



**UNITED
NATIONS**

UNEP/CPR/SC.2026/6/2



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
11 June 2026
English only

**Subcommittee of the Committee of Permanent
Representatives to the United Nations
Environment Programme
Sixth meeting of 2026
Nairobi, 14 May 2026**

Chair's summary of the sixth subcommittee meeting of 2026

Agenda item 1

Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

1. The meeting, which was held in Nairobi in a hybrid format, was opened at 9.10 a.m. on Thursday, 14 May 2026 by Anouar Ben Youssef, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Vice-Chair of the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP. Mr. Ben Youssef chaired the morning session of the meeting and his fellow Vice-Chair, Romy Tincopa, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Peru to UNEP, chaired the afternoon session.
2. The [agenda](#) was adopted on the basis of the provisional agenda that had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

Agenda item 2

Lessons learned from the seventh Global Environment Outlook process as input for future UNEP global environmental assessments

3. A representative of the secretariat provided a [briefing](#) on lessons learned from the seventh Global Environment Outlook (GEO) process, including an [update](#) on the outreach efforts for the seventh GEO report; lessons learned from the process; and provisional plans for the consultative review process for a future UNEP global environment assessment.
4. Representatives of many delegations¹ welcomed the presentation and provided responses to the issues raised. In their comments, the representatives:
 - (a) Commended the contributors to the development of the GEO-7 report, including authors, reviewers and the UNEP secretariat, in particular the Office of Science;
 - (b) Recognized the importance of the GEO report as the flagship report of UNEP and as a key tool for strengthening the science–policy interface and supporting evidence-based decision-making;
 - (c) Welcomed the proposal to conduct a consultative review process to further consider lessons learned and how they might inform the development of future global assessment reports;

¹ Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Norway, Peru, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, the State of Palestine, the European Union, non-governmental organizations major group, scientific and technological communities major group, women major group.

- (d) Advocated adherence to the stipulation in Environment Assembly resolution 5/3 that GEO process funding come primarily from the core UNEP budget;
- (e) Suggested further consideration and clear definition of the role of the Committee of Permanent Representatives in future UNEP assessment processes;
- (f) Commended the secretariat for its outreach efforts since the launch of the GEO-7 report and requested further information on upcoming regional events;
- (g) Expressed interest in the science-policy webinars being organized in partnership with the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies;
- (h) Commended secretariat efforts to engage support in translating the report into various languages, and urged it to continue;
- (i) Underscored the central role of science in providing authoritative evidence that could form the basis of policy formulation, and stressed the importance of maintaining the rigour, integrity and independence of the scientific process;
- (j) Asserted that scientific assessments should be policy relevant but not policy prescriptive, while respecting national sovereignty and local realities;
- (k) Recognized the value of the nexus approach in examining interconnections across multiple environmental issues and its potential role in enhancing synergies between environmental actors;
- (l) Stressed the importance of long-term institutional capacity in relation to Indigenous knowledge as well as traditional and local knowledge and ensuring representation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities;
- (m) Raised questions as to the scientific and methodological integrity of the GEO-7 report, including its use of non-scientific and non-peer-reviewed sources, such as “grey literature”;
- (n) Noted a lack of balanced geographical and academic representation in the development of the report;
- (o) Noted that the length of the report and the time needed to produce it reduced its usefulness as a policy tool;
- (p) Requested greater efforts to align the cycles of GEO reports with those of sessions of the Environment Assembly in order to provide Member States with the scientific information necessary to take well-informed decisions and resolutions at sessions of the Assembly, while recognizing that the GEO cycle’s length was also a function of the scope of the assessment reports;
- (q) Regretted the failure to reach consensus on the summary for policymakers, which potentially jeopardized the impact of the GEO-7 report at national level.

