The United Nations System

Environmental Management Group **23 September 2004**

Report of the Eighth Session of the Environmental Management Group (EMG)
1 September 2004 – Nairobi, Kenya

A. Opening of the meeting

1. The Eighth Session of the Environmental Management Group (EMG) was held in Nairobi on 1 September 2004. The meeting took place back to back with the second meeting of the High-level Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on an Intergovernmental Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building (IGSP), 2-4 September 2004.

2. Dr. Klaus Toepfer, the Executive Director of UNEP and the Chairman of the EMG, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

3. In his introductory remarks he referred to the second meeting of the IGSP and the contribution of the EMG to this process. Referring to the outcome of the seventh session of the EMG held in New York in April 2004 in the area of environment related capacity building, he described the EMG's contribution to the IGSP as twofold: 1) Preparation of the two situation/needs analyses on capacity building in the areas of biological diversity and chemicals, which would provide an overview of the UN system activities in two specific areas; and 2) The preparation of an overall outline of the UN environment-related capacity building activities. Both of the studies would be essential for the Intergovernmental Process as they provide insight into the existing UN environmental capacity building activities and cooperative frameworks.

4. The Chair underlined that the focus of the meeting would be on the further development of the studies, and on the objectives and organisation of work for the issue management group on IGSP, co-chaired by UNDP and UNEP. He thanked all EMG members for their constructive contributions to these papers. Particularly, he thanked UNITAR and UNEP-WCMC for preparing the papers in close consultation with the IMG members.

5. He added that the meeting would also discuss the issue of sustainable procurement and the role of the EMG following the initial discussions which took place at the previous meeting of the Group in New York.

6. The list of participants is contained in annex 1 to the present report.

B. Adoption of the Agenda

7. The meeting adopted the following agenda:

    1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

    2. The EMG's programme of work for 2004
       a. Environmental capacity building
       b. Sustainable procurement and environmental management programmes for the UN system

    3. Reporting requirements for the 59th session of the UNGA, New York, September/October 2004, and the 23rd session of the UNEP Governing Council, Nairobi, 21-25 February 2005

    4. Date and agenda for the next meeting

    5. Any other business

    6. Closure of the meeting

C. Environmental capacity building

8. The Chair briefly informed the meeting on the background of the EMG's work in the area of environmental capacity building. With the view to contribute to the implementation of the WSSD Plan of Implementation in the area of capacity building, the 6th Session of the EMG in February 2004 decided to focus on the issue of environmental capacity building in order to identify the needs and gaps, the potentials for further synergies within the UN system and the possible role of the EMG in this area. The issue management group on capacity building was established and tasked to prepare two pilot studies in the areas of biological diversity and chemicals management. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the UNEP- World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) were appointed as task managers on chemicals management and biological diversity respectively and prepared the first drafts of the two studies for the consideration of the EMG at its present meeting.

9. Responding to the UNEP GC decision SS.VIII/1 of 31 March 2004 on International Environmental Governance, the EMG at its seventh session decided to establish a second IMG on capacity building, jointly chaired by UNEP and UNDP, which would aim to prepare an outline of the UN activities and initiatives on environment related capacity building for submission to the second meeting of

the IGSP. Consequently, the EMG Secretariat compiled the first draft of the outline, which was ready for the consideration of the Group and subsequent submission to the intergovernmental process.

10. After this introduction, the Chairman invited the representative of UNEP-WCMC to present the draft survey on capacity building in the area of biological diversity. The representative of UNEP-WCMC provided a background on the work and the progress of the IMG on biological diversity since the last meeting of the EMG in April 2004 and underlined that the objective of the survey was to provide a UN system situation and needs analysis in the area of capacity building for biological diversity and to define the possible role of the EMG in strengthening synergies within the UN system, particularly in facilitating the exchange of information and experiences.

11. The survey would also help EMG members to identify common areas of cooperation. The focus of the survey was on the cooperative activities of the UN agencies and MEAs in the area of biological diversity; their experiences and lessons learned, best practices, challenges and the possible role of the EMG.

