



United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.: General

30 November 2025

Original: English

Outcome Document of the Third Ad-Hoc Open-Ended Meeting of the Seventh Edition of UNEP's Global Environment Outlook (GEO-7): GEO-7 Summary for Policymakers (SPM) Review and Approval Meeting

145 participants from 67 Member States, 1 member of specialized agency, 6 Major Groups and Stakeholders, Meeting Co-Chairs and Members of the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Meeting, GEO-7 Assessment Co-Chairs, Co-chairs of the Multidisciplinary Expert Scientific Advisory Group (MESAG) and the Intergovernmental Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (IMAG), GEO-7 Authors, and Members of the UNEP GEO-7 Secretariat, gathered in Nairobi in a hybrid meeting to review and approve the SPM of the Seventh Global Environment Outlook (GEO-7). The agenda for the meeting can be found [here](#).

Meeting Summary:

On Monday 27, October 2025, the Ad Hoc Open-ended Meeting for the review and approval of the Second Order Draft (SOD) of the SPM of GEO-7 commenced with opening remarks from Meeting Co-chair Mr. Lorenzo Ciccarese (Italy) and introductions of the meeting's Bureau members: Ms. Anna Mampye (South Africa), Mr. Miroslav Havránek (Czech Republic), in absentia, Mr. Alberto Capra (Argentina) and Dr. Thuraya Said Al Sariri (State of Oman).

UNEP Executive Director, Ms. Inger Andersen expressed appreciation to the various contributors including the meeting bureau, authors, fellows, major groups and stakeholders, Member States, MESAG, IMAG, and funders. She underscored GEO-7's role in advancing multilateralism and noted the impact of emerging technologies, such as Artificial Intelligence, on future environmental assessments. She noted that GEO-7 was positioned as a scientific tool to inform policymaking and support Member States at the seventh session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-7) in addressing global environmental challenges.

In addition, several Member States also provided their general remarks welcoming the GEO-7 report and commending UNEP and its partners for their efforts and engagement during its development.

- Argentina valued the scientific work that underpinned the GEO-7 and recognized its importance as a tool to inform decision-making. Argentina emphasized the shared objective should be to

deliver a policy-relevant rather than policy-prescriptive summary, which provided sound scientific information applicable to all regions and circumstances without suggesting specific policy pathways. Argentina indicated it wished to disassociate itself from references to the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. Argentina also reiterated its position regarding gender equality, referring to equality between men and women. Argentina noted it would work to ensure the use of multilaterally agreed language throughout the SPM. Argentina finally observed it remained committed to engaging constructively in a balanced and consensus-based outcome that strengthens the scientific foundation for environmental action while fully respecting multilateral principles and national sovereignty.

- Chile welcomed the pragmatic approach of GEO-7, which consisted of the system transformation of economy, food, energy, etc, to inform policymaking. Chile also welcomed the inclusion of the natural capital approach that considered the human well-being and economic instruments that support the transformation into decision-making.
- The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK) welcomed the GEO-7 report and stressed that the SPM must uphold scientific integrity, accurately reflect evidence—particularly on global warming rates—and remain consistent with IPCC findings. It raised concerns about assigning policy options to income groups without clear sources and urged framing recommendations as evidence-based rather than prescriptive. It highlighted that references to principles such as “Common but Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR)” should be avoided to maintain neutrality, while regional differences in priorities and capabilities should be better highlighted. The UK supported robust evidence-based measures, including sustainable diets, and called for alignment with internationally agreed language and balanced coverage of ecosystems. The UK shared it was committed to collaboration, and it aimed to strengthen the SPM and ensure a successful outcome in the week’s negotiations.
- The European Union (EU) and its Member States indicated they looked forward to reviewing the SPM with colleagues to ensure delivering an informative and policy-relevant summary, which should not be policy-prescriptive. The EU believed that the SPM must underline the sense of urgency in addressing the global environmental crises. Additionally, the EU sought to ensure that the SPM maintains scientific integrity and credibility in line with the GEO-7 main assessment report and ensure that the SPM is policy relevant.
- Armenia fully supported the proposed policy responses and solution pathways to address the interconnected challenges in climate change, biodiversity loss, pollution, and land degradation. Armenia extended their warm invitations to all parties and stakeholders to participate in the COP17 of the Convention on Biological Diversity to be held in October 2026 in Yerevan, to achieve the global ambition on biodiversity conservation and environmental sustainability.
- Saudi Arabia emphasized the importance of using agreed multilateral language and maintaining clear differentiation between developed and developing countries, aligning with Argentina. Saudi Arabia noted that it did not align with the language on sustainable systems of production and consumption, replacement of fossil fuels, potential competition with food production from biofuels without tailored support and equitable solutions, and the electrifying sectors.
- Brazil underscored the importance of ensuring that the SPM remained clear, balanced, and policy relevant, without being prescriptive. It highlighted that the SPM should convey the main findings of the GEO-7 in an accessible language and in full alignment with previously agreed terminology under the Multilateral Environmental Agreements and United Nations Resolutions. Brazil highlighted the role of the SPM was not to create new policy obligations, nor to provide guidance on how countries should implement their commitments under the existing conventions.