5. Several representatives made suggestions in relation to upcoming assessment processes, including:

- (a) Wider representation and increased Member State engagement;
- (b) Continuation of the nexus approach, which was a unique characteristic of the GEO process;
- (c) Stronger coordination with other assessment panels, in order to avoid overlaps;
- (d) Improved geographical balance of expert pools, with particular attention to underrepresented regions;
- (e) That the planned consultation be conducted in the context of the UN80 initiative, especially work package 27, which aimed at streamlining environmental support to Member States for more impactful action;
- (f) That the secretariat develop options to improve the review and approval process for the summary for policymakers;
- (g) That reports be made more accessible, including by reducing their length and exploring the potential of artificial intelligence and digital technologies to facilitate the dissemination of findings and the generation of real-time data, while avoiding widening technology gaps between the global North and South and keeping in mind the limitations of artificial intelligence and the need for safeguards in its use;
- (h) Integration of a broad range of knowledge, including Indigenous knowledge as well as local and traditional knowledge and behavioural, social and cultural science;

- (i) Embedding of communication and outreach strategies from the outset of the process to enhance dissemination to different audiences;
 - (j) That all stakeholders should strive to disseminate the results of the report in their countries and regions, including through regional offices and resident coordinators and with the support of the United Nations Environment Management Group;
 - (k) That the secretariat clarify its approach to balancing efficiency, accessibility, cost-effectiveness and innovation with the need for robust peer review and scientific integrity.
6. Responding to the comments, representatives of the secretariat:
- (a) Recalled that the preparation of the GEO-7 report had been mandated by the Environment Assembly in its [resolution 5/3](#) and that regular engagement with Member States had taken place throughout the GEO-7 process, including within the frameworks of the ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder advisory group and the multidisciplinary expert scientific advisory group, whose members were nominated by Member States and major groups; the procedures and scoping meetings held in 2022, attended by 56 and over 100 delegations, respectively, at which the procedures and scoping documents were agreed; and the peer review processes for the main report and the summary for policymakers;
 - (b) Clarified that UNEP had not prioritized the publication of the GEO-7 executive summary, which was intended to be a technical summary that complemented the full report and was produced only after the failure to reach agreement on the adoption of the summary for policymakers;
 - (c) Underscored that the guidance contained in the GEO-7 procedures and scoping documents was followed in order to ensure that the report was independent and policy relevant without being policy prescriptive;
 - (d) Indicated that, to make future assessments more succinct, their focus could be narrowed to a specific nexus of environmental issues, following a data- and indicator-driven approach, but that adoption of such an approach depended on the results of the consultative review process;
 - (e) Noted that the consultative review process was at its early stages and that, with regard to the content of the final options to be proposed, no clear idea had yet emerged and no decisions had been taken;
 - (f) Clarified that the consultative review process would start at an internal level, guided by an internal advisory committee;
 - (g) Noted that Member States would be actively engaged and play a clear role in the consideration of options for future assessments and that the secretariat would invite Member States, by late August 2026, to participate in a survey informed by the lessons learned and recommendations discussed during the present meeting. At a later stage, focus groups and, potentially, regional consultations would be organized;
 - (h) Reaffirmed the commitment of UNEP to strengthening participation of experts from underrepresented regions, while noting that participation in GEO-7 had been broader and more diverse than in previous editions;
 - (i) Clarified that the GEO-7 procedures agreed by Member States explicitly allowed the use of both peer-reviewed scientific literature and grey literature, in line with common practice in global assessments;
 - (j) Invited Member States and institutions to assist UNEP with the translation of the executive summary;
 - (k) Stated that UNEP was working with the regional offices, and would explore opportunities for engaging with the Environment Management Group, the resident coordinator system and other key partners to assist with the design and dissemination of future assessments;
 - (l) Reiterated the commitment of UNEP to strengthening the integration of Indigenous knowledge as well as local knowledge into its assessments and noted that such integration also formed part of the new UNEP science strategy;
 - (m) Drew attention to efficiency gains in data analysis made through the use of artificial intelligence, while reaffirming the importance of considering its limitations and potential risks;
 - (n) Clarified the role of projections as tools to support policymaking and reaffirmed the commitment of UNEP to improving their robustness and usability;

- (o) Confirmed that the Office of Science was engaged in the discussions relating to UN80 initiative work package 27 and, where possible, would ensure alignment with the consultative review process;
- (p) Explained that the consultative review process was of a purely informal character and that, therefore, no formal legal frameworks applied to it;
- (q) Clarified that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII), the secretariat could conduct informal consultations on matters that it believed should be presented to the Environment Assembly, and the outcome of those consultations could inform the Assembly's deliberations;
- (r) Recalled that, in Governing Council decision 19/3, paragraph 8, the Executive Director had been requested to consult with interested governments on the framework for future GEO reports and to improve the consultative review process for the preparation of the reports.