12. The analysis in its present state contained mainly information on the current UN system cross-agency initiatives and activities on capacity building for biological diversity. It had been prepared on the basis of inputs received from EMG members through specific questionnaires and the restricted website provided by the EMG and the CBD Secretariats.

13. Further information was needed to complete the section on the existing initiatives as well as the sections on the experiences and lessons learned and the role of the EMG. The GEF operational principles could be applied to organize the information collected and to use them as headings for the section on experiences and lessons.

14. The Chair thanked UNEP-WCMC for the preparation of the paper and invited the members to express their views and comments on the analysis.

15. The Representative of the Ramsar Convention thanked UNEP-WCMC for preparing the useful survey as it presented vast and useful information on environmental capacity building. He made a couple of suggestions on the format and structure of the report. The chapter on experiences should be made as practical as possible so that it could be used as a toolkit. It should especially show challenges and problems, as well as gaps in terms of substantive and geographical areas covered by capacity building efforts. The chapter on experiences should be placed before the chapter on existing activities.

16. The Representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity underlined the importance of this exercise as it would help in identifying areas of overlap and common interest for cooperation as well as needs and gaps. He suggested adding a section on biosafety in the survey and supported the inclusion of the results of the GEF capacity needs assessment into the study.

17. Referring to the importance of assessing the impact of the capacity building activities undertaken since the Rio Conference, he suggested that there was a need for an inventory of capacity building initiatives, a tool kit to assist users in selecting the needed information and using it more effectively

18. He concluded by suggesting the inclusion of the activities undertaken by non-UN agencies and non-governmental organizations in this area, as many capacity building activities are undertaken jointly with NGOs.

19. The Representative of the World Bank suggested that the first operational principle in the experiences chapter (national ownership) should provide links to national strategies for capacity building and similar documents. He observed that though preparing inventories is costly, developing a handbook would be a useful tool in identifying capacity building needs.

20. The Representative of UNDP underlined the importance of the IMG's work, which corresponded to the UNDP Capacity Building 2015 Initiative. He made some suggestions on the structure of the survey and offered to provide the results of the GEF supported national capacity self-assessments (NCSAs) for inclusion into the survey as suggested by the CBD Representative.

21. The Representative of the UN University said that the study should come up with quantitative data/measurable achievements of capacity building and also with figures of funding of capacity building for biological diversity.

22. The Representative of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) highlighted the bottom up approach in identifying the needs and gaps and observed that the assessment of implemented capacity building activities was a difficult but useful task in terms of planning future activities. In this regard he referred to his secretariat's experience and current work in the evaluation of executed capacity building activities in close cooperation with CBD and UNCCD.

23. The Chair observed that the survey in its present state was a useful basis for further interaction and information exchange among the members and suggested making the continually updated information accessible through a mechanism such as a resource library or a clearinghouse. To that end it should be explored if such structures exist so as to avoid duplication. The use of the GEF operational principles was useful though generic, but it would be beneficial to examine the possibility of disseminating the information and lessons learned to the whole UN family and beyond and to make them applicable. He thanked the CBD Secretariat for establishing the restricted website for the IMG.

24. He added that the final objective of this endeavour should not be limited to collecting information on the existing capacity building activities; rather it should identify the areas which need capacity building, and areas where the GEF operational principles were not integrated. He observed that the assessment of implemented capacity building activities was not an easy task and required identification of criteria for measuring the successes and failures. He underlined the importance of including a section on biosafety in the survey and observed that

the input of non-UN agencies and NGOs into this exercise could be integrated after the required information had been collected from the UN system. He reaffirmed a bottom up approach in identifying the needs and gaps.

25. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman suggested that the IMG should continue its work bearing in mind that the scope of this issue does not lend itself to a conclusive and final output, but rather that the aim should be to continue to develop and share resources and information between the agencies. He again highlighted that if the Group succeeded in preparing a broad and substantive information source, the members could single out missing links and the areas where the GEF operational principles are not integrated. He considered it helpful to publish the results of such a survey, even though certain issues raised might be critically received, as they constitute a good basis for further discussion and analysis.

