

## **Background Paper #1**

### **10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production (10YFP): A Review of Options for Institutional Structure**

**For discussion at  
High-Level Intersessional Meeting of the  
Commission on Sustainable Development**

**Panama City, Panama**

**13-14 January 2011**



## I. Introduction

Sustainable consumption and production is referenced in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI), adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, as one of three overarching objectives of, and essential requirements for, sustainable development, together with poverty eradication and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development (JPOI, I.2).

The JPOI calls for action to “encourage and promote the development of a 10-year framework of programmes in support of regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production”.<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) is a holistic and cross-cutting concept. Resource, material and energy efficiency are central to the notion of SCP. The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (III.14) refers to “fundamental changes in the way societies produce and consume”. It calls on all countries to promote SCP in accordance with the Rio principles, “with developed countries taking the lead and with all countries benefiting from the process”. In III.15, the JPOI tasks a 10-year framework of programmes on SCP with helping countries, wherever appropriate, to de-link economic growth and environmental degradation “through improving efficiency and sustainability in the use of resources and production processes and reducing resource degradation, pollution and waste”. A whole-of-life analysis of products can often be helpful in promoting SCP.

To the extent that SCP captures unexploited efficiencies in production and consumption, it allows “win-win” outcomes. Seizing such opportunities involves addressing information and market deficiencies, including in credit markets; making strategic investments (e.g., in infrastructure) to support shifts in production and consumption patterns; and providing choices to make sustainable livelihoods affordable and possible.

Strong political commitment has been demonstrated for SCP since WSSD, including through the regional roundtables and endorsement of regional strategies on SCP in Africa, Latin America, Europe and the Arab region, and the development of national SCP programmes and increased efforts to mainstream SCP into development plans. These initiatives represent important efforts but implementation remains a challenge, and changing entrenched practices and behaviors – however unsustainable – remains a challenge in all countries.

The elevated level of political commitment to promoting sustainable consumption and production is reflected most recently in the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity that includes an SCP target (Aichi Target 4): “By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits”.<sup>2</sup>

During discussions on the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production (10YFP) at the eighteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, success stories with regard to sustainable consumption and production were presented, but it was noted that initiatives were often fragmented, missing opportunities to realize synergies. Delegations noted that a 10YFP is needed to provide strengthened and coherent international support to the diversity of existing policy and other initiatives at national and regional levels as well as to help member States and other stakeholders address new and emerging SCP challenges. Initiatives to date, such as the Marrakech Process<sup>3</sup>, have

---

<sup>1</sup> Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, para. 15.

<sup>2</sup> The Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (the “Aichi Target”) adopted by COP 10, 18- 29 October 2010, Nagoya, Japan. The “Aichi Target” includes 20 headline targets, organized under five strategic goals. One of these goals addresses the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and includes (*i.e.* “Target 4”).

<sup>3</sup> Launched in 2003, in response to Chapter III of the JPOI, the Marrakech Process is a global and informal multi-stakeholder platform to promote the implementation of policies and capacity building on SCP and to support the development of a 10YFP.

been voluntary in nature, and, while they have been effective as an interim means of bringing together communities of interest and sharing knowledge and information across countries and regions, they lack a formal mechanism that would ensure sustainability.

The Commission recognized that the framework could provide a platform for the broad sharing of experiences, lessons learned, best practices and knowledge at multiple levels and could allow for the replication and scaling up of successful initiatives. It could also assist countries in monitoring progress toward their own goals and objectives. It was also noted by many Delegates that the framework should help to mobilize the technical and financial support necessary to allow the implementation of national and regional initiatives.

At CSD-18, Member states expressed interest in being presented with a variety of potential institutional structures for a 10YFP. In response to these requests, this paper reviews six models which provide options for the institutional design of the 10YFP, considering the functions that such a framework needs to fulfil and several criteria for assessing effectiveness.

Progress during the January 2011 Intersessional Meeting in Panama City (for which this paper serves as background) on the formulation of a coherent and effective 10YFP will be important to a successful Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting (IPM) (28 February – 4 March 2011) and CSD-19 negotiations (2-13 May 2011) on the 10YFP on SCP.

## **II. Functions and needs to be filled**

The 10YFP should support a set of ambitious, but realistic actions and initiatives, giving them impetus, incentives, direction, cohesion, and the flexibility to evolve for the period 2011-2020. The starting point is the range of actions that were identified in the JPOI in paragraphs 15 to 19. The 10YFP needs to include programs that support national and regional initiatives, which may vary *inter alia* with level of development and natural resource endowments, but which will all need to promote human development while de-linking production and consumption from negative environmental and social impacts. A life-cycle approach can be especially useful in addressing SCP challenges in a holistic and integrated manner.

The 10YFP must foster action by all countries, while supporting actions of developing countries and countries with economies in transition to shift towards sustainable consumption and production patterns. The framework needs to add value to regional and national initiatives, not only by enhancing the quality and effectiveness of SCP policies and programmes but also by distilling lessons and providing a means of sharing and adapting knowledge, experience, and tools among governments and other actors. A key purpose of a 10YFP should be to facilitate the scale-up and replication of successful local, national and regional SCP practices, programmes and models as well as fill existing gaps. More specifically, the 10YFP should provide mechanisms to identify where there are gaps in understanding or methodologies, and to enable development and consideration of actions and capacity building activities to promote the shift to SCP. The 10YFP should also leverage resources in support of SCP, including from the private sector.

The Framework should be able to respond to perceived needs of stakeholders at different levels. Initiatives at the local, national, and regional levels will reflect different priorities. The Framework needs to be sufficiently flexible to evolve, in order to respond effectively to emerging issues and changing contexts, and in order to accommodate new actors.

The following functions for the Framework draw from the activities of the Marrakech Process on Sustainable Consumption and Production. A number of these functions match those

---

UNEP and UNDESA are the facilitating agencies of this process, with an active participation of national governments, development agencies, private sector, civil society and other stakeholders.

highlighted during the RIMS and at CSD18. Further discussions on these functions may be needed before the form of the 10YFP can be agreed.

**A. Commitment on global common goals and vision:**

- Ideally, provide a shared vision of a sustainable, equitable and prosperous world to which all countries can aspire in the decades ahead (a 10YFP on SCP should be seen as an important step towards realizing that vision);
- Provide a global focus on common goals and agenda setting;
- Catalyze political, technical and financial support for the achievement of those goals;
- Monitor progress towards achieving goals.

**B. Knowledge sharing and networking:**

- Strengthen and extend communities of SCP practitioners, providing an easy way to link such communities across countries and regions;
- Build stronger bridges between communities – e.g., between policy makers, researchers and scientists, between governments and business, between both and NGOs, between local authorities and national governments, etc.;
- Cooperate with international initiatives that promote knowledge sharing on SCP, such as the International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management (“Resource Panel”)<sup>4</sup>;
- Provide a knowledge bank for those seeking policy guidance (set of policies that have worked; network of experts offering policy advice) and policy tools that have proven useful; also for those actors seeking guidance on practical SCP solutions in different sectors, area of endeavour;
- Have a dynamic feedback process whereby the set of policies and tools evolves as more experience is accumulated.

**C. Enabling frameworks and strategic planning and investment:**

- Support national governments and other relevant actors in creating policy, plans and other institutional conditions supporting a shift towards SCP;
- Foster global and regional networks of practice among key communities shaping the policy and institutional framework and the planning and infrastructure investment decisions which shape consumption and production patterns.
- Mainstream SCP in the work of relevant UN agencies as well as in national development strategies and plans.

