



**UNITED
NATIONS**

UNEP/CPR/171/8



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: [Distribution]
22 August 2025
English only

**Committee of Permanent Representatives
to the United Nations Environment Programme
171st meeting
Nairobi, 16 September 2025
[Agenda item 7]**

Consideration of relevant evaluation reports and audits.

Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) of the United Nations System Review of Management and Administration in the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Management Response

I. Introduction

1. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) presents its management response to the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) and to the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) of the United Nations System concerning the recommendations set forth in the report of the JIU on the Review of Management and Administration in the United Nations Environment Programme ([JIU/REP/2025/1](#) and [JIU/REP/2025/1](#) (expanded report)). This represents the first comprehensive review of its kind undertaken by the JIU for UNEP, and we extend our sincere appreciation to the JIU for its work and collaboration.
2. The objective of the review was to provide an independent assessment of UNEP's organisational arrangements, processes, regulatory frameworks, and related practices in the areas of management and administration. The review examined key functional domains, including governance; organisational structure; financial framework; strategic planning and risk management; human resources management; communications and outreach; knowledge management; partnerships; information and communications technology; and oversight.
3. The review was conducted through a consultative, collaborative, and iterative process, with the methodology and Terms of Reference (ToR) jointly agreed upon by both parties.

UNEP acknowledges the constructive engagement throughout the process, which ensured that the findings and recommendations are both relevant and actionable.

4. The JIU distributed the final report and its expanded version on 6 August 2025. The report was addressed to the Executive Director of UNEP, as well as, as appropriate, to the members of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) and the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR). It was also disseminated to all UNEP personnel. The report contains eight formal recommendations, five directed to the Executive Director and three to UNEP's governing bodies, as well as 27 informal recommendations fully presented in the expanded version of the report.
5. In this management response, UNEP addresses all recommendations of the JIU. The five formal recommendations directed to the UNEP Executive Director have been accepted and are summarised with status updates in Table 1. For the three recommendations to UNEP's governing bodies (see also Table 1), UNEP will be guided by the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) and the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) on how it wishes to proceed with the implementation. All 27 informal recommendations from the extended report have been noted, and implementation is underway, as outlined in Table 2.

II. General Comments

6. UNEP notes that the finalisation of the JIU report has taken place against a backdrop of rapid institutional change, driven by growing global needs and a markedly constrained resource environment. Across the United Nations system, there has been a renewed emphasis on demonstrating the effectiveness of multilateral action through forward-looking reforms and continuous improvement.
7. In March 2025, the Secretary-General launched the UN-80 Initiative, a comprehensive reform effort to create a United Nations that is more efficient and cost-effective, more responsive to crises and the needs of countries, more effective in delivering the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), more accountable to taxpayers and the people it serves, and more supportive of UN staff in carrying out their mission-critical work. At its core, the Initiative seeks to ensure that finite resources are used to maximum effect. It is structured around three interlinked workstreams: identifying efficiencies and improvements in the way the UN operates; reviewing the implementation of mandates received from Member States; and examining potential structural changes and programme realignments across the UN system. UNEP is an integral part of this process and is contributing extensively to the UN-80 Initiative in pursuit of these common objectives. Moreover, in parallel, UNEP initiated two major internal reforms in the first half of 2025.
8. On 11 March 2025, the Executive Director launched a process to strengthen UNEP's science function, including by merging the Office of the Chief Scientist (CSO) with relevant functions of the Early Warning and Assessment Division (EWAD), and by reallocating project-based operations in EWAD to other relevant Divisions and Offices. The primary objective of this reform is to ensure that UNEP remains an authoritative voice on the environment within the global scientific community – collecting, analysing, synthesising, and evaluating scientific data that addresses the interconnected challenges of climate change, biodiversity, land and nature loss, as well as pollution, with a renewed focus on solutions.

9. On 2 April 2025, in light of evolving international circumstances and projections of a more constrained resource environment, the Executive Director formally launched an internal Functional Review with a view to realigning the work and structure of the organization within a reduced budget envelope of USD 70 million, to be conducted in three phases. The first two phases, which centred around identifying concrete cost reduction measures – including post management – have now concluded. A third phase is expected to take place in the second part of 2025, with a view of functionally streamlining the organization. The Functional Review represents a critical step towards enhancing UNEP’s overall efficiency, effectiveness, and prudent budget management, positioning the organisation on a more sustainable trajectory for 2026 and beyond.
10. Together, these parallel initiatives reflect UNEP’s commitment to aligning with the Secretary-General’s vision under the UN-80 Initiative while responding decisively to its own strategic and operational imperatives. The implications of these reforms have been carefully considered in preparing this management response.

