an email consultation and online bidding process while the latter are elected for a one-year term during Regional Consultation Meetings taking place annually in each region. The MGFC remains a facilitating body.</p> | <p>The involvement of major groups and stakeholders is facilitated by a global MGFC that comprises members of all nine Major Groups. The members of the MGFC are selected by Major Groups themselves. In each UNEP region, there are regional MGFC that advice on regional issues. The members of the global MGFC are selected from these six regional MGFC. Out of this group, a 9 person secretariat will be selected to facilitate interactions with UNEP.</p>   | <p>Building on the nine Major Groups approach, but taking if further in line with the Rio+20 outcome document, UNEP will establish a permanent advisory civil society body with clearly defined rights and obligations that go beyond the current MGFC. It will provide advice to UNEP and facilitate expert inputs from non-governmental stakeholders into the decision making process in an efficient, participatory and transparent way. The advisory body will have participation rights in all decision-making processes including inter-sessional mechanisms/systems, UNEP's subsidiary bodies and Working Groups. It is entitled to be invited by the Bureaus and SGB to coordinate the preparations and assists the Secretariat in generating and guiding the engagement of non-governmental stakeholders. The civil society advisory body replaces the MGFC and it will include representation of major groups and stakeholders from the regions.</p> |  |

**Table 10 - Stakeholder representative body at global level**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continuity</li> <li>2. The MGFC is working efficiently within its mandate</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Better involvement of the regions</li> <li>2. Better representativity</li> <li>3. The Major Groups Approach is reflected at the regional level and all Major Groups are represented there.</li> <li>4. The current system of Regional Representatives can be abandoned</li> </ol> | <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. A more stable and institutionalised mechanisms, that has better representativity and that allows for expert input and advice.</li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The MGFC is not representative and is limited to the nine Major Groups</li> </ol>    | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A very large body, comprising 5 times 9 members</li> <li>2. It might be difficult to get representatives of all Major Groups in all Regions</li> <li>3. Higher Costs than the MGFS</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Higher Costs than the MGFC</li> </ol>  |
| <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>Cost neutral.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>Increased costs for the participation of the members of the civil society advisory body in UNEP's Governing Body. Currently UNEP funds 18 members of the MGFC and 12 Regional Representatives (30), under this option, UNEP would fund 54 members.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b><br/>N/A</p>   |

**Table 10 - Stakeholder representative body at global level**

**Similar practices in other organizations:**

UN DESA works with and supports major groups and stakeholders through ‘organizing partners’ to facilitate their inputs into the UN CSD process in an efficient, participatory and transparent way. Key major groups and stakeholders’ networks are invited to form these facilitating groups which assist UN DESA in generating and guiding the engagement of stakeholders for each major group sector. The organizing partners (often up to 5 organizations per sector) are facilitators working through and with large global constituencies. They are accountable to their constituents, to the CSD Bureau and to the CSD Secretariat, although they do not represent them and do not necessarily speak on behalf of the sector they coordinate in official policy fora.

Seats of the Global Fund’s International Board with voting power are allocated inter alia to civil society, the private sector, private foundations, NGOs, and the communities living with the diseases. The International Board is the supreme governing body and is in charge of strategy development, governance oversight, commitment of financial resources, etc. Composition of the Board: (i) seven representatives from developing countries, one representative based on each of the six World Health Organization (WHO) regions and one additional representative from Africa; (ii) eight representatives from donors; and (iii) five representatives from civil society and the private sector. All members participate equally. Each follows the same rules and each has one vote on behalf of her/his constituency.

UNAIDS was the first United Nations Programme to have formal civil society representation on its governing body. The position of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) is critical for the effective inclusion of community voices in the key global policy forum for AIDS. UNAIDS seeks to reflect in its structures and operating procedures the values it espouses and promotes to countries, including through the governance structure of the Programme Coordinating Board which includes civil society representatives as equal partners in decision making with member states. Though technically NGOs do not have “the right to take part in the formal decision-making process” of the PCB, in practice NGOs fully participate and are essential, respected stakeholders in decision-making processes. They do not, however, have voting rights.

Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) of the Committee of World Food Security. The CFS has established an Advisory Group to share with the Bureau the expertise and knowledge of the broad range of stakeholders, contributing substantive work and advice. In particular, it assists the CFS and its Bureau to nurture and maintain linkages with different actors at regional, sub regional and local levels to enable an on-going, two-way exchange of information among these stakeholders during inter-sessional periods. In order to fulfil its roles, the members of the AG participate in joint meetings with the Bureau as invited by the CFS Chair. Members of the AG are expected to contribute to the substantive work of the CFS. They may suggest or respond to specific agenda items of joint AG-Bureau meetings and participate in ad hoc working groups formed during those meetings to progress specific issues. Decision-making, however, ultimately pertains to member States. The civil society participation in the CFS is facilitated by a self-managed Civil Society Mechanism (CSM). The CSM reaches out to hundreds of CSOs in all continents, sharing information with them on global policy debates and processes, promoting civil society consultations and dialogue, supporting national and regional advocacy and facilitating the participation of a diverse range of CSOs at the global level, in the context of the CFS.

## Part 5. Funding Mechanisms

| Table 11 - Funding Mechanisms for global and regional level participation   |   |                      |
|---|---|----------------------|
| <b>UNEP Current practices and assessment:</b>   | <p>Current, UNEP provides funding for participation of major groups and stakeholders in the meetings of the following bodies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governing Council and Global Major Groups and Stakeholder Forum: USD 250,000 USD per year;</li> <li>• Regional Coordination Meeting (RCM): approximately USD 30,000 per region per year;</li> <li>• One international consultation per year: USD 50,000 to USD 80,000 per year.</li> </ul> <p>Based on needs expressed by participants and available funding, additional capacity building activities may be funded.</p> |                      |
| Option 1  | Option 2  | Option 3             |
| <p>UNEP will establish a funding facility/trust fund to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership between UNEP and CSOs.</li> <li>• Stakeholder consultations.</li> <li>• Participation in UNEA and subsidiary bodies. Contributions to the trust fund would be for UNEP to cover core activities and from interested governments.</li> <li>• UNEP would provide a regular contribution of USD 600,000 every year to the trust fund and donors will be invited to make additional contributions to support activities with stakeholders.</li> <li>• The trust fund will be managed by UNEP’s Major Groups and Stakeholder Branch, in close coordination with stakeholders.</li> </ul> |   |                      |
| <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No “competition” for funds between Governments and Civil Society</li> <li>2. More transparency with respect to funding for civil society participation</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p>   | <p><b>Pros:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The fund might not have enough money to cover all needed activities</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>   | <p><b>Cons:</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <p>Approximately USD 100,000 more than what is currently spent on stakeholder participation.</p>   | <p><b>Costs:</b></p>  | <p><b>Costs:</b></p> |

**Table 11 - Funding Mechanisms for global and regional level participation**

**Similar practices in other organizations:**

N/A