**D. Technical cooperation:**

- Offer a convenient means of accessing technical assistance for those working on SCP at national and regional levels, including for:
  - Utilization of various tools;
  - Design of policies;
  - Creation of programmes (e.g. on sustainable procurement, education, etc);
- Establish links and encourage cooperation and coordination among various technical assistance programmes with overlapping areas of expertise, to achieve synergies;
- Explore ways of linking programmes under 10YFP to existing funding mechanisms and sources for capacity building.

**E. Collaboration:**

- Foster effective partnerships to advance various aspects of SCP, including by:

---

<sup>4</sup> The International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management (“Resource Panel”), established in 200, aims to provide independent scientific assessment of the environmental impacts due to the use of resources over the full life cycle, and advise governments and organisations on ways to reduce these impacts. UNEP/DTIE serves as a Secretariat for the Resource Panel.

- Facilitating the creation of new multi-stakeholder partnerships in areas of need;
- Providing incentives for existing partnerships to become more active, effective;
- Providing a platform for sharing of experiences and resources among partnerships;
- Provide a platform for online collaboration in developing and implementing global and regional SCP programs and initiatives.

**F. Awareness raising, education and civil society mobilization:**

- Raise the understanding and visibility of SCP as a goal for the international community and for all stakeholders;
- Facilitate global public campaigns to achieve specific SCP goals and targets;
- Devise innovative tools and channels (including through use of new information technologies) for engagement of Major Groups and civil society actors in implementation of SCP actions across countries and regions;
- Provide a platform for educators within and across regions to share curriculum materials and other resources for teaching sustainability issues and sciences at all levels;
- Support networks and groups dedicated to popularizing sustainable lifestyles, values and behaviours.

### **III. Options for the structure of a 10YFP**

It is expected that the 10YFP will have two broad components, namely the institutional arrangements and a set of programs which together could support implementation of agreed goals and objectives of a 10YFP. The following sections focus on the institutional arrangements – possible programs are dealt with in a separate paper.

In developing the Framework, it is useful to look at different examples of international cooperation and collaboration models that involve a wide range of participants and stakeholders. The following examples provide a range of approaches:

- i. Marrakech Process model: Global informal process on SCP
- ii. SAICM model: Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
- iii. UN-Water, -Energy, -Oceans model: Inter-agency coordination mechanisms
- iv. GAVI model: Global Alliance for Vaccine and Immunization
- v. MDGs model: Millennium Development Goals
- vi. CGIAR model: Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research.

There are other models that could be examined and some, such as the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), have been brought to the attention of the Secretariat.

Following is a brief overview of the main features of each model, with a particular focus on its governance structure. The model features are discussed in more detail below in the comparative assessment.

#### **Marrakech Process (MP)**

The Marrakech Process is a global and informal multi-stakeholder process with a Secretariat jointly held by UNEP and UNDESA, an Advisory Committee (AC) representing each UN region and major groups, which has supported and guided consultation on potential elements for a 10YFP. Being informal, it does not integrate any formal monitoring, accountability mechanisms, financial mechanisms or formal high-level commitment. Implementation has mostly happened through the work of seven voluntary Task Forces financed by developed countries. The Marrakech Process has also organized a number of international and regional expert meetings, where regional priorities on SCP have been identified. Progress of the Marrakech Process has been reported at the UNEP Governing Council and the CSD.

### **Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)**

SAICM is a voluntary global policy framework to ensure that, by 2020, chemicals are produced and used in ways that minimize significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment. SAICM was initiated by the UNEP Governing Council in 2002, developed by a multi-stakeholder Preparatory Committee and adopted by the governing body, the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), in Dubai on 6 February 2006, after a three-year consultation.

SAICM comprises the Dubai Declaration on International Chemicals Management and an Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS). The Declaration is a high-level political commitment while the OPS sets out objectives (risk reduction; knowledge and information sharing; governance; capacity-building and technical cooperation; and addressing illegal international traffic), financial considerations, underlying principles and approaches, and implementation and review arrangements. A Global Plan of Action serves as a working tool and guidance document to support implementation. Activities in the plan are to be implemented, as appropriate, by stakeholders, according to their applicability.

The ICCM provides for full involvement of all stakeholders in its Rules of Procedure. The Open-ended Working Group is a subsidiary body for the preparation of ICCM sessions and intersessional work. The Quick Start Programme supports financially initial enabling activities in developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition. SAICM is supported by a Secretariat housed in UNEP.

### **UN-Water, -Energy, -Oceans**

These are mechanisms designed to foster coordination and collaboration among UN entities as well as other relevant organizations working in a particular domain. They have varying degrees of formality in their governance arrangements. UN-Water (2003) emerged out of close collaboration among UN agencies on water related issues. UN-Oceans (2003) was endorsed by the UN System Chief Executives Board to establish an effective, transparent and permanent inter-agency coordination mechanism on ocean and coastal issues. UN-Energy (2004) helps ensure coherence in the UN system's work on energy issues. Each is served by a secretariat housed within the UN – either a dedicated permanent secretariat or a rotating secretariat.

UN-Water has a Result-Based Framework, including a scheme and indicators for monitoring progress. It offers a common vision within the broader water field issues. It publishes “The World Water Development Report” every three years. UN-Energy initially focused on a limited number of activities that could be delivered on a timely basis. Work on policies provides options, strategies/toolkits and analyses in support of implementation of international decisions. UN-Oceans is a coordinating mechanism mandated by the Member States. It works on emerging topics through specialized Task Forces, coordinated by a lead institution, which pursue time-bound initiatives.

### **Global Alliance for Vaccination and Immunization (GAVI)**

GAVI is a global health partnership representing stakeholders in immunization from the private and public sectors in the developing world and donor countries, private sector philanthropists such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the financial community, developed and developing country vaccine manufacturers, research and technical institutes, civil society organizations and the World Health Organization, UNICEF and the World Bank.

The GAVI Alliance provides support to national governments through the GAVI Fund in response to country proposals, which are reviewed by an independent group of experts – mostly health officials from developing countries. In addition, the Alliance has introduced a pilot project enabling civil society organisations in 10 countries to apply for support. The Board establishes all policies, oversees the operations of the Alliance and monitors

programme implementation. It is supported by an Executive Committee, the Secretariat, the Auditors, the Standing Board Committees, and Advisory Committees.

### **Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)**

The MDGs are a set of eight development goals adopted by member States and at least 23 international organizations to be achieved by 2015. Agreed upon by the General Assembly in 2000, they are reflected in the Millennium Declaration. Most targets derive from the global conferences of the 1990s as well as from international norms agreed upon over the past half-century.

The MDGs provide a framework for the international community to work together towards a common end. Progress is measured through 21 targets and 60 official indicators. The MDG Monitor provides annual progress updates using data from UNDP. ECOSOC supports and provides coordination for the General Assembly, which conducts a periodic review of MDG progress, most recently at the 2010 Summit on the MDGs. The MDG Achievement Fund (2006) aims to accelerate progress on the MDGs.

### **The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)**

Created in 1971, CGIAR is a strategic partnership of international agricultural centres. It was started as a network of international agricultural research centres (IARC) working together to create and disseminate improved plant varieties in order to alleviate hunger and poverty. Created by the UN and Bretton Woods institutions with support of key developed country aid agencies, it has its secretariat hosted by the World Bank, which is also its main financial source. An independent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) defines priorities, assesses activities and conducts regular evaluations of the different centres. The CGIAR Consortium selects and defines Mega Programs uniting the IARC and provides a single contact point for donors. CGIAR's monitoring and evaluation framework is designed to conduct review, clarify core responsibilities and reduce duplication. The IARC first mentor and then collaborate with national agricultural research systems (NARS).