- The Russian Federation welcomed the gathering and noted the general and regional parts of the SPM were generally characterized by qualified presentation of the material, and the main conclusions did not raise fundamental objections. The revised summary rightly highlighted the unprecedented and mutually reinforcing impacts of climate change, biodiversity loss, pollution, and land degradation, which potentially threaten irreversible harm to atmosphere, land, oceans and seas and freshwater systems. Several proposals, such as advancing innovative technologies, promoting inclusive circular economies, and accelerating poverty reduction, deserved comprehensive support.
- Côte d'Ivoire considered the science was the earth of development. Côte d'Ivoire mentioned it was committed to overcoming the challenge of science by education and research as essential pillars of sustainable development. Côte d'Ivoire noted it had established a new climate challenge governance system and welcomed bringing science and political decision makers closer and providing a rapid and concrete response to the environmental challenges of our time.
- China expressed their gratitude to UNEP as well as the expert team from MESAG and IMAG for their hard work. China emphasized that the purpose of the GEO-7 report was to provide scientific and strategic guidance to all countries to address environmental challenges and issues in the future, therefore its language should be positive and confident. Additionally, China called for scientific rigor and avoidance of non-peer-reviewed sources.
- Cuba appreciated inviting Cuba to the meeting and found the report useful for governments and policy makers.
- Colombia welcomed the GEO-7 report which offers a unique evidence-based window into the state of our planet, but the value of that knowledge depended entirely on what is done with it. Colombia urged actionable messaging on prompt decisions, shifts in investments, and change in practices.
- The Scientific and Technology Major Group expressed gratitude to the GEO team, IMAG and MESAG for their inclusion into the GEO process. They advocated for inclusion of Citizen Science as a data collection tool in the GEO-7 SPM.
- The Indigenous Peoples Major Group appreciated the consideration and acceptance of Indigenous Knowledge into the GEO-7 report. They were also very grateful for the three Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge global dialogues organised by the GEO-7 Secretariat that collected information regarding how the knowledge and practices of Indigenous Peoples contributed to addressing environmental crises. The Women's Major Group emphasized the importance of women empowerment to attain global environment justice and expressed the expectation on enhanced gender equity into the transformation in the GEO-7 report.

Following the adoption of the agenda of the meeting and according to the GEO procedures, the GEO-7 main assessment report was formally accepted by Member States following confirmation of the positive validation opinions issued by the IMAG and MESAG. The acceptance followed the proposal from the GEO-7 Assessment Co-chairs to delete *Annex 1 Regional Priorities*, which listed countries and regions deemed unnecessary. Member States reaffirmed that the SPM must remain science-based and aligned with the GEO-7 main assessment report, GEO procedures document, and GEO-7 scoping document.

Delegates discussed the second order draft of the GEO-7 SPM, line by line, one paragraph at a time, from Monday, 27 October 2025, to Friday, 31 October 2025, in plenary. Furthermore, delegations agreed to revisit the Key Messages of the SPM after completing the review and approval of Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the SPM, acknowledging that the authors required additional time to revise the Key Messages based on the agreed content of the reviewed sections.

Friends of the Chair groups were established to resolve more contentious issues. Some agreement emerged on those issues such as the approval of an SPM chapeau clarifying the document's non-prescriptive nature, but consensus failed on major terminology and policy-related sections. Disagreement persisted on issues such as conflict linkages, gender-related terminology, fossil fuels, harmful subsidies, food sovereignty, grouping of countries by income, taxation reforms, and circular economy elements.