26. The Chairman then invited the Representative of UNITAR to present the draft survey on capacity building for chemicals management. In his presentation, the UNITAR representative provided the background on the consultations between the EMG Secretariat, UNITAR and the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), which resulted in the preparation of the present survey. The survey aimed at providing an overview of the existing international policy framework affecting chemical management capacity building, relevant activities of international organizations as well as existing coordinating arrangements in the area of chemicals management capacity building in the UN system. It had been prepared in close consultation with the participating organizations of the IOMC, as well as the IFCS, OPCW and the Basel Convention Secretariat.[1]

27. In addition to the EMG and the IGSP processes, the survey would be made available to the process to develop a Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), and to the IOMC discussions scheduled for January 2005 to develop an IOMC strategy for chemicals management capacity building.

28. The survey was structured in five sections. Section 1 provided a background and context and a summary of the process of its preparation. Section two featured a summary of key international agreements and decisions affecting chemicals management capacity building. Section three summarised the organizational set-up and activities of international bodies involved in chemicals management capacity building. Section four reviewed the current status of co-ordinating mechanisms and information exchange mechanisms concerned with chemicals management capacity building and sections five and six, once further developed, would feature issues which may merit further attention and explore the possible role of the EMG.

[1] The IOMC is the pre-eminent mechanism for initiating, facilitating and co-ordinating international action to achieve the WSSD 2020 goal for sound management of chemicals. It was established in 1995 through a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the executive heads of Participating Organizations (POs), including ILO, FAO, UNEP, UNIDO, OECD, WHO and UNITAR. UNDP and the World Bank are currently participating observers in the IOMC.

29. The paper analyzed existing international agreements and capacity-building programmes within the context of the elements for the sound management of chemicals at the national level, as provided in Programme Area E of Chapter 19 (Section 19.56). Those elements, as agreed in Rio, include:

- adequate legislation;
- information gathering and dissemination;
- capacity for risk assessment and interpretation;
- establishment of risk management policy;
- capacity for implementation and enforcement;
- capacity for rehabilitation of contaminated sites and poisoned persons;
- effective education programmes; and
- capacity to respond to emergencies.

30. Issues under chapter 19 of Agenda 21, Programme Area E elements, were selected as a framework for analysis as it allowed for the identification of horizontal linkages and potential synergies across international agreements and related capacity building programmes of international organizations.

31. The study highlighted that there were many actors within and across the UN system involved in capacity building for chemicals management. In addition to the formal co-ordination taking place through the IOMC, a number of informal coordination and information exchange mechanisms were also in place. Most of the co-ordination took place around "vertical" issues, such as POPs or PRTR, while co-ordination around horizontal issues (e.g. legislation) was currently not the focus of attention. One of the ongoing challenges for the IOMC is how to achieve effective coordination while keeping co-ordination costs low.

32. With regard to the possible role and added value of the EMG, he mentioned that in light of the existence of the IOMC, opportunities for the EMG to contribute to the daily co-ordination of chemical management capacity building are probably rather limited. Nevertheless, a number of opportunities for possible EMG involvement could be considered. The EMG might, for example, play a role in facilitating discussions across sectors in light of its cross-sectoral membership, e.g. defining links between chemicals management and other environmental areas such as climate change, biological diversity and water issues.

33. The EMG might also provide a forum to facilitate a dialogue among UN agencies about concrete areas of common interest, such as the preparation of capacity self-assessments or facilitating public participation in project implementation. Lastly, the EMG could facilitate the exchange of experience gained in various sectors to facilitate co-ordination within the sector. In this regard the IOMC experience of co-ordinating chemical management activities might be if interest to EMG members.

32. The Chair thanked the UNITAR representative for his presentation and invited members to provide their comments.

33. The Representative of UNDP supported the approach and the structure of the survey developed on the basis of the selected issues contained in Chapter 19 of Agenda 21. He suggested strengthening co-ordination on horizontal areas of chemical management capacity development in future interagency cooperation. He also noticed a lack of reference to the work of the private sector in chemicals management and requested the addition of the private sector activities in the survey.