## **IV. Performance Criteria for the Framework**

The following performance criteria, based on the proposed functions and needs outlined above, are used to assess each of the models:

- 1) **Global focus for common vision and goals:** and does the model have a scheme for monitoring progress towards the agreed goals and vision?
- 2) **Science base and policy interface:** does the model provide a strong, credible and accessible science base and policy interface and effective mechanisms to disseminate this scientific knowledge to key stakeholders and actors?
- 3) **Support national and regional initiatives:** does the model provide value added including tools, policies, and partnerships and other means of implementation to support existing national and regional initiatives to achieve the agreed goals?
- 4) **Broad participation of stakeholders:** for example, UN agencies, other international and regional institutions, national governments, major groups and other stakeholders (business, civil society). Does the model provide strong incentives for engagement of these different stakeholders?
- 5) **Effective coherence within the UN system:** does the model facilitate effectiveness and coherence in the coordination of policies/programmes and/or build cooperation and synergies within the UN system?
- 6) **Flexibility:** does the model accommodate needs and priorities of different countries at different levels of development, with different resource endowments and institution types? And does the model allow integration of new knowledge and experience, and respond to new and emerging challenges as they arise?

- 7) **Effectiveness/scale of impact in achieving its goals:** is the model effective in delivering support at regional and national levels, in supporting scale up and replication of current best practices, and generating new and innovative ones?
- 8) **Incentives to continuous improvement:** does the framework provide an inducement, support to all stakeholders continuously to enhance the ambition of the goals?
- 9) **Leveraging of resources and action:** does the model help to mobilize technical and financial resources beyond what individual initiatives and programmes in isolation might have been able to achieve?

## V. Comparative Assessment

This section provides an assessment of whether and how far the different models could be expected to meet the needs and perform the functions specified in section II, and how they stack up against the different performance criteria in section IV.

Attached at Annex A is a matrix indicating the main function(s) performed/needs met by each model, along with an evaluation of each model against the performance criteria. It is hoped that the matrix will enable the reader easily to compare the characteristics of the models in terms of needs they can be expected to meet and how effectively they can be expected to meet them.

### Main functions served by models

Although the models address different issues and take different approaches, there are some common features. Each of the models reviewed responds to a global issue that:

- cannot be dealt with by one country acting alone;
- requires global cooperation;
- requires the participation of a wide range of actors for success.

Another feature is they all represent work in progress – none has achieved its goals – and are still evolving. Some have been established for decades and have achieved maturity and credibility and accumulated a wealth of experience on which to draw, while others are relatively young.

Some are already working in areas that contribute to the move towards sustainable consumption and production and could be leveraged.

Most models seek to involve a wide range of actors. There are key differences though in the extent to which the full range of participants is involved in the oversight and governance arrangements. SAICM, GAVI and CGIAR have formal and specific governance arrangements developed by the key partners or stakeholders. SAICM's governing body, the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), provides for full involvement of all stakeholders in its Rules of Procedure, while GAVI and CGIAR have formalised management arrangements that include representatives of the major participants. Both GAVI and CGIAR have substantial fiduciary responsibilities and the relationship between key partners is reflected in legal agreements. The UN-Water, -Energy and -Oceans models (UN interagency models) either have no formal governance, or are limited to representation of UN agencies. The Marrakech Process has an informal Advisory Committee that represents regions and major groups.

### 1) Global focus for common vision and goals:

All models have goals or objectives that provide focus for participants. In the case of the MDGs and the UN interagency model, the goals and the objectives were dictated by intergovernmental decisions. In the case of SAICM, CGIAR and GAVI, they were negotiated in the establishment process. And the vision and goals of the Marrakech Process were developed by its participants, though the mandate to contribute to developing a 10YFP



derives from the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation agreed by UN Member States at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002.

The arrangements for monitoring, evaluation and review are strongest among the two partnerships with the most focus and fiduciary responsibility, namely GAVI and CGIAR. The MDGs are monitored through a UNDP-led process that provides annual updates on progress, along with an annual report to the UN General Assembly. The MDG goals, universally endorsed at the highest levels, have helped galvanize the international community, civil society and the business sector. The strong monitoring component of the MDG model is driven in part at least by the alignment of both Government budgets and donor support to achieving measurable progress towards the goals.

## **2) Science base and policy interface:**

Not all models are scientifically based or directly involved in policy development. The CGIAR, by its nature of being a partnership of research organisations, has a strong science base, and has developed effective mechanisms for disseminating its products through its national partners, through agricultural extension services and through broadcast and other media. In the interagency model, the science and policy base lies mainly with the participating agencies, although they also disseminate information through specific platforms. In both the Marrakech Process and SAICM models, scientific, technical and socio-economic issues are identified and responded to through the models, and dissemination of information uses the structures developed at global, regional and national levels as part of these models. UN-Oceans relies on the core competence of the UN Agencies to bring science and policy knowledge on specific issues. SAICM also relies on distributed knowledge of agencies, private sector, and universities.

## **3) Support national and regional initiatives:**

Both CGIAR and GAVI were established with a comparatively narrow focus and goal. Both deliver specific products (vaccines in the case of GAVI, and the results of agricultural research in the case of CGIAR). GAVI is responsive to national health sector priorities, and CGIAR partners focus on priority areas of agricultural research. Although both have consequences beyond their immediate focus, their primary focus is sectoral. The CGIAR has been instrumental in building the capacity of National Agricultural Research Centres, initially mentoring them and then partnering with them to deliver national products and programs. Their presence in developing countries has been very valuable in that regard. The benefit of the interagency model is that it allows for coordination of product delivery among the participating agencies, although it is clear that there is considerable room for improvement. To varying degrees, the UN-x model engages participating agencies in responding in a coordinated manner to national and regional priorities and needs. UN-Water has a Task Force on country level coherence that aims to improve and scale up delivery of coordinated UN actions in the area of water supply and sanitation. At the same time, these UN coordination mechanisms bring together agencies and entities with different mandates – some more normative and others more operational – and with varying regional and national presence. SAICM's Global Plan of Action (GPA) reflects stakeholder priorities and is the basic guidance tool for implementation of SAICM. The integration of national and regional consultation processes ensures that relevant national and regional initiatives are identified and, where practicable, are the basis for implementing actions, including those undertaken with the support of the financial mechanism. The SAICM model is also effective in identifying gaps that require responses beyond national or regional capability. A similar approach is taken in the Marrakech Process, although less formalised. Regional and national priorities have been identified, and collaborative programs developed and implemented to address them.

## **4) Broad participation of stakeholders:**

The UN interagency model differs from the other models reviewed in that it is mainly limited

to the UN family. UN-Water does partner with other major related organisations, and UN-Oceans encourages major NGO participation in Task Forces. GAVI involves a wide range of stakeholders in the delivery of vaccines: the governance arrangements involve a narrower representation, with legal agreements between key partners. CGIAR also has broad participation of stakeholders in delivery arrangements, but not in the governance. The incentive for participation by stakeholders relates mainly to access to the products – vaccines or research results. Both SAICM and the Marrakech Process have wide participation of stakeholders, but with differing degrees of formality. SAICM is a community of partners, comprising stakeholders from Governments, intergovernmental organizations and civil society, including the private sector. A network of SAICM national and other focal points is maintained by the SAICM secretariat. The designation of focal points provides an important mechanism for communication and for access to support from the SAICM Quick Start Programme Trust Fund. Participation in SAICM involves formal endorsement by the governing bodies or CEOs of agencies. Incentives for participating relate to improved access to funding, knowledge sharing, and potential for collaboration. The Marrakech Process brings together a range of different stakeholders – governments, NGOs, business and industry, researchers and academia, local authorities, intergovernmental organizations, and relevant UN agencies. Incentives for participation relate primarily to knowledge sharing and leveraging capacity by collaboration. The MDGs are a textbook example of how setting a limited number of goals and targets around which there is broad consensus can bring together expertise and commitments from various agencies and major groups, including the business sector.