Agenda item 3

Briefing on the World Environment Day 2026 campaign

- 7. A representative of the secretariat provided a [briefing](#) on the World Environment Day 2026 global campaign, including its thematic focus, creative concept, key messages, call to action and participation opportunities, as well as the high-level event to be held in the host country, Azerbaijan, on 5 June 2026.
- 8. The representative of one delegation² requested further clarification on cities' participation in the climate change aspect of the campaign.
- 9. In response, the representative of the secretariat noted that cities could engage in the "50 Cities at 50°C" initiative in various ways and offered to provide additional information by email.

Agenda item 4

Working with finance ministries, regulators, commercial banks, and insurers to better align the financial system with sustainable development priorities

- 10. Representatives of the secretariat provided a [briefing](#) on working with finance ministries, regulators, commercial banks and insurers to better align the financial system with sustainable development priorities.
- 11. Representatives of many delegations³ welcomed the presentation and provided responses to the issues raised. In their comments, the representatives:
 - (a) Welcomed the focus, in the briefing, on framing environmental challenges in economic and financial terms and the emphasis on working with finance ministries and regulators, which could help anchor climate, nature and pollution objectives in economic policy, growth strategies and investment planning;
 - (b) Acknowledged the important role of the UNEP Finance Initiative in working with commercial banks, insurers and other financial institutions on redirecting financial flows, managing risk and advancing more sustainable business practices, and noted that shifts in public and private finance flows would be central to enabling transition pathways and strengthening economic resilience;
 - (c) Asserted that financial flows should align with national development priorities, support macroeconomic stability and planning and strengthen the capacity of developing countries to counter climate change and other environmental challenges;
 - (d) Emphasized that a one-size-fits-all approach should be avoided and that sustainable finance initiatives should be flexible and voluntary where appropriate and should not unintentionally create barriers to investment, trade, access to finance or economic development;
 - (e) Stressed the importance of capacity-building and technology support, balanced regional representation in the development of finance-related initiatives, and transparency in governance arrangements and oversight;

² Mexico.

³ Argentina, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Netherlands (Kingdom of the), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

- (f) Noted the difficulties some countries faced in accessing funding, technology, investment opportunities and international cooperation mechanisms that were vital to implementing environmental policies and sustainability initiatives;
- (g) Noted the need, identified at the first Conference on Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels, for additional guidance on transformation pathways, including consideration in transition-related investment of exposure at a systemic level, as well as to fossil fuel subsidies and price shocks;
- (h) Recognized the crucial role of the Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action in helping ministries of finance to integrate climate change and biodiversity into core economic decision-making, including through the flagship guide currently being updated under UNEP leadership;
- (i) Stressed the importance of allaying concerns that environmental measures could negatively affect the economy and continuing to highlight the role of sustainable approaches in strengthening economies and building resilience;
- (j) Noted the value of such instruments as taxonomy development and green bonds in bridging the gap between investor demand and impactful projects;
- (k) Asserted that greater prominence should be given to the elimination of environmentally harmful subsidies as a threat to biodiversity;
- (l) Reaffirmed the need to send strong policy signals to mobilize private capital and to encourage financial system reform in order to unlock investment at scale;
- (m) Highlighted the value of targeted financing and tailored financial products in promoting the development of circular economy approaches;
- (n) Praised the high rate of adoption in the banking sector of the Principles for Sustainable Banking as a prerequisite for joining the United Nations Responsible Banking Community;
- (o) Highlighted the role of the private sector in driving the transition of capital towards more sustainable pathways, including in the areas of climate goals, nature protection and sustainability objectives;
- (p) Expressed concern that additional regulation of the financial sector might hinder fundraising and economic growth, particularly in developing countries;
- (q) Requested the secretariat to clarify:
- (i) How the effectiveness of interventions was assessed at country level;
 - (ii) How to ensure effective alignment and interoperability of the growing number of tools and frameworks, including taxonomies and sustainable finance instruments;
 - (iii) How to ensure that UNEP support aligned with national planning;
 - (iv) The next steps needed for Governments and financial institutions to move from sustainability commitments to measurable economic transformation;
 - (v) The key barriers to mainstreaming sustainable finance globally;
 - (vi) When and where UNEP had been given a mandate to develop environmental, social and governance criteria for sustainability-linked loans;
 - (vii) The content of the six Principles for Responsible Banking mentioned during the presentation.
12. In response, the representatives of the secretariat:
- (a) Described secretariat efforts to satisfy requests from Governments to review fiscal policies and public spending in order to identify challenges and barriers;
 - (b) Noted that some banks and insurance agencies had requested additional regulation of the financial sector to enable them to harness the opportunities in, for example, renewable energy and a blue economy approach;
 - (c) Recalled that UNEP operated within the mandate of its medium-term strategy, which included a subprogramme on finance and economic transformations;
 - (d) Explained that the secretariat had revised the indicators in its programme of work and was recording the number of national and subnational Governments that unlocked or redirected finance to reduce climate, nature and pollution footprints and commercial banks and insurance companies that took related policy action;