34. The Representative of UNFCCC mentioned that it would be useful if the survey could include more information about the co-ordination experience of the IOMC, reflecting the experiences, lessons learned and the effectiveness of such mechanisms. He referred to the UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD cooperative framework called the Joint Liaison Group, which was emerging and was furthering information exchange on an informal basis. He concurred with the Chair on the importance of developing a common approach in capacity building needs assessments.

35. The Representative of UNITAR, responding to comments, mentioned that he would be pleased to pass on to the IOMC the interest of the EMG to learn more about the lessons learned from establishing and operating the IOMC. He added that the future version of the survey could include the activities of the private sector and other non-governmental actors.

36. The representative of the World Bank pointed out that the study should place more emphasis integrating chemicals management capacity building into main stream development issues, such as investment projects for clean water, etc.

37. The Representative of the CBD suggested that the survey might include a matrix showing the geographical coverage of capacity building activities that includes a breakdown by agency.

38. The Representative of the Ramsar Convention referred to the issue of horizontal linkages and the possibility of cooperation on cross cutting issues as described in the survey, as well as the role of the EMG in identifying such opportunities for cooperation.

39. The Representative of UNU suggested that it would be useful if the survey could include the organization's list of best practices and the departments as well as the personnel responsible for environmental capacity building.

40. The representative of the WMO informed the meeting on his organization's programme on Global Atmospheric Watch, which included a number of regional and national activities related to environmental capacity building.

41. The Director of the UNEP NY office underlined the usefulness of the horizontal approach which provided a strategic sense for interagency cooperation.
He referred to the UNEP IEG process at which the functional clustering versus the sectoral clustering was analysed. He suggested that the survey in demonstrating the value of horizontal cooperation, followed closely the approach proposed in the context of the IEG on environmental coordination, and therefore it

would be useful if the survey could be made available for the information of other forums.

44. He added that the study had a lot of valuable content, however, the conclusions were only limited to the potential role of the EMG. He underlined that it was more beneficial if the conclusions could be broader in such a way to capture the generic lessons learned on capacity building in the area of chemicals management and to identify the areas for further synergies. As such the survey could be useful in a sense that enabled the EMG's members to identify areas for cooperation and to establish formal coordination frameworks.

45. The UNDESA representative observed that the survey provided a useful insight into the existing activities and concurred with the suggestion of the Chair on the feasibility of applying certain successful interagency cooperation framework models in other areas. As such, the survey was more useful if it included further information on the lessons learned and the experiences of the existing cooperative frameworks. He also observed that the issue of funding was missing in the two surveys and suggested that a study could be made on the total funding spent for such cooperative frameworks which could help the EMG in considering appropriate models for enhancing interagency coordination.

46. The Chair observed that it would be beneficial if the survey could identify the areas where there are low and high concentrations of capacity building activities and a set of sectors in which capacity building is necessary.

47. Highlighting the deliberations of the first SAICM PrepCom (Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management) in Bangkok, on the necessity of the interlinkage of chemicals issues with other sectors, he stressed the idea of a comparable assessment by which the experiences of one environmental sector could be transferred into other areas.

48. The Chairman then invited the Director of the UNEP NY office to inform the Group on the work of the second IMG on capacity building for the IGSP. He briefed the meeting on the IGSP process and the role of the EMG in providing the process with a consolidated input on the work of the UN agencies in the area of environmental capacity building.

49. The eighth special session of the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum in its decision SS.VIII/1 decided "to establish a high-level open-ended intergovernmental working group of the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum with the mandate to prepare an intergovernmental strategic plan for technology support and capacity-building for its consideration at its twenty-third session." In the same decision it requested the Executive Director "to make available relevant reports, including an inventory of existing capacity-building and technology support activities of the United Nations Environment Programme and of other relevant international organizations, to assist the high-level working group, as necessary, noting that the Environmental Management Group could play an active role in that regard."

50. Furthermore, at the first meeting of the high-level working group, several governments expressed the need to have a better understanding of the mandates, roles and activities of United Nations organisations active in the field of technology support and capacity building for environment and sustainable development.