#### **5) Effective coherence within the UN system:**

All models provide an opportunity for greater coherence in policy and programs within the UN system. The extent to which they are effective depends on the degree of formal involvement and accountability of the agencies. Where it is voluntary, there is less evidence of effectiveness in enhancing coherence. Where it involves either a legal agreement or formal endorsement, then the effectiveness is enhanced. In the case of the MDGs, each agency has the MDGs included in its program and planning structures. In the case of chemicals management, while SAICM involves the participation of all relevant UN agencies, its secretariat and administrative arrangements are based in UNEP. Coordination and coherence within the UN system is achieved mainly through the Inter-organisational Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) which involves the key agencies active in chemicals management. The value added of SAICM is the involvement of the broader range of stakeholders and the capacity for resource mobilisation. The UN-Water carries out its mandate through time-bound task forces that draw on the expertise of specific UN Agencies and other partners as well as providing a platform for coordination among Agencies.

#### **6) Flexibility:**

The majority of the models reviewed provide a direct means of responding to identified needs of countries. The UN interagency model is the exception. In SAICM, the GPA reflects chemicals management needs and priorities of all countries, not only developing countries: some are national, others regional or global in nature. Responses are tailored accordingly and tend to involve a wide range of actors. GAVI and CGIAR both focus on developing countries needs, and respond to emerging issues identified by their stakeholders but also by donors. The MDGs model take into account the needs and priorities of different sectors and groups in developing countries, and is flexible enough to allow for differences in approach: though some stakeholders feel that the poor's voice is not well reflected in the goals. The Marrakech Process features a bottom-up approach that allows for the national and regional priorities to be identified and responded to. A key factor in all models is the delay in responding – this tends to be a function of the meeting cycle of the decision making bodies. However, in the case of SAICM, the Marrakech Process, and UN-Energy, partners can respond directly to requests. A similar situation arises with the MDGs, but the model does not appear to have been effective in responding to emerging issues such as climate change.

#### **7) Effectiveness/scale of impact in achieving its goals:**

Only CGIAR, GAVI and the MDGs have been in operation for a decade or more, and hence provide a sound basis for review of effectiveness. For others, it is only possible to reflect on the progress to date, but conclusions about effectiveness should be drawn cautiously. CGIAR has been in operation since 1971; GAVI and the MDGs were launched in 2000; the Marrakech Process and the UN interagency models in 2003-4; and SAICM in 2006. Both CGIAR and GAVI have the benefit of systematic evaluation processes that allow conclusions to be drawn about their effectiveness. GAVI has enabled higher levels of immunisation and at a faster rate than would otherwise have been possible. CGIAR can demonstrate a 9:1 return on investment in CGIAR and its programs. The annual reporting of the MDGs indicates that the goals are being met in an increasing number of countries. UN-Water has made considerable progress in providing key information to decision makers and in providing a useful platform for addressing key issues and concerns. UN-Oceans reduced its resource needs and increased accountability by establishing a “distributed secretariat” with functions divided among participating organizations. The Marrakech Process has resulted in a widespread improvement in the understanding of SCP issues, and has supported the development of SCP programs in 20 countries and the incorporation of SCP principles into planning processes of 30 more. SAICM so far has been effective in focussing global efforts to achieve sound management of chemicals, and in mobilising efforts of different stakeholders in a coherent manner. Regional meetings are held to review progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach; provide guidance on implementation to all stakeholders at the regional level; and enable technical and strategic discussions and exchange of information. However, the magnitude of the challenge, and the continued growth of production and use of chemicals continues to exceed the capacities of many developing countries, indicating that scaled-up effort is needed.

While it is clear that judgements about effectiveness are influenced by the parameters used to assess achievement of goals, in the models reviewed it does appear that those that have purpose-built governance arrangements, formal structures, dedicated funding and clearly defined goals are more effective.

#### **8) Incentives to continuous improvement:**

In SAICM, financial incentives are available for eligible stakeholders that have formally recognised SAICM. Other incentives flow from the ability to leverage resources through structured collaboration on projects and initiatives. While these enhance the capability of individual countries and partners to achieve SAICM goals, there have not been moves to make the overall goal more ambitious. The monitoring and evaluation programs of CGIAR and GAVI have initiated changes in structure and operations that have resulted in improved performance. Some of the issues triggering the changes included stakeholder perceptions and the scope for greater operational efficiencies. In the MDGs, the annual review by the UNGA provides a clear incentive for countries to improve their performances. The Marrakech Process has provided some financial and technical support for continuous improvement and more action, and some partners have scaled up their ambition and their actions. Still, there is no long-term support, hence little predictability of program continuity. Given that SCP is a broad concept and that much is still to be learned about how best to foster changes in consumption and production patterns, the incentive for continuous improvement is extremely important for the 10YFP.

#### **9) Leveraging of resources and action:**

Both GAVI and CGIAR have access to major resources. The CGIAR’s funding base is the subject of legal agreement with the donors. It is the largest single program supported by the World Bank. It also relies on voluntary funding and funding earned by the research activities of its partners. GAVI’s funding is innovative in that donor countries make 10-20 year legally-binding aid commitments, and the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm)

borrowed against these pledges on capital markets, raising funds that can be disbursed to enable a more concentrated effort early in the program. The MDG Achievement Fund was established to help national governments, local authorities and civil society in their actions towards meeting the goals. The MDGs have also raised resources from the private sector and citizens by setting specific goals and inviting all to contribute. Both SAICM and UN-Water have Funds established to assist with activities. SAICM's Quick Start Program (QSP) provides limited funding for initial enabling activity in the five pre-agreed priority areas. SAICM has also mobilised donor funding for specific initiatives. The Marrakech Process does not have a specific financial mechanism, but has attracted donor contributions in support of its activities, notably but not only the work of the Marrakech Task Forces and the organization of national, regional and international expert meetings. The link between secure and predictable funding, effectiveness and high stakeholder involvement and commitment is apparent.

### **Ability to Support the Functions for SCP**

Though none of the models studied above singly performs all of the functions and satisfies all of the criteria desirable for the 10YFP, it is apparent that each model has features or mechanisms that, if designed into a framework for SCP, would strengthen its performance.

#### **A. Commitment on global common goals and vision:**

Most of the models can claim a common goal and vision. The differences lie in the manner in which the goals and vision are determined. In SAICM the stakeholders established the goal and objectives during the process of negotiating the Strategic Approach – governments and others subsequently formally “signed on” to these to provide the political endorsement. In the Marrakech Process, the participants themselves have developed the vision, but there has been no opportunity for formal endorsement of it. The MDGs were the product of inter-agency negotiation and subsequent endorsement by governments. In both GAVI and CGIAR the goals and vision are developed by the key partners, and reflected in the contractual arrangements that are a feature of those models. The SAICM model appears to provide the best approach for SCP, in that it provides for full participation of a wide range of stakeholders in developing the goal and objectives, and in formalising their commitment. In all cases, the commitment of stakeholders is voluntary and the monitoring is designed principally as a means of determining how enhanced support and effort could accelerate progress toward shared goals.