III. Way Forward

11. To strengthen institutional accountability, UNEP Executive Office will maintain regular engagement with the Directly Responsible Individuals (DRIs) assigned to oversee and implement the recommendations issued under this Review of Management and Administration in the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Progress will be systematically consolidated, monitored, and recorded, with achievements both for the eight formal and the 27 informal recommendations integrated into UNEP’s audit repository to support organisational learning, foster collaboration, and enhance knowledge management. The Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) will receive annual updates on implementation progress, complemented by an annual, in-depth presentation detailing actions undertaken and results achieved. Furthermore, all formal recommendations will be incorporated into, and reported through, the JIU recommendation tracking system currently under development, ensuring comprehensive oversight and alignment with the wider United Nations system’s accountability framework.

Table 1. UNEP Management Responses to the Formal Recommendations for the Decision by Legislative Organs and/or Governing Bodies and for the Action by Executive Head

No.	JIU Recommendation	Management Response
1	The United Nations Environment Assembly should, at its eighth session at the latest, clarify the mandate and role of the Committee of Permanent Representatives as its intersessional body and examine the frequency of its formal meetings, as appropriate.	UNEP will be guided by the United Nations Environment Assembly on how it wishes to proceed with this recommendation.
2	The Executive Director should conclude, by the end of 2025, the review of the UNEP Delegation of Authority Policy and Framework and update it, as appropriate, in the context of the implementation of the Policy for One UNEP Delivery for Better Collaboration and Country Support.	<p>Response: UNEP will revise the 2019 Delegation of Authority Policy and Framework by the end of 2025 and will explore options for the automated issuance of delegations, with a view to strengthening monitoring and oversight of subdelegations. The revision process will be undertaken in a consultative manner, engaging both UN Headquarters and UNEP Divisions and Offices.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: The Policy will be revised by the end of 2025, alongside the introduction of an internal portal encompassing both the areas covered by the UN Secretariat Delegation of Authority Portal and additional areas specific to UNEP, such as project management.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
3	The Executive Director should issue, by the end of 2025, a corporate guidance document to support the consistent implementation of the Policy for One UNEP Delivery for Better Collaboration and Country Support across the organization.	<p>Response: UNEP will develop guidance, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and/or documented best practices to operationalise the Delivery Model policy. This will include clarifying roles and responsibilities, establishing success metrics for the Delivery Model policy, and providing guidance to strengthen selected country engagement plans and UNEP-wide teams working in specific countries, in line with the Regional and Divisional roles defined under the Delivery Model.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By end-2025, analysis of regional functions and presence completed. • By end-2025, success metrics for the Delivery Model policy collaboratively developed. <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>

4	<p>The Committee of Permanent Representatives should request the Executive Director to present in 2026 a monitoring framework for the Policy for One UNEP Delivery for Better Collaboration and Country Support that would enable the assessment of progress against expected results.</p>	<p>UNEP will be guided by the Committee of Permanent Representatives on how it wishes to proceed with this recommendation.</p> <p>In addition, UNEP will develop success measures for the Delivery Model policy, with initial insights from these indicators to be presented to the CPR at a subcommittee meeting to be held in Q2 of 2026.</p>
5	<p>The Executive Director should review and update, as appropriate, the current resource mobilization strategy and present it to the Committee of Permanent Representatives in 2026.</p>	<p>Response: UNEP will review and update its Resource Mobilization Strategy with the overarching objective of securing adequate resources for the implementation of the Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) 2026–2029 and its related Programmes of Work (PoW). Following consultations with the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) at the Annual Subcommittee Meeting in September 2025, the Secretariat will finalise the strategy and develop a detailed implementation plan by the end of 2025. Both the strategy and the implementation plan are expected to be presented to the CPR at its first quarterly meeting in 2026.</p> <p>The new Resource Mobilization implementation plan will be guided by the priorities set out in the MTS (2026–2029) and will support UNEP in aligning its mobilization objectives and budget with the strategic direction provided by the MTS, as well as the implementation priorities and capacities defined in the PoW 2026–2027.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: The updated Resource Mobilization Strategy and its implementation plan will be finalised by the end of 2025 and presented to the CPR at its first quarterly meeting of 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
6	<p>The Executive Director should designate, by the end of 2025, a Chief Risk Officer to accelerate and coordinate measures aimed at strengthening the mechanisms, tools, systems and procedures for enterprise risk management and ensure their effective implementation at all levels of the organization, including the functioning of the Enterprise Risk Management Committee.</p>	<p>Response: UNEP concurs that the establishment of a Chief Risk Officer function (to be carried out by an existing staff) constitutes a strategic step that aligns with global best practices in Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) across the UN system. This measure will centralise leadership and accountability, accelerate the integration of risk considerations into strategic planning, and enhance the organisation’s capacity to anticipate and respond to emerging risks across all areas of its work.</p> <p>The implementation of ERM, including its mechanisms, tools, systems and procedures, is already underway at UNEP, with progress being reported. In parallel, UNEP is preparing the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Chief Risk Officer role. These steps will serve to consolidate the process, ensure consistent application</p>