51. In response to these requests, the Environmental Management Group decided to establish an Issue Management Group, under the co-chairmanship of UNEP and UNDP, with the mandate to provide a coordinated contribution by its members to the high-level working group. As a first step, the EMG Secretariat had compiled an inventory of the mandates, roles and activities of the EMG member organisations in this area. The inventory would be further developed by the Issue Management Group, taking into account discussions and decisions at the second meeting of the high-level working group.

52. He then suggested that the Group transmit the paper to the second IGSP meeting as a compiled text on UN activities in the area of capacity building. He added that taking into account the guidance and the request of the second meeting of the IGSP, the IMG would meet and discuss its contribution to the third ISP meeting which would take place in Bali, Indonesia from 1 to 4 December 2004.

53. The Representatives of UNDP and UNFCCC supported the idea of transmitting the paper to the Intergovernmental Process as a compilation and a living document, which needed further input and consolidation. They observed that the paper in its present form did not yet address issues such as overlaps, areas of joint cooperation and challenges, which might be needed by the governments.

54. The Representative of WMO suggested that it would be useful if the Secretariat could develop guidelines for defining what kind of information should be provided by the members so as to effectively serve the needs of the intergovernmental process.

55. The Chairman underlined that this was a living and unedited document, which needed further input from the members. He suggested that it would be helpful to develop a matrix, asking the members for their own assessment and overview of their activities in this area. He suggested that further contact could be made with those heads of agencies who had not yet provided input. He proposed that the IMG should continue its work, bearing in mind the discussions of the second IGSP, and prepare the required input for the utilization of the third session of the Intergovernmental Process. He also informed about the recently published UNEP report on its capacity building activities, prepared for consideration at the second IGSP meeting.

D. Sustainable procurement and environmental management programmes for the UN system

56. The Chair invited the representative of UNEP/DTIE to introduce the EMG paper on the issue of sustainable procurement.

57. In her presentation she referred to the definition of sustainable procurement, the overall purchasing policies and purchasing power of the UN system, the mandates from intergovernmental fora related to UN sustainable procurement, including the Marrakech Process on sustainable consumption and production, UNEP and UNDESA's mandates, the challenges in UN sustainable procurement, the possibility of developing sustainable procurement guidelines and the possible role of the EMG, particularly in preparing an in-depth assessment and in mapping those UN purchasing practices in which environmental considerations were incorporated .

58. The representative of the World Bank supplemented UNEP/DTIE's presentation with a brief on the Bank's procurement practices which incorporate environmental and social considerations. He referred to the Bank's policy in influencing both the suppliers as well as the consumers to incorporate social and environmental dimensions in their purchasing practices.

59. The representative of UNDESA stressed the need to involve the UN procurement as well as management and administrative bodies on possible sustainable procurement plans. He provided a number of detailed proposals (Attached as annex 2 to the present report) on the content and structure of the EMG paper, as well as the possibilities for future work on this issue. Notably he informed the meeting that the DSD/DESA was planning to hold a meeting on promoting sustainability in the UN Secretariat towards the end of the year to which any contribution of the EMG was welcome.

60. The Representative of UNFCCC underlined the importance of knowing what different organizations were doing on sustainable procurement and that it was useful if EMG members would inform the others on any existing guidelines so as to avoid duplicating the same work by other agencies. The financial impact of sustainable procurement was also important as it should be clarified who would pay the additional costs related to the application of sustainable procurement and how this should be handled**.**

61. The Representative of UNDP considered it important to benefit from the World Bank's experiences and to mainstream the lessons learned in other agencies' programmes**.**

62. The Representative of UNEP/DTIE informed the meeting on the existing interagency frameworks on sustainable procurement such as the Inter-Agency Procurement Working Group (IAPWG) and the Inter-Agency Group on Environmentally and Socially Responsible Procurement (IAESRP) and proposed to link the interested members of the EMG with those frameworks. She informed the meeting of the website (http://www.sustainableprocurement.net/)which provides information on different actors and programmes on sustainable procurement. She said that the EMG was invited to the next meeting of the IAESRP which would take place in Washington D.C in late November 2004.