#### **B. Knowledge sharing and networking:**

The CGIAR and GAVI models have the advantage of being reasonably narrowly focused, having clear mandates and the backing of significant financial resources. Their operation is vertical in nature, delivering products. CGIAR operates a major knowledge bank and is active in disseminating its products. The networking is related to the dissemination of the products and mentoring of national agricultural research systems. Aspects have wider applicability, eg the successful use of the broadcast media, but there is little in those models to foster cross-sectoral national or regional networking. It is not clear the extent to which the MDG process fosters knowledge sharing or networking. To the extent that it happens, it is probably the product of other processes that incidentally contribute to the MDG goals. The same could be said of the UN interagency models that mostly focus on intra-UN agencies' coordination, though the UN-Water platform does contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Both SAICM and the Marrakech Process foster networking at global, regional and national levels. In SAICM, the regional networks are formally established and feed into the ICCM processes. The QSP process also encourages multi-stakeholder approaches. In the Marrakech Process networking occurs through coalitions of interested parties, notably in the task forces but also through regional roundtables and at the International Expert meetings. The SAICM and GAVI models are more amenable to civil society, business and higher education knowledge contributions that will be important in successful implementation of SCP.

Within the community of those engaged in SCP policy and practice, there are specialized sub-communities – e.g., procurement policy makers and practitioners, managers of global supply chains, architects committed to sustainable building design, sustainable urban planners, etc. The most intensive communication is likely to happen among such specialized practitioners, and will happen even without a 10YFP, but such a framework could support effort to make such communities more inclusive – with particular outreach to developing countries – and should also aim to facilitate knowledge sharing and fertilization across communities of practice.

### **C. Enabling frameworks and strategic planning and investment:**

SAICM, GAVI and CGIAR demonstrate the advantages of a stable and predictable funding base to underpin initiatives. GAVI has achieved the most tangible results in this regard. Its practice of rewarding through funding governments that exceed their immunisation targets enables governments to invest in improvements elsewhere in their health systems. CGIAR has also been able to support governments in institutional strengthening of their national agricultural research systems, but evaluations have identified policy research as a weakness in CGIAR. In terms of investment, the CGIAR has been most successful in receiving contributions from the World Bank, development banks and development agencies. SAICM's support of enabling activities through the QSP, and the inter-linkages between the regional and global networking structures, provide a sound framework for supporting governments and accessing knowledge and expertise across sectors. The Marrakech Process structure involving Task Forces and regular forums for exchange of information and experience among practitioners could also be effective, but it lacks a stable and predictable funding base.

### **D. Technical assistance:**

In the GAVI and CGIAR models, the source of technical assistance is narrowly focussed. A CGIAR model for SCP would involve the establishment of regional centres that could create capacity to address SCP issues in their respective regions, and develop tools and other approaches to assist governments and support the various ministries working on SCP. The centres could also serve as catalysts for cooperation and collaboration amongst actors in the region and assist in reducing duplication and in identifying gaps. The other models have the sources of technical assistance dispersed among the participants. Under the SAICM approach, sources of technical assistance are identified through either the clearing house function or the networks, and such assistance is channelled through the UN agencies, bilaterally or as an aspect of projects funded through the QSP. In a Marrakech Process approach, technical assistance would be identified and delivered through the regional and/or thematic networks/programs. There are a number of elements in the CGIAR model that appear to be relevant to the SCP context. The approach of incorporating existing research centres into the consortium, and using them as the focus for regional initiatives could be applied to support the shift to SCP, where there are already centres addressing issues relevant to SCP in most regions (eg, for cleaner production, hazardous wastes, chemicals, as well as centres of UNIDO, WHO and FAO). The SAICM model demonstrates the ability to identify and channel diverse sources of technical assistance, along with the advantage of UN-interagency coordination in delivery of technical assistance.

### **E. Collaboration:**

Given the cross-cutting nature and diversity of potential partners and stakeholders in SCP, the GAVI and CGIAR models do not appear to offer a solution, except as regards the ability of funding to act as a catalyst for collaboration. The MDG approach of setting the goals and allowing all actors to find their best path to meeting those goals may be applicable, if the goals can be set in a way that reflects the aspirations of stakeholders and allows for differentiation among countries based on development, endowments and other factors which may shape their policy priorities. Several models use partnership approaches.. As partnerships should and will have a role to play in implementing a 10YFP, more consideration needs to be

given to an effective partnership model. If greater consistency in approach is required, there will be the need for a common vision and established procedures for development and operation of the partnerships. That in turn requires overall mechanism for oversight of initiatives within the 10YFP to ensure that they are consistent with each other, and to avoid unnecessary overlaps or duplication, while supporting national and regional needs and priorities.

The UN-x model and SAICM both aim with some success to foster greater coherence among multiple initiatives and programmes with overlapping objectives. These could be adapted to fostering greater UN system collaboration, including with the IFIs, on implementing the SCP agenda. The challenge will be for the UN to reach out, engage and interest other partners in collaboration.

#### **F. Awareness raising, education and civil society mobilization:**

The engagement of major groups and civil society will be essential for the successful pursuit of SCP goals. Given the cross cutting nature of SCP, it would seem desirable to engage those groups as equal partners at all levels of the SCP framework. This is the approach followed specifically by SAICM and the Marrakech Process. It is followed to a lesser extent with GAVI in relation to vaccine delivery and the promotion of immunisation campaigns. In the case of SAICM, business, civil society and academia participate directly as well as through the formal regional and national networks. Development and implementation of broad scale public awareness campaigns is facilitated and supported through the QSP. The MDGs approach also utilises a wide range of partnerships, campaigns and actions, including high level advocacy, to inform and mobilise stakeholders. It is unlikely though that SCP will achieve the status of the MDGs, and hence the SAICM approach would be more realistic and applicable.

## **VI. Conclusions**

The Marrakech Process is the only model reviewed that was established specifically for meeting SCP related goals, and which is contributing directly to their achievement. Of the others, CGIAR and SAICM contribute incidentally to SCP goals and will continue to do so regardless of any formal link to SCP. But in their current form, no model on its own would deliver all the functions outlined in Section II and adequately meet all performance criteria.

It is clear, though, that a suitable framework can be developed, drawing on best experiences and mechanisms from each model. Each of the models reviewed has features that could be incorporated into the institutional structure for the 10YFP and contribute to the achievement of the functions set out in Section II. The selection of the features, and the manner in which they are put together, depends to a large extent on the level of political support and ambition for the 10YFP, and whether it is believed that incremental change, building on the current initiatives, can achieve the shift in attitude and practices necessary to achieve a broad shift to SCP patterns.

A 10YFP could be based on a shared vision – one which recognizes common but differentiated responsibilities – and which defines ambitious but realistic goals for different groups of countries, achievable in a 10-year time frame (2011-21). The MDG goals, universally endorsed at the highest levels, have for instance helped set the agenda for and galvanized the international community, civil society and the business sector around those goals. The CSD could use the vision and goals developed under the Marrakesh Process as a starting point for discussing vision and goals as part of a 10YFP.<sup>5</sup> High level endorsement

---

<sup>5</sup> Paving the Way to Sustainable Consumption and Production Marrakech Process Progress Report including Elements for a 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable

would be necessary to bring SCP out of the realm of the environment ministries and into the realm of the other important ministries such as industry, finance, and economics ministries.

The Marrakesh Process highlights that priority actions and programmes will vary across countries and regions at different levels of development, with different levels of resource endowments and institutional types. Thus, goals must be broad enough to galvanize action and flexible enough to allow for variations in national and regional programs.

Given the breath of the SCP agenda, a dual track approach might be considered to endorse immediately goals in areas where consensus is emerging such as in energy, water and material efficiency and to develop those goals in other areas where consensus will have to be built by all stakeholders over time such as in sustainable consumption and lifestyles.