		<p>across all levels of the organisation, and further strengthen the work of the ERM Committee.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Terms of Reference for the Chief Risk Officer endorsed, and designation notification issued by end-2025.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
7	<p>The Executive Director should approve, by the end of 2026, a comprehensive strategy to support an organization-wide approach to knowledge management and knowledge-sharing.</p>	<p>Response: UNEP is implementing this recommendation through several initiatives already underway, including a comprehensive update of the digital portfolio, enhanced internal portal management, adoption of a consistent taxonomy, and the application of artificial intelligence to improve findability and classification. An organisation-wide Knowledge Management Strategy is currently under development, which will integrate these elements and further measures to ensure UNEP is fit for purpose in managing and disseminating knowledge in support of its mandate and to enhance impact. A cross-organisational team has been established to facilitate this work.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By end-2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Office of Science.</p>
8	<p>The Committee of Permanent Representatives should request the Evaluation Office to consider the inclusion of a higher number of strategic or corporate evaluations in its annual work programme and to report back on their findings and conclusions.</p>	<p>The UNEP Evaluation Office will be guided by the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) on how it wishes to proceed with this recommendation, including with regard to the allocation of core resources to support an increase in the number of evaluations not funded by extra-budgetary sources.</p>

Table 2. UNEP Management Responses to Informal Recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Management Response
1	<p>Organizational structure</p> <p>The Inspector suggests the timely finalization of a revised bulletin (revision of ST/SGB/2006/13)</p> <p><i>(Para. 22, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP finalised an updated draft of ST/SGB/2006/13 by the end of 2024. The draft underwent internal editorial review in early 2025; however, the process was temporarily paused in light of organizational changes announced in the Executive Director’s memorandum of 11 March 2025, titled “<i>Establishment of a Task Force for the Uplift of the Science Function in UNEP</i>”. The initiative aimed to strengthen UNEP’s science function by, among other measures, consolidating the Office of the Chief Scientist with relevant functions of the Early Warning and Assessment Division (EWAD) and reassigning EWAD’s project-based operations to other Divisions and Offices. In view of these structural adjustments, the update of ST/SGB/2006/13 is expected to resume and be finalised by the end of 2025.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Updated draft to be finalised by end-2025.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Executive Office.</p>
2	<p>Organizational structure</p> <p>The Inspector encourages UNEP management to review whether the current ratio between senior management positions and staff meets the needs of the organization, considering its portfolio of activities and delivery model.</p> <p><i>(Para. 22, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: Through UNEP’s internal Functional Review, launched under the Executive Director’s memorandum dated 2 April 2025, the Budget Steering Committee (BSC) noted that the current ratio between senior-level positions and staff could be adjusted across the Professional (P) and General Service (GS) categories. This has been included as one of the recommendations of the Functional Review and will be gradually implemented as job openings are prepared for both vacant and new positions.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: The review of the organisational structure was undertaken in the first two phases of the Functional Review (April – August 2025). The recommendation to reduce the number of senior positions in both the P and GS categories has been incorporated into the Functional Review, and UNEP will endeavour to rationalise the ratio in line with established human resources parameters.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>