- (e) Explained that the analytical and policy support provided by UNEP was entirely demand-driven and directly linked to government-led processes;
- (f) Highlighted the importance of transition plans, which were used by financiers to benchmark companies, and of greening finance to put those plans into action;
- (g) Identified policy uncertainty as a challenge in mainstreaming sustainable finance globally, as investors could be reluctant to commit capital without clear signals from Governments;
- (h) Noted the fast pace of sustainable finance policy developments, especially in developing countries, and that UNEP assisted in reporting that progress in order for Governments and other stakeholders to learn from one another;
- (i) Acknowledged that equitable environmental transitions required access to financial and economic tools;
- (j) Recalled that UNEP had a long history of conducting economic and financial analyses;
- (k) Pointed out that UNEP did not develop environmental, social and governance criteria for borrowers but worked to establish an enabling environment for sustainability activities;
- (l) Noted that detailed information on the six Principles for Responsible Banking was available online, that banks were implementing the Principles voluntarily and that UNEP had developed similar initiatives targeted at the insurance industry.

Agenda item 5

Briefing on the outcomes of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

13. Amy Fraenkel, Executive Secretary of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, [presented a summary of the outcomes](#) of the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, held in Campo Grande, Brazil, from 23 to 29 March 2026, and suggestions for ways that UNEP could support the uptake and implementation of the outcomes. Following the presentation, a representative of the UNEP secretariat gave a [briefing](#) on the linkages between the outcomes and the UNEP programme of work.
14. Representatives of many delegations⁴ welcomed the presentations and provided responses to the issues raised. In their comments, the representatives:
 - (a) Thanked the Government of Brazil for hosting the fifteenth meeting and expressed appreciation for the outcomes thereof;
 - (b) Welcomed in particular the launch of science-based knowledge tools, the efforts to integrate Indigenous knowledge into scientific deliberation, the advancement of global initiatives on ecological connectivity and the recognition of climate change, pollution and by-catch as cross-cutting issues;
 - (c) Noted that the very nature of migratory species rendered their conservation dependent on coordinated international action;
 - (d) Highlighted the importance of taking into account different national circumstances, environmental conditions and implementation capacities;
 - (e) Said that a truly effective global framework for the conservation of migratory species should be grounded in gender-responsive science and that it was crucial to formally recognize and embed citizen science as a legitimate knowledge system in the implementation of the Convention;
 - (f) Voiced concern at the lack of an explicit mechanism for collecting age- and sex-disaggregated data on the use, management and conservation of migratory species;
 - (g) Welcomed increased attention to resource mobilization to support the effective implementation of Convention decisions, particularly in developing countries, and the need to access all possible sources of finance, whether domestic or international, public or private;

⁴ Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, European Union, non-governmental organizations major group, women's major group.

(h) Emphasized that resources should be mobilized in coordination with similar efforts under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(i) Noted that the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species, at which the Convention's 50th anniversary would be celebrated, would be a good occasion to take stock of progress made to date and improvements needed in the future;

(j) Called for the contributions under the Convention to achieving the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework to be recognized in national biodiversity strategies and action plans; for accession to or ratification of the Convention to be promoted at the seventeenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity; and for recognition, at that meeting, of the importance of the Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2024–2032 in implementing the Framework;

(k) Also called for stronger implementation of the Convention; a focus on ecological connectivity; urgent action to address the key threats identified at the fifteenth meeting; the application of the precautionary principle by Governments; greater cooperation in the implementation of biodiversity-related agreements; and enhanced capacity-building, technical assistance and access to financial mechanisms;