Rapid implementation of the 10YFP will likely require dedicated funds to encourage governments and stakeholders to prioritize SCP, to support demonstration projects, and in the process to initiate a cycle of learning on SCP, as in SAICM and the CGIAR. Countries could have also access to achievement funds modelled after the MDG Achievement Fund or the SAICM Quick Start Programme to encourage a higher level of ambition in their goals.

A 10YFP would benefit from a formal structure for knowledge sharing, tool building, networking, and delivery of technical assistance. National focal points could be identified as links between national programmes and regional SCP knowledge centers, possibly located within existing research centers, think tanks, and universities. The regional centers would presumably have different areas of focus and expertise, depending on regional priorities. Networks of such centers and national institutions could be formed around specific SCP issues. As with the CGIAR experience with the national agricultural research systems, these centers may initially need capacity building, for which an initial programme of technical support could be envisaged.

Member States and other stakeholders will want to consider, as they discuss the shape of the 10YFP, the following:

- How important is a shared vision and common goals? How broad or specific should the goals be? How should they be differentiated across countries at different levels of development?
- How formal an institutional structure would be desirable for a 10YFP?
- What sort of governance structure would be desirable for a 10YFP? Should it be decentralized/distributed or should there be an overarching governing body? If the latter, with what representation?
- How should civil society, business and sub-national entities participate in governance and implementation of the 10YFP?
- What secretariat functions are needed and who should perform them? Should they be divided among organizations/agencies in accordance with comparative expertise, or centralized in a single entity?
- What sort of funding will be needed to support the 10YFP, for what purpose? The same for technical assistance, which also may require funding?
- How would progress in implementation be monitored and reported and to what forum, to ensure progress towards establishing SCP patterns?
- What approach, ground rules should be used for developing and selecting priority programmes to be included in the 10YFP?

---

Consumption and Production (SCP). Marrakech Process Secretariat (UNDESA and UNEP) with input from the Advisory Committee, 2010. Background paper to Commission on Sustainable Development, Eighteenth session, 3-14 May 2010, CSD18/2010/BP4.

<b>Model</b>	<b>SAICM</b>	<b>GAVI</b>	<b>Marrakech Process (MP)</b>	<b>Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)</b>	<b>CGIAR</b>	<b>UN-Water, -Energy, -Oceans</b>
<b>Main Function(s)</b>	To coordinate, catalyse, facilitate and provide greater coherence in global actions on sound management of chemicals. Established 2006, SAICM operates under its own governance arrangements that were adopted as part of its establishment.	To increase access to immunisation in poor countries. Launched in 2000. GAVI operates under specific statutes and by-laws developed and agreed by its partners	To provide a global and multi-stakeholder platform for SCP knowledge and experience sharing. Launched in 2003, Task Forces are voluntary initiatives led by governments, which - in co-operation with various other partners from the North and the South and support from UNEP and DESA - commit themselves to carrying out a set of concrete activities at a national or regional level that promote a shift to SCP patterns.	A set of eight comprehensive and specific development goals that 192 United Nations member States and at least 23 international organizations have agreed to achieve by the year 2015. Adopted in 2000.	Mobilizing scientific research to achieve sustainable food security and reduce poverty in developing countries. Established in 1971, it operates as a loose association of autonomous research centers and interested donors that share objectives but pursue them with only weak strategic coordination. As the result of several evaluations, CGIAR will move to a new model that emphasizes binding contractual obligations and clear lines of accountability.	The three programs all aim to promote system-wide collaboration with a coherent and consistent approach. Established in 2003-4.



**Performance Criteria:**

<b>1) Provide global focus for common vision and goals</b>	The global focus is reflected in the goal and the five priority themes for achieving it. The governing body reviews stakeholders' reports and overall progress triennially.	Its vision and four strategic goals were developed by its partners and are supported by a broad range of stakeholders from the public and private sectors. Its governance includes formalised program evaluation.	The two objectives – sustainable consumption and sustainable production -- provide a global focus. The 7 Task Forces have objectives that are developed collaboratively by the participating stakeholders. Being informal, the MP does not integrate any formal monitoring and accountability mechanisms. Monitoring is through the international review meetings and reporting at different levels.	The goals were adopted by a consensus of experts from the United Nations Secretariat, the IMF, OECD and the World Bank. The 8 MDGs provide a framework for the entire international community to work together towards a common end. The MDG Monitor provides annual updates on how countries are progressing in their efforts to achieve the MDGs using the latest information from United Nations Development Program (UNDP).	The vision and strategic objectives provide the focus for the strategic partnership of international agricultural research centres of CGIAR. There are formal monitoring and evaluation procedures addressing performance and fiduciary aspects. The mega-programs are externally evaluated.	The mechanisms have no specifically developed vision and goals. Goals and objectives in the three areas derive from other forums or bodies (eg Agenda 21, CSD or JPOI). The UN-Water, Energy and Oceans programmes aim to create coherence within the UN system for achieving these goals and objectives.
--	---	---	--	---	--	---

**2) Science base and policy interface**

The functions of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) include promoting scientific cooperation and focusing attention and calling for appropriate action on emerging policy issues. Scientific associations are among the stakeholder groups that have participated in the development and implementation of SAICM alongside Government policy makers. Opportunities for this interface have included the discussion of emerging policy issues by the ICCM and the undertaking of projects under the Quick Start Programme (QSP).

GAVI was established not as a scientific or policy development forum but as a means of delivering mass immunization in delivering countries. Necessarily its strategy for effective immunization is science-based. Health policy frameworks in participating countries are important to effective delivery.

Participation of governments and other stakeholders provides an active policy interface. Technical and economic issues are addressed. However, the MP does not yet incorporate mechanisms to provide a strong science base and policy interface that would ensure coordinated and systematic inputs/guidance from the scientific community to SCP policy-making processes. Closer linkages e.g. with the Resource Panel could address this shortcoming.

CGIAR's focus is on research on crop productivity, forestry and agroforestry, water management, aquaculture, and livestock. All knowledge produced is freely available through its website, two databases, and documents. Intellectual property is widely accessible. Print and broadcast media are used to make activities better known to the public.

In general, the science base lies with the participating organisations. Information and knowledge is made public through a range of media, including a "wiki" approach that offers the potential for involving major groups in UN-Water's work and increasing the body of knowledge available to all users of the internet.

### 3) Support national and regional initiatives

SAICM's Global Plan of Action (GPA) reflects needs and priorities identified by stakeholders, and serves as a working tool and guidance document to support SAICM at the national and regional levels.

GAVI is responsive to national health sector priorities developed in line with national plans and strategies.

The MP is basically a "demand driven" approach, responding to identified needs and priorities at the national and regional levels.

The MDGs provide the framework within which countries may plan their social and economic development. They were conceived to apply and be tailored to national conditions.

While the CGIAR's research centres are distributed equally around the world, one or two regions are emphasised, particularly Africa. CGIAR works with national agricultural research systems (NARS).

UN-Water facilitates and supports work being carried out at the regional and sub-regional levels, both within the UN System and with partners. Regional UN-Water arrangements are expected to operate based on terms of reference and work plans that are coherent and aligned with those of UN-Water itself, considering the specific priorities of each region.