3	<p>Observations regarding the structure</p> <p>The Inspector urges UNEP management to conclude a review of the benefits and challenges associated to the centres collaborating with the organization and to clearly distinguish the legal status under which they operate, including the dimension of reputational risks.</p> <p><i>(Para. 26 (c) expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: In its final recommendations to the Executive Director, the Task Force established under the Executive Director’s memorandum dated 11 March 2025, entitled “<i>Establishment of a Task Force for the Uplift of the Science Function in UNEP</i>”, recommended that the Director of the Corporate Services Division (CSD) finalise the review of UNEP Collaborating Centres. The aim of the review is to clarify the value these Centres add to the organisation and to promote consistency in approach, including with respect to governance. This recommendation was formally announced by the Executive Director through a memorandum entitled “<i>Uplifting of the Science Function in UNEP: Way Forward</i>”, which tasked the Director of the Corporate Services Division with finalising the review in collaboration with the Office of Science.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the end-2025.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
4	<p>Senior Management Team</p> <p>The Inspector encourages UNEP management to formalize and strengthen the process for decision-making during senior level retreats, as well as the monitoring mechanism and implementation of those decisions.</p> <p><i>(Para. 31, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP acknowledges the recommendation and wishes to highlight that a systematic decision-tracking mechanism for the Senior Management Team (SMT) is already in place for SMT meetings. This mechanism ensures consistent documentation, monitoring, and follow-up of SMT decisions through the maintenance of comprehensive meeting minutes, regular reporting on SMT activities, and an indexed record of SMT decisions to facilitate transparency, institutional memory, and accountability. All the aforementioned documents are available to all UNEP personnel via dedicated channel and intranet page. UNEP senior management remains committed to ensuring that the outcomes of senior-level retreats are integrated into this established process, thereby reinforcing the effective decision-making as well as implementation and monitoring of such decisions.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Implemented.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Executive Office.</p>
5	<p>Budget Steering Committee</p> <p>The Inspector thus encourages UNEP management to plan and allow more time for the preparation and presentation of budgetary requests to the Committee.</p>	<p>Response: The Budget Steering Committee (BSC) commenced the budget submission and allocation process for 2025 in September 2024. This timeline was required in order to establish an accurate budget envelope based on pledges and contributions made by Member States to the Environment Fund (EF) for the following year, as well as to calculate the projected surplus or deficit that may be</p>

	<p><i>(Para. 32(b), expanded report)</i></p>	<p>carried over by each Division and Office. As the budget submission templates and guidance remain largely consistent from year to year, Divisions and Offices are expected to have a solid basis on which to prepare their budgetary requests, incorporating updated figures.</p> <p>For any ad hoc budgetary requests – for example, allocations from the Planetary Funds – the Directors of the concerned Divisions or Offices are responsible for planning and presenting the requests. The BSC will endeavour to strengthen its engagement with senior management to ensure that they are equipped with the necessary information to submit prudent and comprehensive budgetary requests.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: The recommendation will be taken into account during the budget submission and allocation process for 2026, commencing in September 2025.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
6	<p>Budget Steering Committee</p> <p>The minutes of the [Budget Steering] Committee for 2023-2024 as reviewed by the Inspector included indications on recommendations for the abolishment and redeployments of staff positions funded by the Environment Fund and programme support costs for the upcoming year, but not the total number of staff posts by division/office, before and after such decision. To increase transparency, the Inspector suggests adding such information to the meeting minutes. Furthermore, in case of transfer of staff positions agreed during deliberations, the Inspector draws attention to the need of recording that the coherence between the funding source and the position after transfer has been considered.</p> <p><i>(Para. 32(c) expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: The Budget Steering Committee (BSC) will record in its meeting minutes the total number of staff posts by Division and Office, both before and after post actions are decided.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Effective immediately.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
7	<p>Quarterly business review process</p> <p>The Inspector suggests having periodical reviews of the indicators included in the Quarterly Business Review process to ensure their continuing relevance.</p>	<p>Response: UNEP will integrate structured annual reviews of Quarterly Business Review (QBR) indicators into the QBR process.</p>