By 19:20 hours on Friday 31 October 2025, only about 55% of the SPM was reviewed, with many sections still bracketed. Considering the adopted agenda and modality alignment of ensuring review and approval by consensus, the meeting co-chair, Mr. Lorenzo Ciccicarese, announced the end of the agenda item 5 on the SPM review.

Closing Session

The meeting co-chair, Mr. Miroslav Havránek, invited UNEP's legal advisor, Mr. Gerhard Kreutzer, to guide delegations through the approval process of the SPM. Considering the rules of procedure laid out in the GEO procedures document as explained, Mr. Miroslav Havránek, announced that no approval of the GEO-7 SPM had been achieved. Member States did not raise any objections to the announcement.

Meeting co-chair, Mr. Miroslav Havránek, invited Member States, Major Groups and Stakeholders, and other interested parties to provide final remarks before closure of the meeting:

- UK delivered a statement on behalf of 35 delegations: Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Italy, Japan, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine. The statement was supported by the nine Major Groups and Stakeholders. They expressed its deepest gratitude to the co-chairs, to the authors and the GEO-7 secretariat for their excellent work and strong efforts. They said that the report shows governments and stakeholders what transformations are required and what solutions pathways are available to address the global environmental crises. Further the UK et al. stated that the mentioned delegations consistently prioritized upholding the scientific integrity of the SPM review process, respecting the findings of the scientific community while adhering to the procedures. They also regretted that the process to approve the Summary for Policymakers didn't reach a successful outcome. However, they also noted that the accepted GEO-7 main assessment report and its findings are available for governments and other stakeholders and will be launched at UNEA-7. ***(The full statement is reflected on its integrity in the meeting report as requested by the delegations in Annex 2).***
- Saudi Arabia stated that although the meeting did not achieve an approval of the SPM, the GEO-7 main scientific report with data and facts would guide nations, and from which countries can learn and put to good use. Saudi Arabia also thanked other delegations for the constructive negotiations.
- Argentina expressed the frustration and disappointment with the outcome of the meeting. However, Argentina thanked the co-chairs, authors, IMAG, MESAG, and Secretariat. Argentina also highlighted that the process would inform future assessments and confirmed its commitment to a more sustainable future.
- The Russian Federation expressed gratitude to the authors and co-chairs, appreciated the respectful review process and highlighted that a way forward can be found in the future.
- Iran (Islamic Republic of) appreciated the GEO Team and the hundreds of scientists and emphasized that the main assessment report will remain as the legacy of this team, and that it will be used as a reference and expressed regret for not having an approved SPM.

- Brazil appreciated the co-chairs, Secretariat, authors and all delegations, and expressed the importance of the role of scientific assessments and evidence-based decision-making on environmental issues. They recognized the meeting could not fully review the SPM document, which they regretted but noted the work done during the week will help pave the way for UNEA-7. Brazil thanked everyone for their professionalism, dedication and contributions, and noted that science and policy must work together for a sustainable future for all.
- The United States of America (USA) expressed their appreciation to the Secretariat and authors for all their hard work and mentioned several areas of concern that they were not in agreement with: climate change, financial flows, circular economy, phasing out fossil fuels, plant-based proteins, CBDR language, the Paris Agreement, and references to the SDGs. They added that the USA remains committed to pragmatic and science-based approaches. They also supported Argentina's observation on the need to reflect on the process.
- The Indigenous Peoples Major Group thanked the participants for their hard work and expressed appreciation for the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge in the report.

After these statements from Member States and major groups, Dr. Bob Watson, GEO-7 Assessment Co-Chair, expressed the disappointment of the GEO-7 experts with the result of the meeting, but reaffirmed that they were very pleased with the GEO-7 main assessment report, which he described as “a superb document”. He added that the GEO-7 Assessment Co-Chairs supported the UK's statement on behalf of many countries. He thanked the Secretariat for the work and collaboration and the over 300 scientists for their brilliant work in developing the report. In addition, he mentioned that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge was incredibly important.

Following the statements delivered by Member States, major groups, and the assessment co-chair, the meeting co-chair on behalf of the meeting bureau, expressed profound appreciation to all participants for their contributions to the review process. He extended special thanks to the assessment co-chairs, authors, fellows, MESAG, IMAG, and UNEP Secretariat staff for their dedicated efforts over the past three years.

The meeting closed at 19:30 hours on Friday, 31 October 2025.