(l) Requested clarification on:

- (i) How the Programme for the Development and Periodic Review of Environmental Law (Montevideo Programme) could support States in strengthening legal frameworks and enforcement capacities to address crimes affecting migratory species and their ecosystems;
- (ii) How the Convention secretariat and UNEP were collaborating on issues common to the Convention and the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention);
- (iii) How, given the breadth of the support needed in relation to governance and science, finance and country support, UNEP was prioritizing its engagement with the Convention on Migratory Species in order to ensure that the outcomes of the fifteenth meeting were implemented where they could add the most value;
- (iv) What country-level collaboration would entail in practice, whether it would be delivered through United Nations country teams, and how it would align with national priorities such as national biodiversity strategies and action plans and investment pipelines;
- (v) How UNEP was ensuring that Convention priorities were translated into funded programmes and investment opportunities, including by engaging private-sector finance at scale.

15. In response, Ms. Fraenkel:

(a) Drew attention to the Convention's national legislation programme, in which over 70 States parties participated and which involved a confidential review of national legislation. Discussions had been held with UNEP on potential collaboration on the matter. The Convention secretariat also actively engaged with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), particularly in relation to the FAO legal hub and Sustainable Wildlife Management Programme;

(b) Noted that the Convention secretariat collaborated closely with its counterparts at the Ramsar Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity, and that it had adopted a joint work programme with the secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora and had discussed the possibility of doing the same with the secretariat of the Ramsar Convention.

16. In his replies, the representative of UNEP:

(a) Explained that national legislation could be bolstered through capacity-building and compliance initiatives under the Montevideo Programme, review mechanisms, legal training and online resources such as the United Nations Information Portal on Multilateral Environmental Agreements;

(b) Noted that UNEP and the Convention on Migratory Species secretariat had discussed collaborating on a study on penalties and deterrence to support the implementation of the provision on the taking of species listed in Appendix I to the Convention;

- (c) Emphasized that chronic underfunding made prioritization essential and that Convention considerations should be integrated into national biodiversity strategies and action plans in which member-driven funding mechanisms, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), were key to advancing priority conservation areas;
- (d) Explained that UNEP was guided by its medium-term strategy and requests from Member States, including those made in the context of enabling activities under GEF;
- (e) Noted that UNEP actively supported identifying and advancing synergies among biodiversity-related conventions, including not only the Ramsar Convention, but also the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, to reduce fragmentation of efforts and ensure coherent implementation, including by facilitating the Bern process;
- (f) Noted that the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre provided a considerable amount of scientific data and evidence and supported the report on the conservation status of migratory species.

Agenda item 6

Briefing on the Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste

17. A representative of the secretariat provided a briefing on the developments in the two years since the adoption of the Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste, following which, Kay Williams, Head of the secretariat of the Framework, gave a more detailed [presentation on progress under the Framework](#) and preparations for the first International Conference of the Framework, to be held in November 2026.
18. Representatives of many delegations⁵ expressed gratitude for the information provided and made a number of comments. In their comments, they:
 - (a) Acknowledged the importance of the sound management of chemicals and waste and reaffirmed their support for the Framework;
 - (b) Welcomed the shift from Framework adoption to implementation and the progress made on implementation, including on indicator measurability and draft implementation programmes;
 - (c) Welcomed in particular the creation of programmes in the health and agriculture sectors;
 - (d) Noted the growing focus on value chain, traceability, disclosures and financing approaches and emphasized the importance of ensuring that such measures did not unintentionally create barriers to trade, investment, industrial development or access to finance, particularly for developing countries;
 - (e) Welcomed the operationalization of the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund, but expressed concern regarding the insufficiency of current contributions to the Fund;
 - (f) Called for financial flows consistent with the Framework's strategic objectives and targets and encouraged the Framework secretariat to intensify the search for alternative funding;
 - (g) Encouraged Member States and partners to consider innovative financing approaches, blended finance mechanisms and stronger private sector accountability;
 - (h) Emphasized the importance of a well-thought-out, innovative and sustainable resource mobilization strategy to support broader implementation efforts and enable more countries to address the harmful effects of chemical pollution;
 - (i) Emphasized the importance of equitable access to financial resources;
 - (j) Encouraged all countries in a position to do so to contribute to the Framework process to ensure that it remained as inclusive as possible;
 - (k) Called for greater transparency, inclusivity, clear guidance and technical support in the project selection process;

⁵ Brazil, Colombia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), European Union, children and youth major group, non-governmental organizations major group, women major group.