	<i>(Para. 40, expanded report)</i>	<p>Implementation Timeline: The first annual review of QBR indicators will be conducted between February and April 2026, with annual reviews to continue thereafter.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>
8	<p>Challenges regarding the three-tiered model for support services</p> <p>The Inspector was informed that, as part of the UN80 Initiative, a United Nations Secretariat-led working group was developing a proposal for a framework that reorganizes management and administrative structures into common administrative platforms meant to consolidate existing administrative capacities, with Nairobi being one of the duty stations selected for the first phase of deployment. While awaiting the outcomes of the working group, the Inspector suggests reviewing the current process architecture for each service to ensure that the information and expectations are clearly presented on both sides, which is expected to lead to an improvement of the client-user relations and ultimately of the delivery of services.</p> <p><i>(Para. 50, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: As part of UNEP's internal Functional Review, a dedicated assessment was undertaken to evaluate the organisation's administrative framework and service delivery model. The Review concluded that a new model for administrative services is required, aimed at streamlining organisational layers, reducing complexity and duplication of tasks, and enhancing the agility and efficiency of programme delivery. The new model will establish streamlined regional administrative hubs in Bangkok, Nairobi, Panama and Paris, designed to meet UNEP's administrative service needs through specialised and upskilled staff within each region.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: UNEP will adopt a phased approach to the implementation of the proposed administrative services model. A transitional phase (August–December 2025) will ensure business continuity through non-Environment Fund (EF)-funded administrative staff, with support from the Corporate Services Division (CSD), while the regional hub configuration is finalised. Full operationalisation of the administrative hubs will begin in January 2026, characterised by clearly defined roles, specialised training and performance monitoring against Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), in alignment with broader UN reforms.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
9	<p>Corporate services in UNEP</p> <p>The Inspector suggests an internal functional review of administrative and financial processes and the division of labour between the UNEP Corporate Services Division and administrative and financial units in other divisions or offices.</p> <p><i>(Para. 53, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: The transition to a streamlined administrative services model will reflect the outcome of the review of administrative and financial processes, as well as the division of labour between the Corporate Services Division (CSD) and administrative and financial units in other Divisions and Offices. Corporate services are also provided by other Divisions, including Policy and Programme Division (PPD), which supports programme quality, coordination, monitoring, results measurement and reporting, strategic planning and resource allocations, as well as engagement with vertical funds and country-level activities.</p> <p>Separating administrative functions (HR, legal, procurement, budget) from programme and policy support (internal and external) will be a key element of the model. The approach aims to enhance service quality, establish clear accountability,</p>

		<p>and align the administrative-to-non-administrative post ratio, while retaining critical functions within Divisions and Offices and ensuring effective oversight by CSD (also see informal recommendation 8).</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: As outlined in the timeline provided for informal recommendation 8.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD) and Policy and Programme Division (PPD), as applicable.</p>
10	<p>Advisory Service Unit for the Multilateral Environmental Agreements</p> <p>In 2024, the Deputy Executive Director issued a memorandum on strengthening support and interactions with the secretariats on management and administrative issues affecting them, which was updated in April 2025. To follow-up on that memorandum, the Inspector suggests having measures to track how that document is implemented in practice, in order to identify the outcomes of the consultation process and lessons learned.</p> <p><i>(Para. 55, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: The recommendation is duly noted and considered pertinent to both the programmatic and administrative dimensions of the relationship between UNEP and the UNEP-administered Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) secretariats.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The memorandum will be reissued by the UNEP Deputy Executive Director on a semi-annual basis. • A tracking table will be developed in the fourth quarter of 2025 to document outcomes and lessons learned from the consultations. <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD) (with respect to administrative aspects); and Policy and Programme Division (PPD) and Law Division (with respect to corporate policies and related initiatives that have programmatic relevance).</p>
11	<p>Unusual extension of the time frame covered by the programme of work and budget</p> <p>Taking note of the interest expressed by representatives of Member States during interviews to be consulted on budgetary matters, not only at the level of the Environment Assembly but also at the level of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the Inspector recommends caution with such an approach and avoiding it in the future, as Member States should discuss and adopt distinct programmes of work and budget documents for each biennium, properly reflecting necessary strategic and budgetary shifts at the midpoint in the implementation of midterm strategies</p>	<p>Response: In accordance with Decision 5/4, adopted by the fifth United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) on 2 March 2022, the Programme of Work (PoW) for the period 2022–2023 was extended by two years, to the end of 2025, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This exceptional measure allowed the continuation of environmental initiatives, with the budget and targets prorated accordingly. Members of the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) were consulted on, and endorsed, the extended PoW with prorated budget and targets for the additional two years.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Adoption of the PoW and budget for 2026–2027 by UNEA by December 2025.</p>