Rapporteur	Signature
Ms. Anna Mampye	

Annex 1: Participants list of the GEO-7 Review and Approval Meeting

Number	Country/Organization	Title	Last name	First name	Gender
Member States					
1	Argentina	Mr.	SALZBERG	Joaquin	M
2	Argentina	Ms.	FAZZOLARI	Lara Susana	F
3	Argentina	Mr.	LEVIT	Luis Alejandro	M
4	Armenia	Ms.	HAKOBYAN	Narine	F
5	Australia	Ms.	MAGINI	Ariana	F
6	Australia	Ms.	YUNUS	Famiza	F
7	Australia	Ms.	SAFARI	Stephanie	F
8	Australia	Ms.	MILLS-SMITH	Stacey	F
9	Belgium	Mr.	KARIMI	Mehdi	M
10	Bhutan	Ms.	DEKI	Tshering	F
11	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ms.	LJUŠA	Melisa	F
12	Brazil	Sr.	VIEIRA	Joao Paulo de Sousa	M
13	Brazil	Mr.	ALMEIDA	Ronney	M
14	Burkina Faso	Mr.	OUEDRAOGO	Gouyamba	M
15	Cambodia	Mr.	SOK	Seyla	M
16	Canada	Ms.	HAWLEY	Jillian	F
17	Canada	Mr.	TAN	Jonathan	M
18	Canada	Ms.	SELLATHURAI	Luxshica	F
19	Canada	Mme.	COLLAS	Pascale	F
20	Canada	M.	MARTIN	Philippe	M
21	Chile	Mr.	SHEE	Álvaro	M
22	China	Mr.	ZHOU	Jun	M
23	China	Mr.	YONG	Ren	M
24	China	Mr.	LI	Haoyuan	M
25	Colombia	Mr.	MERCADO	Carlos Adolfo Hernández	M
26	Colombia	Ms.	LEON	Eugenia Ponce de	F
27	Colombia	Ms.	MEDINA	Sandra Perdomo	F
28	Comoros	Mr.	ALI	Fouad Issoufa	M
29	Costa Rica	Mr.	ÁLVAREZ-VEGA	Christian	M
30	Costa Rica	Mr.	CECILIANO	Luis Fernando	M
31	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr.	KOUADIO	Kouame Georges	M
32	Cuba	Ms.	BERRO	Carmen Cristina Terry	F
33	Cyprus	Ms.	LOANNA	Sabina	F
34	Cyprus	Mr.	VLADIMIROU	Savvas	M
35	Czechia	Mr.	NOVOTNY	Michal	M
36	Denmark	Ms.	RAADSHØJ	Anna	F
37	Denmark	Mr.	VON PLATEN-HALLERMUND	Tobias	M
38	Djibouti	M.	AYEH	Mahamoud Elmi	M
39	Dominican Republic	Ms.	CEBALLOS	Mariana Pérez	F

Number	Country/Organization	Title	Last name	First name	Gender
40	Egypt	Mr.	ESAWAY	Mohamed	M
41	Eritrea	Mr.	ZERISENAY	Kalekristos	M
42	European Union	Ms.	SCEPONAVICIUTE	Rasa	F
43	European Union	Mr.	PEYDRO AZNAR	Jorge	M
44	Finland	Ms.	YRJÄ	Maija	F
45	Finland	Ms.	KOKKONEN	Marjaana	F
46	France	Ms.	TURCQ-BAYLE	Ariane	F
47	France	Mr.	SAVET	Geoffroy	M
48	France	Ms.	FAURE	Pauline	F
49	France	Mme.	VON SCHUCKMANN	Simone Karina	F
50	France	Mme.	SZOPA	Sophie	F
51	Gambia	Mr.	BADGIE	Dawda	M
52	Georgia	Ms.	GOKHELASHVILI	Nino	F
53	Germany	Ms.	Weber	Moritz	F
54	Germany	Ms.	KABEL	Claudia	F
55	Germany	Ms.	MBURU	Ivy	F
56	Germany	Mr.	RÖW	Martin	M
57	Ghana	Mr.	ADJEI	Joseph Danso	M
58	Ghana	Mr.	DERY	Peter	M
59	Ghana	Ms.	DANSO	Rena Asare	F
60	Ghana	Ms.	ADAM	Suweibatu	F
61	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr.	ANSAR	Ali	M
62	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr.	GHOLAMPOUR	Ali	M
63	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr.	KHORSAND	Arman	M
64	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr.	ANIAZI	Saleh	M
65	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Ms.	SHEIDA ASGHARZADEH	Ghahroudi	F
66	Iraq	Mr.	SLAIMAN	Akram	M
67	Iraq	Mr.	AHMED	Ali	M
68	Iraq	Mr.	HASAN	Khalid Abdulsattar	M
69	Iraq	Mr.	ABED	Osamah	M
70	Italy	Ms.	BUTTINO	Isabella	F
71	Japan	Mr.	HAMA	Ichiro	M
72	Japan	Ms.	KIMURA	Mariko	F
73	Japan	Ms.	ABE	Yukina	F
74	Kazakhstan	Ms.	KURMANKULOVA	Nazym	F
75	Liberia	Mr.	AQUOI	James Z.	M
76	Madagascar	Mr.	RAKOTONIRAINY	Elysé Odon	M
77	Malawi	Mr.	MAZINGA	Martino	M
78	Maldives	Mr.	SHAN	Ahmed	M
79	Mauritania	Mr.	CHAHE	Mohammed-Yahya	M
80	Mauritius	Ms.	POINEN	Yovanie	F
81	Mexico	Ms.	LUDLOW	Gisele Fernandez	F