### 4) Broad participation

SAICM is a community of partners, comprising stakeholders from Governments, intergovernmental organizations and civil society, including the private sector. A network of SAICM national and other focal points is maintained by the SAICM secretariat. The designation of focal points provides an important mechanism for communication and for access to support from the SAICM Quick Start Programme Trust Fund. The governance of SAICM comprises representatives of governments, UN organisations and programmes, and non-government organisations (including from environment, industry and health sectors). Commitment to SAICM is at governing body or CEO level. Incentive to commit derives

GAVI is a partnership representing a wide range of stakeholders. Participation of multilateral organisations is limited (WHO, UNICEF and World Bank). Civil society is actively engaged. Governments are able to leverage their resources through participation. The GAVI Alliance is governed by the GAVI Alliance Board. It establishes all policies, oversees the operations of the Alliance and

The MP brings together different stakeholders – governments, NGOs, business and industry, researchers and academia, local authorities, intergovernmental organizations, relevant UN agencies, among others. The MP Advisory Committee includes government representatives from all regions, representatives of the Task Forces and Major Groups. Multi-stakeholder policy dialogues and consultations at the

The MDGs provide the framework for governments, various agencies and major groups to work toward common goals. Although implementation of the MDGs has fostered many examples of collaboration and partnership (eg, The MDG Monitor, Global Compact's Private Sector Forum, Global Business Coalition on HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria (GBC), Stand up against Poverty!, etc) there is no specific

CGIAR has 64 Members (21 developing & 26 developed countries, 4 co-sponsors and 13 international organizations). During the course of 2009, the CGIAR Centers worked together to design the new Consortium of CGIAR Centers. All the Centers have signed the Consortium's Establishment Agreement. The Consortium is a legal entity established to lead, coordinate and support the Centers. The Consortium leads

UN-Water's specific activities and programmes are hosted by individual member agencies on behalf of UN-Water. Senior programme managers from UN-Water member agencies meet twice a year. An elected chair and a vice chair, which rotate among UN agencies usually every two years, represent UN-Water at international conferences, major fora and processes and oversee the implementation of the UN-Water work programme. A permanent Secretariat, hosted by the United

from ability to work collectively on issues of global concern, the equal status and opportunity for full participation given to all stakeholders, and the opportunities for targeted resource mobilisation

monitors programme implementation. With membership drawn from a range of partner organisations, as well as experts from the private sector, the Board provides a forum for balanced strategic decision making, innovation and partner collaboration. In addition to the GAVI Alliance Board, GAVI relies upon two other boards - the IFFIm Board and the GAVI Fund Affiliate Board - who administer the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm), an innovative financing mechanism established to fund GAVI programmes.

national and regional levels were conducted; the seven Task Forces engage governments and multi-stakeholder partners. The Task Forces have developed tools, projects and policy recommendations to support and complement existing national and regional strategies and initiatives. Participatory processes aimed at UN agencies, civil society and the business sector have been sporadically active. Incentives for participation relate primarily to knowledge sharing and leveraging capacity by collaboration.

governance arrangement to oversee the implementation process other than the UNGA.

the formulation of CGIAR's Strategy and Results Framework, and the development of research programs under the strategy. CGIAR Centres also work with national and regional agricultural research institutes, national governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector.

Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) in New York, provides administrative, technical and logistical support. Major related organizations (professional unions or association or other civil-society groups) can be partners. UN-Energy involves UN agencies, funds, programmes and conventions and the World Bank on an informal and voluntary basis, but less than half participate regularly. Membership of UN-Oceans is limited to UN agencies, but international NGOs are encouraged to contribute to the activities of the Task Forces.

**5) Coherence within the UN system**

The key UN agencies involved with chemicals participate in SAICM, both directly and through the aegis of the IOMC. In that regard, the SAICM model constitutes a UN interagency framework in relation to chemicals. Each agency has recognised SAICM with a view to incorporating it in their programmes, thus enabling SAICM activities to be set within broader initiatives. The agencies also serve on the funding mechanism established under SAICM (the Quick Start Programme).

WHO and UNICEF, along with the World Bank, are active partners.

UNEP and DESA are key agencies supporting the MP. Other agencies are involved on a voluntary basis - UNECE and UNESCO are engaged on education for sustainable consumption and lifestyles; UNIDO and UNECA on technical cooperation with Africa and UNIDO on cleaner production centers; ILO on sustainable public procurement: & UN WTO on sustainable tourism.

The MDG-model is an initiative of the United Nations, and the 191 United Nations member States and at least 23 international organizations have agreed to achieve the MDGs. All UN agencies have integrated the MDGs into their programmes and agency goals. The expertise of all agencies is brought to bear on a well-focused and defined problem.

FAO. WFP, IFAD, the World Bank, regional banks, and UNDP are co-sponsors of CGIAR, but their programs are not well aligned.

Greater cooperation, coordination and coherence are common aspirations for all the areas, however it is not clear the extent to which this is achieved. The voluntary nature of involvement, and the lack of agreement on roles (eg, with UN-Energy) limits the effectiveness.

**6) Flexibility: - country, regional, stakeholder differentiation**

Stakeholders commit to SAICM in accordance with their own needs and capabilities. The GPA reflects national needs and priorities. The QSP provides funding for eligible stakeholders for enabling activities.

GAVI focuses on poor countries with limited infrastructure and health system capability.

The MP allows the identification of specific needs and priorities per region and different levels of development. The Task Forces are decentralised and driven by governments. New task forces can be created in response to emerging priorities.

The eight MDGs are supposed to take into account needs and priorities of different sectors and groups. The MDGs are flexible enough to allow these different regional priorities. At the same time, the model does not easily accommodate new goals.

UN-Water has identified a need to work more proactively in identifying emerging trends and challenges and develop, with its members and partners, collaborative response. In UN-Energy, individual members respond to requests for energy related projects.

**- addressing new and emerging issues**

There is a formal process through the ICCM for identifying & responding to emerging issues. Information dissemination is done through the clearing house activities, and the programmes of the stakeholders including IGOs. Improvements in the level and availability of information are necessary if SAICM's 2020 goal is to be achieved.

The formalised evaluation processes provide lessons learned that are taken into account in policy and programme development.

Transfer and take up of new knowledge and experience is achieved through continuous dialogue and consultations; so far, identifying sources of funding support for creating task forces or other vehicles to address new priority areas has been difficult.

The MDGs have shown weaknesses in taking into account emerging issues such as climate change.

The focus of the Centres' research, the significant spillovers of their activities, their strong interaction with NARS, and their autonomy to pursue their specific missions, have been crucial for the Centres' successful performance. However, changing circumstances, including the broadening of the Centres' mandates, the reduction in unrestricted funding, and the growing role of the private sector in agricultural research, have required significant adjustments in the policies and organization of the CGIAR.

UN-Energy has taken up new joint initiatives, e.g. on energy access and efficiency, based on priorities identified by senior management of the UN system.

**7) Effectiveness/  
scale of impact**

SAICM has been effective in focussing global efforts to achieve sound management of chemicals, and in mobilising efforts of different stakeholders in a coherent manner. Regional meetings are held to review progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach; provide guidance on implementation to all stakeholders at the regional level; and enable technical and strategic discussions and exchange of information. However, the magnitude of the challenge, compounded by the continued growth of production and use of chemicals, continues to exceed the capacities of many developing countries.

GAVI is recognized as an effective mechanism. Since 2000, immunization programmes funded by the GAVI Alliance has averted an estimated 3.4 million deaths in developing countries. It has been innovative and effective in raising and disbursing funds. Its procedures for guaranteeing pricing of vaccines have accelerated their development, manufacture and use.

As well as enabling widespread improvement in the understanding of SCP, the MP has supported the development of SCP programs in approx. 20 countries, and the incorporation of SCP principles in 30 more. Measuring the effectiveness and scale of impact of the MP in changing consumption and production patterns remains very challenging, due to the informality of the process, great number of sectors, activities and actors involved, and the absence of specific targets and use of evaluation tools, indicators and procedures.