- (l) Emphasized the importance of collaboration between relevant international organizations, agencies and bodies to ensure synergies and avoid overlap, and of building on their work through collaboration with the various scientific panels;
- (m) Expressed support for multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder approaches to national and regional initiatives aimed at delivering Framework objectives and targets;
- (n) Called on the global chemicals industry to assume financial responsibility for the environmental liabilities it had generated over decades of activity;
- (o) Advocated a transition to agro-ecology and an end to the use of highly hazardous pesticides;
- (p) Called for strengthening of legal and institutional frameworks through increased support for capacity-building, enforcement and coordination across sectors;
- (q) Called for improved transparency and access to information on chemicals, including through stronger implementation of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals, improved monitoring systems and public access to information on chemicals;
- (r) Emphasized the voluntary nature of the Framework and the need for implementation to remain nationally driven, flexible and respectful of national circumstances, priorities and capacities and different development pathways;
- (s) Highlighted the importance of gender considerations, protection of workers and others in vulnerable situations and meaningful participation of all those affected in decision-making and implementation processes;
- (t) Emphasized the importance of balanced regional representation and transparency in governing arrangements;
- (u) Suggested that the first International Conference represented a valuable opportunity to drive global collaboration on perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances by designating them as a permanent issue of concern;
- (v) Expressed concern regarding the funding shortfall for the organization of the first International Conference and the resulting impact on in-person participation of delegations from the global South;
- (w) Recalled that meaningful engagement of developing countries in the first International Conference was essential to the Framework's legitimacy and effectiveness;
- (x) Requested further clarification on:
 - (i) Possible savings with respect to the organization of the International Conference;
 - (ii) Efforts to broaden the donor base to include the private sector and stakeholders other than Governments;
 - (iii) Coordination with the work of the United Nations Task Force on Critical Energy Transition Minerals;
 - (iv) Plans to scale up financing;
 - (v) Measurement of success in terms of real reductions in harm and improved outcomes for people and the environment;
 - (vi) Ensuring equitable participation and technical support for developing countries, small island developing States and youth constituencies in implementation and reporting processes;
 - (vii) Use of lessons learned from existing multilateral environmental agreements and science-policy platforms to inform the Framework's governance and accountability architecture;
 - (viii) Translation of indicators into actionable national policy guidance and investment priorities;
 - (ix) Expanding investment in youth engagement, science capacity and community-level implementation.

19. The representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands announced a contribution of €50,000 from his country towards the organization of the first International Conference.

20. Responding to the comments and requests for clarification, Ms. Williams and the representative of the secretariat:

(a) Recalled that UNEP, as one of its co-chairs, was working with the Task Force on Critical Energy Transition Minerals on how to support countries in meeting the Framework's five strategic objectives;

(b) Noted that the Task Force had a strong relationship with the Framework because electronics was among the high-impact sectors targeted by Framework implementation;

(c) Indicated that, in preparing for the International Conference, cost savings were being sought in document production and logistical arrangements including travel;

(d) Explained that the private sector was primarily being engaged through associations representing groups of companies – the Association of Supply Chain Management was already participating in discussions and offering to contribute to the International Conference;

(e) Recalled that contributions from private entities were subject to the UNEP due diligence process;

(f) Explained that real reductions in harm would be difficult to quantify, as improved data collection often led to the realization that the situation was worse than expected; however, the methodology used for the high-level indicators would be key to assessing the global environmental burden and the global burden of disease associated with chemicals and waste;

(g) Underlined the challenging task the Executive Board of the Fund had faced in selecting 16 projects from the 138 eligible concept note applications received in the second round of funding, and that feedback to help improve applications had been provided to those who had requested it;

(h) Noted that the secretariat was engaging with Joseph Nguthiru, United Nations Young Champion of the Earth, in relation to his possible involvement at the International Conference.

Agenda item 7

Other matters

21. No other matters were considered.

Agenda item 8

Closure of the meeting

22. The meeting was declared closed at 3.30 p.m. on Thursday, 14 May 2026.