Number	Country/Organization	Title	Last name	First name	Gender
82	Mexico	Ms.	PADILLA	Astrid Cerón	F
83	Morocco	Mr.	EL MOUAOUINE	Mohamed Rachid	M
84	Morocco	Mr.	Fassi	Nour Eddine	M
85	Netherlands (Kingdom of the)	Mr.	BOS	Dylan	M
86	Netherlands (Kingdom of the)	Mr.	VAN DEN BROEK	Joost	M
87	Norway	Ms.	HARALDSTAD	Marie	F
88	Norway	Ms.	CROMPTON	Solveig Maud	F
89	Norway	Ms.	MARTINUSSEN	Anne	F
90	Oman	Ms.	AL SARIRI	Thuraya	F
91	Oman	Mr.	ALQASSABI	Hilal	M
92	Peru	Mr.	PINTO	Yury	M
93	Peru	Mr.	LEIVA HASSINGGER	Favio Wilfredo	M
94	Peru	Mr.	LECAROS DE COSSIO GAUTHIER	Guillaume Lecaros de Cossio Gauthier	M
95	Peru	Ms.	WAMBUI	Bertilla Melissa	F
96	Philippines	Mr.	PACIS	Henry	M
97	Philippines	Ms.	OLAYA	Danna Paula	F
98	Philippines	Mr.	MATIAS	Michael Drake	M
99	Portugal	Mr.	LUIS	Miguel	M
100	Portugal	Ms.	DOMINGUES NETO DA SILVA	Beatriz	F
101	Qatar	Sr.	AI-KHULAIFI	Abdullah	M
102	Qatar	Sr.	AL-TAMIMI	Abdulla Ahmed	M
103	Qatar	Ms.	AL-EMADI	Muna Askar	F
104	Qatar	Ms.	AL-JOMALI	Nada Ahmed	F
105	Qatar	Ms.	AL-HAMAD	Sarah Salem	F
106	Russian Federation	Mr.	MORGUNOV	Boris	M
107	Russian Federation	Ms.	TELNOVA	Irina	F
108	Russian Federation	Ms.	BUBLIKOVA	Galina	F
109	Russian Federation	Mr.	TKACHENKO	Vsevolod	M
110	Russian Federation	Mr.	TERENTYEV	Andrey	M
111	Saudi Arabia	Mr.	BILASI	Nawaf	M
112	Saudi Arabia	Mr.	ALSHARARI	Qasem	M
113	Saudi Arabia	Mr.	ALRASHEDI	Mubarak M.	M
114	Saudi Arabia	Ms.	ALSHEIKH	Iman A.	F
115	Sierra Leone	Mr.	KANNEH	Sheku Mar	M
116	Spain	Sr.	FERNÁNDEZ	Salvador Robles	M
117	Sri Lanka	Mr.	RANAWEERA	Indika Amal Shantha	M
118	Sri Lanka	Ms.	KUMARAGAMA	Wasantha	F
119	State of Palestine	Ms.	ALARQAN	Dima	F
120	Sweden	Ms.	SNELLMAN	Karin	F
121	Sweden	Ms.	ERIKSSON	Lisa	F
122	Sweden	Ms.	LUNDBLAD	Ninni	F