	<i>(Para. 57, expanded report)</i>	Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).
12	<p>High financial dependency on one global funds mechanism</p> <p>The Inspector suggests that UNEP management undertake an analysis to determine the most appropriate funding proportion from global funds mechanisms that would mitigate the dependency risks for the organization.</p> <p><i>(Para. 66, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP will assess funding from global funds, particularly in light of reduced contributions to those mechanisms by major donors. The findings will inform the Resource Mobilisation Strategy and its implementation plan.</p> <p>Implementation timeline: December 2025.</p> <p>Responsible for implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD) and Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>
13	<p>Time to revise the resource mobilization strategy</p> <p>A revised strategy should clarify roles and responsibilities to promote a more coherent and consistent approach to current and potential funding partners. In addition, to support resource mobilization efforts, the Inspector proposes the creation of an organization-wide client relations management system that would enable the organization to consolidate knowledge on funding partners, record resource mobilization initiatives, and track lessons learned and other relevant information in a single repository.</p> <p><i>(Para. 70, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP is revising its Resource Mobilization Strategy to align with the new Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) 2026–2029, with the overarching objective of securing adequate resources for the implementation of the MTS and its related Programmes of Work (PoW). Following consultations with the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) at the Annual Subcommittee Meeting in September 2025, the Secretariat will finalise the strategy and develop a detailed implementation plan by the end of 2025. Both the strategy and implementation plan are expected to be presented to the CPR at its first quarterly meeting in 2026.</p> <p>The strategy will outline the respective roles and responsibilities within the Secretariat, with further details provided in the implementation plan, including identification of processes and tools that are required, or need to be enhanced or developed, to ensure more efficient and effective end-to-end management of resource mobilization activities.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: UNEP Resource Mobilization Strategy to be finalised by end-2025.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
14	<p>Strategic planning framework</p> <p>The present review found different approaches in the way in which UNEP management presents information on the subprogrammes, with deliverables being described in section 14 that are not part of the programme of work and budget. The Inspector recommends improving future planning documents in this regard to ensure more coherence and traceability among them.</p>	<p>Response: The proposed programme budget for 2027 (Section 14) will be prepared in alignment with the Programme of Work (PoW) and budget for 2026–2027.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the end of the first quarter of 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>

	<i>(Para. 75, expanded report)</i>	
15	<p>Need to clarify and expand indicators included in the biennial programme of work and budget</p> <p>The Inspector recommends strengthening the UNEP performance framework by: (a) producing indicator methodologies that explain their definition and how the baseline and targets are calculated, as such elements were found to be missing in the review of the programme of work and budget documents; and (b) reflecting on the nature of these indicators to ensure that they reflect the most relevant outcomes of UNEP activities, as currently some indicators measure multiple dimensions.</p> <p><i>(Para. 79, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP will develop indicator methodologies (metadata, reference documents) for all indicators in the Result Framework in Programme of Work (PoW) and budget 2026–2027. This will ensure they reflect the most relevant outcomes of UNEP activities, as currently some indicators measure multiple dimensions.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the end of the fourth quarter of 2025.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>
16	<p>Need to clarify and expand indicators included in the biennial programme of work and budget</p> <p>The Inspector recommends including impact indicators in medium-term strategies and planning for relevant data collection beyond project completion dates.</p> <p><i>(Para. 79, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP has proposed a set of impact indicators in the Programme of Work (PoW) and budget 2026–2027, in addition to the Subprogramme indicators. These indicators will be presented for discussion at the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) and for adoption by the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA), based on the indicators the Assembly deems appropriate. Following UNEA adoption in December 2025, UNEP will begin applying the indicators and reporting from the end of 2026, allowing sufficient time to establish measurement systems and integrate them into relevant projects.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By December 2025, following UNEA adoption.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>
17	<p>Plethora of reporting mechanisms</p> <p>When reviewing the Programme Performance Report 2022–2023, the Inspector noticed that explicit reporting on qualitative indicators was missing. While such information could be inferred from the narrative, the Inspector encourages UNEP management to structure more clearly its reporting on qualitative indicators, which could contribute to the demonstration of results attained by the organization.</p>	<p>Response: UNEP will explore approaches to present its reporting on qualitative indicators more explicitly in the 2024–2025 Programme Performance Report (PPR). At this stage, no qualitative indicators are planned for inclusion in the 2026–2027 Programme of Work (PoW).</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: February – June 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>