63. She referred to the economic dimensions of this issue and observed that although the UN Procurement Office is currently not involved in the IAESRP, since they do

not have a strong mandate to look into sustainable procurement, a close consultation with them would be useful.

64. The UNDP representative proposed that the Chair might wish to write to the heads of the EMG member organizations informing them on the EMG's intention to embark on work in the area of environmentally and socially sustainable procurement, and to invite them to participate in the work of the IMG.

65. Concluding the Group's discussion on this agenda item, the Chair proposed to establish an IMG on this issue, which should turn the discussion on this issue into a policy development exercise. Work on developing supplier codes of conduct, preparation of an inventory of existing sustainable procurement policies and practices and the issue of training, were the issues that should be addressed by the IMG. He suggested that the World Bank and UNEP/DTIE in close consultation with IAPSO be appointed as the task managers of the IMG.

66. The Chair suggested that the next discussion of the EMG on this issue should take place at the time when considerable progress had been made.

E. Reporting requirements for the 59th session of the UNGA, New York, September/October 2004, and the 23rd session of the UNEP Governing Council, Nairobi, 21-25 February 2005

67. The EMG Secretariat informed the meeting on the reporting requirements of the EMG *via à vis* the UNEP GC/GMEF and the GA. Based on the GA Res 58/209 in which UNEP was requested to make available reports on the work of the EMG to the GA through the Governing Council of UNEP, the EMG submitted the report of its activities in the year 2003 to the 8th Special Session of the UNEP GC/GMEF in March 2004. The report contained the EMG's work in the areas of harmonization of national reporting for biodiversity related conventions, and the environmental aspects of water, sanitation and human settlements. The EMG Secretariat was also in the process of preparing the report of its work in 2004 for the twenty-third session of UNEP GC/GMEF in February 2005, which would include the EMG's work in the areas of environmental capacity building and sustainable procurement. The Secretariat also referred to the UNEP GC/GMEF decision GC SS.VIII/1 which requested the UNEP Executive Director to prepare, for the consideration of the 23rd session of the GC, an assessment report on the location of the EMG Secretariat. An independent consultant in close consultation with the UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit would prepare this report.

F. Date and agenda for the next meeting

68. Given the importance of the EMG's contribution to the Intergovernmental Process on Capacity Building, it was suggested to hold the next meeting in Bali, Indonesia, back to back with the third meeting of the IGSP.

69. The Group would mainly discuss the work of its IMGs in the area of capacity building. Nevertheless, the Secretariat would consult EMG members and seek their views on other issues they would like to discuss at the next meeting.

G. Closure of the meeting

70. The Director of UNEP's Division on Policy Development and Law thanked the participants for their attendance and their useful contributions and declared the meeting closed.

ANNEX I

Meeting of the Environmental Management Group, 01 September 2004

List of Participants

Name	Organization
Klaus Toepfer	Executive Director, UNEP
Erie Tamale	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
Hamdallah Zedan	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
Angela Kabiru-Kang'ethe	International Labour Organization (ILO)
Mohammed Reza Salamat	UNDESA
Salvatore Arico	UNESCO
Janos Pasztor	UNFCCC
Ole Lyse	UN-Habitat
Achim Halpaap	UNITAR
Philip Dobie	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Kemal Mustafa	United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
Sam Johnston	United Nations University (UNU)
Stephen Njoroge	WMO
Steve Gorman	World Bank
Yinka Adebayo	World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
Alioune Ndiaye	World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
Bakary Kante	UNEP-DPDL
Halifa Drammeh	UNEP
Adnan Amin	UNEP
Isabella Marras	UNEP-DTIE
Peter Herkenrath	UNEP-WCMC
Hossein Fadaei	EMG

ANNEX II

DESA's Comments on the EMG Background Paper on Sustainable Procurement and Environmental Management Programmes for the UN System

By: Mohammad Reza Salamat
EMG-8 meeting/Nairobi, 01 September 2004

1. The paper's title and objective include both sustainable procurement and environmental management, but most of the discussion is on procurement. Some of the recommendations for the future work also include management aspect, but they need more supporting information. Indeed, if both subjects are to be addressed equally, the scope may become too wide. The EMG may wish to decide on the focus of the work to set a coherent framework.