Number	Country/Organization	Title	Last name	First name	Gender
123	Switzerland	Mr.	KURTH	Alexis	M
124	Thailand	Ms.	PUMEYUTH	Tassanatorn	F
125	Trinidad and Tobago	Ms.	STANISLAUS	Gillia	F
126	Türkiye	Mr.	AYNM	Yusuf Ziya	M
127	Türkiye	Ms.	KESKI	Menekse	F
128	Ukraine	Mr.	DEMIANIUK	Oleksandr	M
129	Ukraine	Mr.	TOKAR	Yurii	M
130	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms.	KABORA	Tabitha	F
131	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms.	JUTTING	Katherine	F
132	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms.	PAYNE	Caroline	F
133	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr.	VUAI	Ali	M
134	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr.	SHIMBE	Simeon	M
135	Yemen	Mr.	ALGHOPIR	Yasser	M
Major Groups and Stakeholders					
136	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact	Mr.	THARU	Prem Singh	M
137	Fundacion Barranquillar+20	Mr.	ALMOITE	Clarence Gio	M
138	Fundacion Barranquillar+20	Mr.	OMONDI	Clive Donnley	M
139	Gulf Research Center	Mr.	ALY	Mohamed	M
140	Reseau des Femmes Africaines pour la gestion Communautaire des Forêts	Mme.	NDIAYE	Ndeye Fatou	F
141	Reseau des Femmes Africaines pour la gestion Communautaire des Forêts	Ms.	KABAYAMBI	Joan Prose	F
142	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	Mr.	CASAGRANDE	Richard	M
143	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	Mr.	WETANGULA	Jude Thadeus	M
144	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	Mr.	RUGAMBWA	Laurean	M
145	Zonta International	Ms.	KABAYAMBI	JOAN PROSE	F
Ad-Hoc Open-Ended Group Bureau Members					
146	Czech Environmental Information Agency	Mr.	HAVRÁNEK	Miroslav	M
147	Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Environment of South Africa	Ms.	MAMPYE	Anna	F
148	Italy's Higher Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA)	Mr.	CICCARESE	Lorenzo	M
GEO-7 Assessment Co-chairs					
149	University of Costa Rica (retired)	Mr.	GUTIERREZ-ESPELETA	Edgar E.	M
150	University of East Anglia	Mr.	WATSON	Robert	M
IMAG Co-chair					
151	Netherlands Ministry of Infrastructure & Water Management	Mr.	EIJS	Arthur	M

Number	Country/Organization	Title	Last name	First name	Gender
MESAG Co-chairs					
152	Spanish Ministry for the Ecological Transition and Demographic Challenge	Ms.	VIANA RODRIGUEZ	Maria del Mar	F
153	Wilderness Foundation Africa	Mr.	KING	Nicholas	M
GEO-7 Authors					
154	University of British Columbia	Mr.	DAVIES	Jonathan	M
155	University of Exeter	Mr.	HARRISON	Stephan	M
156	SWCA Environmental Consultants	Ms.	GADDIS	Erica	F
157	Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency	Mr.	LUCAS	Paul	M
158	Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency	Mr.	DAIOGLOU	Vassilis	M
159	Institut National de la Recherche en Agriculture	Mr.	TURNHEIM	Bruno	M
160	University of Bern	Mr.	RUEFF	Henri	M
161	University College London	Ms.	TURCU	Catalina	F
162	National University of Singapore	Mr.	BROADSTOCK	David	M
163	Chatham House	Mr.	SCHROEDER	Patrick	M
164	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Guatemala	Ms.	LEY	Debora	F
165	University of Edinburgh	Mr.	ALEXANDER	Peter	M
166	University College London	Ms.	TAYLOR	Gail	F
167	The University of Edinburgh	Ms.	BEEVERS SMITH	Lindsay	F
168	Seadon Consulting	Mr.	SEADON	Jeff	M
169	University of Bern	Ms.	MATHEZ-STIEFEL	Sarah-Lan	F
170	University of Central Asia	Mr.	SAMAKOV	Aibek	M
171	Keystone Foundation	Ms.	KRISHNAKUMAR	Jyotsna	F
GEO-7 Fellows					
172	Imperial College London	Mr.	ALKHARUSI	Tarik	M
173	Global Shield Secretariat	Mr.	VAIDYA	Soham	M
174	Santa Rosa First Peoples Community	Ms.	BROOMES	Acasia	F
175	Global Youth Biodiversity Network	Ms.	EQAN	Maryam	F
176	Institut de Formation et de Recherche Demographiques	Ms.	MAFFO	Astride	F
177	SOGAZ	Ms.	BASLANDZE	Marianna	F
178	Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia	Ms.	CHICMANA ZAPATA	Victoria Del Pilar	F
179	University of Chemistry and Technology Prague	Mr.	MATUŠTÍK	Jan	M
180	The London School of Economics and Political Science	Mr.	HAN	Zhuang	M
181	Fundación Avina	Ms.	SANCHEZ	Jimena	F
United Nations					
182	United Nations Environment Programme	Mr.	KAPPELLE	Maarten	M
183	United Nations Environment Programme	Mr.	SANCHEZ DIAZ	Ignacio	M