	<i>(Para. 82 (b), expanded report)</i>	
18	<p>Due diligence process and termination of partnerships</p> <p>The Inspector observes that it is not standard UNEP practice to terminate an unsatisfactory partnership, and that UNEP generally allows such relations to run until expiration without renewal. This may change in the future given the enhanced expectation on due diligence. The Inspector suggests centrally recording information on any terminated partnerships to reinforce the due diligence approach.</p> <p><i>(Para. 84, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP has been transitioning from the 2011 Partnership Policy and Procedures (2011 PPP) to the 2024 Partnership Policy (2024 PP), which came into effect on 29 September 2024. Taking into account feedback received on the implementation of the 2024 Partnership Policy, relevant portals, and operational modalities, the Corporate Services Division (CSD) is proposing a phased approach to progressively address areas identified for improvement. This process will commence with the most critical issues concerning implementing partners. In line with the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) recommendation, the central recording of information on any terminated partnerships will be incorporated to strengthen the due diligence process when updating the procedures of the 2024 PP.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the end of the first quarter of 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
19	<p>Private sector and philanthropy</p> <p>As the new policy on partnerships supersedes several previous policies, the Inspector suggests clarifying in the announced revision of the philanthropic engagement strategy how the engagement of the organization with the private sector and its recent attention to philanthropy are articulated in the broader framework, especially as divergent views on the topics were expressed by several UNEP officials.</p> <p><i>(Para. 86, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: The UNEP Senior Management Team will review private sector engagement in September 2025 to provide further clarity on existing guidance, while the playbook for private sector engagement is updated to align with the new Partnership Policy and its procedures. Further engagement with the philanthropic sector will be addressed as part of the development of the new Resource Mobilization Strategy and aligned with the Partnership Policy to ensure the creation and maintenance of an enabling environment.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: To be determined.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
20	<p>Inter-agency collaboration</p> <p>The inputs collected for the review suggest that the functions of the Group are focused on data consolidation and the identification of complementary areas of intervention between United Nations system entities. Contrary to its predecessor, the Environment Coordination Board, which was placed under the Administrative Committee on Coordination, the Environment Management Group is not integrated within the CEB machinery. The terms of reference are currently under review, and the Inspector suggests</p>	<p>Response: The Environment Management Group's (EMG) Terms of Reference (ToR) have been regularly reviewed since its establishment to ensure alignment with global environmental priorities, the 2030 Agenda, ongoing UN reform processes, and to enhance the EMG's effectiveness as a UNEP-funded project.</p> <p>Following the terminal evaluation of the UNEP EMG project 2018–2022, a series of internal consultations were conducted within UNEP and with UN entity members of the EMG to address the evaluation's recommendations. These discussions, among other objectives, were intended to inform a revised EMG ToR for consideration by EMG Senior Officials in October 2025.</p>

	<p>examining whether adding a reporting line to the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination would benefit and facilitate the work of the Group. As Chair of the Group, the Executive Director has a key role to play in that regard.</p> <p><i>(Para. 87, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>However, in light of ongoing UN-80 Initiative discussions, UNEP's Functional Review, and the JIU evaluation report, it was deemed prudent to await the outcomes of these processes before submitting a revised ToR. This approach will ensure that any amendments reflect the most current institutional context and opportunities for enhancing the EMG's effectiveness, including potential linkages with the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: The revised EMG ToR is expected to be finalised in late 2025 or early 2026, discussed with EMG members at the 2026 Midterm Meeting, and submitted for endorsement to EMG membership at the thirty-second meeting of EMG Senior Officials (SOM32) in late 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: New York Office.</p>
21	<p>Joint programmes and partnerships with other United Nations entities could be further strengthened</p> <p>While the 2024 partnership policy can be seen as a response to some of these observations, the Inspector encourages UNEP management to continue its reflection on a less fragmented and more strategic approach to partnering with United Nations entities.</p> <p><i>(Para. 88, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: Strengthening UNEP's engagement with the UN system to advance environmental integration is ongoing and closely linked to the development of the next Medium-Term Strategy. To reinforce joint programming and partnerships with other UN entities, UNEP will revise the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Environmental Management Group (EMG), as noted in the response to recommendation 20, and enhance efforts to integrate the environment into UN Development System planning and programming. This will strengthen UNEP's coordination role, support more effective delivery of environmental priorities, and increase visibility across all UN pillars: development, humanitarian, peace and security, and human rights.</p> <p>To further operationalise this approach, UNEP will develop a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for joint programmes at the country level, while also identifying and documenting good practices in joint programming.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the end of the second quarter of 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>
22	<p>Issues related to affiliate personnel</p> <p>As the affiliate workforce represented more than 50 per cent of UNEP personnel in 2024, and since the information exists already in internal monthly dashboards, the Inspector suggests also reporting the data on affiliate personnel to the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the Environment Assembly, so as</p>	<p>Response: UNEP acknowledges the JIU's recommendation to include affiliate personnel data in reports to the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) and the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA). Most affiliate personnel are engaged on specific, donor-funded projects rather than through UNEP's core budget or voluntary contributions, and their recruitment is guided by project</p>