2. The paper shows clearly that there is a need to conduct a proper survey on the current status of procurement and environmental management in the UN system. The paper identifies that with regard to procurement, major procurement bodies, such as UNOPS, IAPSO and IAPWO should be involved. Similarly, for environmental management related to daily office operations, relevant bodies should be involved, for example, the Department of Management in the case of the UNHQ.

3. The lack of awareness is pointed out as a major factor for lack of implementation in sustainable procurement. To start with, however, procurement officers need a clear legislative mandate in working towards sustainable procurement. The lack of a clear mandate may be a major cause in hampering the implementation. There is a limited scope in what can done to obtain such a mandate through political process of each governing body. Under such circumstances, however, it is still possible to make more sustainable choices within the same cost envelope. It would be helpful if there is a clear position statement from the high level to commit to such exercise, as in the case of recycled photocopy paper for which there is a statement from the Secretary-General. It would be also necessary to have a set of clear, objective guidelines which demonstrate the advantage of "sustainably produced" goods and services as well as merit of contracting "environmentally friendly" or "socially responsible" companies.

4. With regard to possible future work:

    a. The paper first calls for a mapping of UN operations and procurement methods and enlists UNEP, IAPSO, UNOPS to carry this out with the help of IAPWG. It is important to ensure that all the key UN entities are covered by these inter-agency structures. For example, the UN Procurement Division is responsible for the procurement for the UN Secretariat, peace-keeping operations and a part of regional Economic Commissions, accounting for around $900 million a year. They are a member of IAPWG, but it is important to ensure that if the correspondence

goes through IAPWG, these key entities will be reached. With regard to "operation" or "management", there is probably a need to involve each organization and agency since there is no equivalent inter-agency structures regarding "management". A questionnaire could be developed and sent out.

b. The paper then calls for work on a concept of SP in three different areas: UN field projects and operations; UN HQ and office operations; and UN policy advice to governments. As mentioned at the beginning, it is important to clarify the scope and the framework of the work envisaged. The proposed work is on the concept of sustainable procurement (SP), but the second point includes "office operations". "Work on a concept" is not clear, but as far as policy advice is concerned, DSD/DESA is already working on the third aspect, as already presented in the last EMG meeting. Through our work with governments, we have accumulated information on different approaches and methodologies in pursuing sustainable procurement. This information can be utilized in developing a concept paper regarding UN HQ and office operations.

c. In the third point, the paper recommends to identify one or two key risk areas (or high impact areas) and make proposals for sustainable procurement. If this means to develop a set of guidelines on these key risk areas (for example, conference and meetings, office appliances, office management, etc.), we may think of volunteering on a few. This should be a cooperative endeavour among interested agencies, such as UNEP, IAPSO, UN Procurement Division.

d. As a fourth recommendation point, the paper points out the possibility for information dissemination, including the possibility of professional training. For this to be effective, perhaps a special site on "Greening the UN system" or something of the sort could be useful.

5. DSD/DESA is planning to hold a meeting on promoting sustainability in the UN Secretariat towards the end of the year. At the appropriate time, we would be happy to receive any input from the EMG on the agenda, including possible speakers.

6. As a factual point, United Nations Common Supply Database has now been replaced by United Nations Global Marketplace. The information can be obtained from: http://www.uncsd.org/AboutUncsd.aspx

7. The United Nations Procurement Department is now developing "supplier codes of conduct", which cover areas such as child labour, anti-mine, health, freedom of association, environment among others. This will be a good start to raise awareness among potential suppliers to the United Nations. Currently, general condition for a contract for the United Nations does not include issues such as child labour or environment. The Legal Office considers that under current circumstances, these issues could not be enforced or monitored properly. UNICEF, on the other hand, includes clause against child labour and engineers involved in mine manufacturing in their general condition for a contract.