Number	Country/Organization	Title	Last name	First name	Gender
184	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	HINWOOD	Andrea	F
185	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	SARASAS	Pinya	F
186	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	DUAN	Yunting	F
187	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	KAIMURU	Caroline	F
188	United Nations Environment Programme	Mr.	KREUTZER	Gerhard	M
189	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	STOKES	Martha	F
190	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	ROCCATO	Adele	F
191	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	ALLISON	Hilary	F
192	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	ODHIAMBO	Grace	F
193	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	LI	Ruoxi	F
194	United Nations Environment Programme	Mr.	LELEI	Allan	M
195	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	KANG'ETHE	Muthoni	F
196	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	ALIYEVA	Atina	F
197	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	KAWKA	Paula	F
198	United Nations Environment Programme	Ms.	OHANGA	Brigitte	F
199	United Nations Environment Programme	Mr.	VASQUEZ	Juan Carlos	M
200	Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	Ms.	OHN	Kei	F

Annex 2: Statement by UK on behalf of 35 Member States, the EU, and the 9 Major Groups and Stakeholders¹

Mr. Chair,

The United Kingdom would like to deliver this statement on behalf of Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Italy, Japan, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Madagascar, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Thailand and Ukraine, and is supported by the nine Major Groups and Stakeholders.

First of all, we would like to express our **deepest gratitude** to the co-chairs, to the authors and the GEO secretariat for their excellent work and strong efforts this week, and since the inception of the GEO-7 process. We recognise the commitment to the environmental evidence base, kept across three years.

The authors have done an excellent job at drafting a report that shows governments and stakeholders what transformations are required and what solutions pathways are available to address the global environmental crises. The time and effort dispensed by them on the GEO report is deeply appreciated.

This week, we were entrusted with a clear mandate to approve a summary of the GEO-7 report intended to support policymakers by distilling its key findings and recommendations.

Our delegations have consistently prioritized upholding the scientific integrity of this process and respecting the findings of the scientific community while adhering to the procedures we have **all agreed upon**. We made important concessions to address concerns from all delegations, including negotiating a chapeau to accommodate these concerns. It is widely understood that the SPM is intended to present scientific evidence in a way that supports countries in developing their own policies and actions. Despite these efforts, we witnessed diversion attempts to question the scientific nature of this process.

Mr. Chair,

Science-based decision making is fundamental to understand and to globally address environmental crises. Our delegations fully respect every State's right to safeguard their country's national interests and rights, but, as highlighted in many interventions this week, science is not negotiable.

While we regret that the process to approve a summary for policymakers hasn't reached a successful outcome, the accepted main report and its findings are available for governments and other stakeholders to act upon the necessary systemic transformations. We are looking forward to its launch at UNEA-7.

We believe in the continuous improvement of our intergovernmental processes and recognise that valuable lessons must be drawn from our experience. Significant time and resources went into this at a time, when resources at our disposal are limited. We have a collective duty to make the best use of them in order to maximise our impact.

Finally, Mr Chair, our delegations remain fully committed to collaborating with all of those interested in developing urgently needed, science-based assessments of the global environment, and in identifying policy options and actions that enable governments and stakeholders to effectively address environmental crises.

Once again, we thank the Co-Chairs of this meeting, and we once again express our deep gratitude for all of those involved on this process, from the authors to MESAG, IMAG and the Secretariat.

Thank you very much.

¹ The statement is reflected on its integrity in the meeting report as requested by the delegations.