	<p>to provide Member States with a more comprehensive overview of the UNEP workforce.</p> <p><i>(Para. 108 (c), expanded report)</i></p>	<p>requirements and donor agreements rather than by organisational workforce planning.</p> <p>Consequently, the geographic and thematic distribution of affiliate personnel reflects the location and priorities of funded projects, rather than UNEP's strategic human resources objectives. Analysis of their numbers therefore does not provide meaningful insights into the organisation's workforce composition or diversity. Workforce planning and diversity monitoring at UNEP are more effectively focused on regular staff recruited through core resource processes, whose distribution aligns with the organisation's long-term goals.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the CPR ultimately determines which workforce information best supports oversight and transparency. UNEP remains committed to clear and responsive reporting and will adapt its practices in accordance with Member States' preferences.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the first quarter of 2026, if required by the CPR.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
23	<p>Benchmarks on public information and communications</p> <p>The Inspector notes the requests by two UNEP management committees in 2024 for strengthening the tracking tools for the use of UNEP publication and communication products and encourages UNEP management to further examine this issue.</p> <p><i>(Para. 110, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: The Office of Science and the Communications Division are continuing efforts to procure suitable databases to support the systematic tracking of publication uptake and impact. Progress has been affected by challenges in aligning service provider terms with United Nations procurement requirements. In the interim, manual tracking mechanisms are employed, including the monitoring of media coverage of reports, their citation and download data. Besides, specific mentions in key policy fora will be tracked.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By end-2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Office of Science.</p>
24	<p>Capacity of the communication function</p> <p>The Inspector suggests that the UNEP Evaluation Office conduct a comprehensive corporate evaluation of the communication function integrating an assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness and administrative distribution of responsibilities across UNEP organizational entities so as to ensure that the function best</p>	<p>Response: The Evaluation Office acknowledges the proposal that an evaluation of UNEP's communication function be considered as a relevant topic for a corporate evaluation. Consistent with the management response to the formal recommendation 8, the initiation of this work is dependent on the allocation of core resources.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By end-2027.</p>

	<p>supports the implementation of the 2022 delivery model and the overall programmatic approach of UNEP.</p> <p><i>(Para. 112, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Responsible for Implementation: Evaluation Office.</p>
25	<p>Further improvements needed in the approach to publications</p> <p>The Inspector suggests that UNEP management carry out an assessment of the measures undertaken since 2024 aimed at ensuring better alignment between the publication release capacity of the organization and the number of approved publication concepts, to verify whether they produced a positive impact on the release rate without compromising the quality of the content.</p> <p><i>(Para. 117, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: The Senior Management Team (SMT) Publications Board has requested, at its June 2026 meeting, a review of the reasons for delays in publications, as well as their quality and impact, and for recommendations to be presented to the SMT Publications Board. The Publications Committee will conduct the review under the guidance of the Chief Scientist and Director of the Office of Science.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: By the second quarter of 2026.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Office of Science.</p>
26	<p>Measures to enhance oversight</p> <p>The Inspector stresses the importance of properly discussing in the formal meetings of the Committee the findings and conclusions of audit and evaluation reports and the management responses, especially as oversight issues are currently not discussed at the level of the Environment Assembly. In this context, the Inspector believes that consideration should be given to inviting OIOS, as an independent function, to present its findings and recommendations to the Committee, either in person or virtually.</p> <p><i>(Para. 132, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP will liaise with the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) audit team to provide an annual briefing to the Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR), as appropriate.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: UNEP will liaise with OIOS at the earliest opportunity; the timing of the briefing is contingent on OIOS availability.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD).</p>
27	<p>Oversight findings and recommendations</p> <p>The Inspector encourages UNEP management to continue to work towards improving the implementation rates of recommendations from external oversight bodies and to report respective acceptance rates in its annual reporting.</p> <p><i>(Para. 133, expanded report)</i></p>	<p>Response: UNEP remains committed to strengthening the implementation of recommendations from both internal and external oversight bodies. It has consistently achieved a 70% implementation rate for Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) recommendations in recent years and attained the same rate for Board of Auditors (BOA) in the 2024 report, reflecting a notable reduction in the total number of outstanding audit recommendations.</p> <p>To sustain this progress, UNEP continues to prioritise targeted training, systematic monitoring, continuous follow-up, and enhanced quality control of accepted</p>

		<p>recommendations. Any instances of non-acceptance will be reported in UNEP's annual performance report.</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Continuous, in line with UNEP's annual report timelines.</p> <p>Responsible for Implementation: Corporate Services Division (CSD) and Policy and Programme Division (PPD).</p>
--	--	--