Of the 117 countries for which data are available, 63 are now on track to meet the MDGs compared with only 46 countries in 2006. National governments and their partners, even in countries lagging far behind on many MDGs do have a good sense of the programmes and interventions required to meet the MDGs.

Estimates of the return on investment indicate that, for each \$1 invested in CGIAR research, \$9 worth of additional food is produced in developing countries. Other evaluations indicate that CGIAR has had big impacts on reducing poverty.

UN-Waters' impact is in 4 areas: coordinated responses and better program delivery; information to inform decision making; focus on, and response to, emerging water issues; and unique interagency discussion platform on key issues and concerns. Impact of the other two initiatives is more limited.

**8) Incentives to continuous improvement**

Financial incentives are available for eligible stakeholders that have formally recognised SAICM. Other incentives flow from the ability to leverage resources through structured collaboration on projects and initiatives. Both enable participants to improve their performance and individual goals. To date, there have been no moves to make the overall goal of SAICM more ambitious; a decade remains till the target date for achieving the goal in any case.

Stable funding allows countries to plan and finance their immunisation programmes. Financial incentives that exist for countries to exceed targets can be used for improving national health systems.

The MP provided a forum open to all stakeholders for discussing SCP challenges, identifying priorities and building new partnerships. The dissemination of information, good practices and tools has encouraged further participation and support. The number of partners involved in the MP and its various activities within the Task Forces has continuously increased. Despite the absence of a stable funding mechanism, funding opportunities within the Task Forces encouraged the development of initiatives and partnerships.

The MDG Review 2010 helped to galvanize interest around MDG progress. The review provided an incentive for national governments and other stakeholders to address areas where goals are not on track and it also gave ammunition to civil society and government officials in the respective ministries to push for faster progress.

The CGIAR's organization and programming approach has efficiently changed over time in order continuously to improve the work and adapt to new mandates. In 2010 a new structure was adopted to overcome inefficiencies arising from overlaps in mandates, cumbersome monitoring and review procedures, an inability to harmonize funding and resource allocation, and a lack of authority to enforce decisions.

UN-Water: Pressure from partners and members is the biggest incentive for continuous improvement. UN-Energy: internal and external reviews are the most important sources of criticism and recommendations for improvement on the current practices. UN-Oceans: Annual meetings have been instituted to review progress made by the thematic Task Forces, the developments relating to the Regular Process, and other ongoing (inter-agency) activities.



**9) Leveraging of resources and action**

SAICM includes a dedicated financial mechanism (QSP) for initial enabling or capacity building activities related to the five priority areas. The QSP has also been used to channel funds for meeting multilateral environment agreement commitments in African, Caribbean and Pacific countries.

GAVI's innovative financing facility uses governments' long term funding commitments to raise funds in the capital market. This enables investment to be "front loaded", allowing more timely and concentrated immunisation campaigns.

The MP is supported by ad hoc contributions. It does not have a formalised financial mechanism. Finance raised in this way for Marrakech Process activities amounts to approximately \$5 million. The bottom-up approach means that programme development has not been very strategic, and funding secured has come from a limited number of sources (mainly EU member states, the EC, plus Norway and Switzerland). The finance has so far been mainly sourced from Environment Ministries and is limited in scale.

The MDG Achievement Fund, established in 2006, is an international cooperation mechanism whose aim is to accelerate progress on the MDGs. The Fund supports national governments, local authorities and citizen organizations in their efforts to tackle poverty and inequality. Official development assistance (ODA) is the key source of MDG finance, especially for least developed countries which lack the infrastructure necessary to attract private capital flows and to support the MDGs. However, it is clear that delivery of ODA will fall well short of the targets set for 2015

The CGIAR Consortium provides a single contact point for donors. 30% of funding is from the World Bank. Other funding is from members and others, and from Center-earned income. The donors can designate their funds to: unrestricted funding to the entire CGIAR program portfolio; programmatic funding for one or more Mega Program(s); or institutional funding for one or more Center(s). Since these contributions to the CGIAR are entirely voluntary, the level of funding is one of the constant challenges faced by CGIAR's management and the Centres themselves. So far, however, the CGIAR has been successful in securing funding for the Centre's activities, perhaps because of demonstrated effectiveness.

UN-Water: a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), administered by United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), has been established to strengthen UN-Water activities. UN-Energy and UN-Oceans do not have structured resource mobilisation mechanisms, but rely on funding from individual members or other financial institutions (eg the GEF)

## 10) Conclusion

There are strong inter-linkages between chemicals management and SCP. Hence, implementation of SAICM can be seen as a contribution to the objectives of SCP and sustainable development more broadly. However SAICM's focus is limited to chemicals. Its structure reflects many features relevant to SCP. Its performance to date demonstrates many of the problems faced in addressing an issue that is not only cross-cutting, but also essential to achieve development targets.

Key features relevant for 10YFP include: high-level political support; global program of action; broad stakeholder involvement in decision making; and dedicated funding source to catalyse action in countries.

While the overall structure and organisation components are representative of other public/private partnerships, the differences lie in the key operating elements being incorporated (with consequent legal identities), the narrow and clearly defined focus, and the innovative financing mechanism. These aspects do not seem applicable in the SCP context. GAVI's governance arrangements are formal, specific to GAVI, provide for key partner involvement and institutionalised monitoring and evaluation, and are a key factor in GAVI's performance.

The MP has features that are key to the 10YFP for SCP, eg, arrangements for engagement & participation of a wide range of stakeholders in working towards common goals and vision, agenda setting, and knowledge and experience sharing. The MP also clearly supports national and regional priorities. The weaknesses relate to the low level of a formal political or international commitment and the lack of financial mechanisms to support implementation. Likewise, formal monitoring and evaluation are lacking. The feature most relevant for a 10YFP is the flexibility of the MP and ability to respond to demand and specific needs on SCP, while triggering broad multi-stakeholder participation.

The strengths of the MDG Model are its clear, limited number of goals and targets that are endorsed at the highest level. There is a periodic UN General Assembly review of MDG progress. The approach of setting the goal and giving flexibility to all partners to achieve them the best way they can, is one of the major strengths of this model. The dedicated fund has also helped bring together all actors for implementation at the national level. The MDG targets take a long time to achieve, and donors are hesitant to commit to making open-ended long-term commitments during which the policy environment may change drastically.

The CGIAR model is one of partnerships at different levels, and with different degrees of formality. A major strength of CGIAR is its governance arrangement that involves directly the key partners. The major outcome of the CGIAR model is its applied research, and its role in increasing developing countries' capacity to conduct such research by mentoring national agricultural research centers and then partnering with them. Sustainable agriculture and food security, two topics of importance for SCP, are covered by the research centres. The CGIAR products are important for SCP, as are some aspects of the structures. The feature of CGIAR most interesting and relevant for a 10YFP is the networked regional centres model. Also, the fact that there are very concrete measures of success is a plus.

The three UN interagency models have evolved differently. UN-Water is the most formal model, with dedicated funds and strong coordination, which foster ownership and coherence inside the UN system on water related issues. It includes a strong Result Based Framework to achieve externally determined objectives. UN-Energy is still very informal, without clear goals and objectives and dedicated resources. Yet, UN-Energy is the only model that has set targets to be achieved. UN-Ocean demonstrates that, for politically sensitive issues, the partnership model will most likely be limited to developing tools and sharing knowledge without setting specific goals or targets. The most interesting feature of UN-Water is the results-based framework, which could be a model for funding support to SCP initiatives. Inter-agency coordination is a positive feature shared by all three.