

Thank you, Chair. I speak on behalf of the Women major group.

Extensive involvement of Major Groups stays essential to make the transition from policymaking to action at grassroots level.

Bringing in women as actors and facilitate them to fulfill their roles is crucial. We would like to refer to the **Aarhus Convention Guidelines on Public Participation in International Forums** as good guidelines.

The funding **of the implementation processes is often very complicated**, via e.g. the GEF and Clean Development Mechanism. Project applications by major groups, often have to go through bureaucratic, - sometimes intransparent,- national government structures.

The **innovative, pro-poor implementation solutions**, - such as women's recycling initiatives – have hardly **any chance of accessing** such global funds.

We see a real need to **have funding mechanisms, for sust. Dev., which have earmarked funding** for local communities and women's organizations, going directly through and to citizens organisations.

We **need financial mechanisms, paid for by the polluters, by plastic industry, electronics industry, to clean up waste**, the plastic soup in the oceans, the obsolete pesticides, the toxic electronic waste, often brought to developing countries as so called recyclable resources, bringing pollution and illness.

Also, we agree with - I believe it was Argentina – to **reduce costs of the bureaucratic system**, especially in the Bretton Woods institutions! It is shocking to visit the World Bank HQ in Washington, all in marble and with a 5-star canteen!

We see **lack of coherence between UN processes**, such as between this Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women. Or with the Non Proliferation Treaty, which are our neighbours here in the building – when we are here addressing mining incl uranium mining, and waste, including nuclear waste, also from the military sector.

CSD policy session conclusions are little followed through or linked to other agreements and conventions.

We need more implementation goals **with timelines and targets, leading to binding agreements**, as conclusion of the CSD policy year, to ensure real action.

CSD seems not to be bringing the necessary implementation steps needed.

The last **important environmental multilateral agreement** developed was the one on Mercury at the UNEP GC/GMEF.

We also need to assess the benefits and constraints of the 2 year cycle model for the CSD.

Another **constraint for implementation are weak procedures of conventions**, e.g. the consensus based decision-making model. Even when the procedures of a Convention, such as the Rotterdam Convention, stipulate that decisions to inform about imports of hazardous substances should be based on international science, a handful of countries continue to block process, **on asbestos and endosulfan**, in name of short-term economic interests.

We see that **International Environmental and Sustainable Development governance** needs to be strengthened.

But we see the **UN agencies struggling** - each for themselves – for financial resources. For example, UNEP does not even receive funding from the general UN budget.

We see that **often Environmental ministers, for example in Africa, many who are women**, have hardly any budget at their disposal.

This situation needs to be reformed. Humanity **cannot confront the immense challenges** of climate change, biodiversity loss, toxic chemicals, nuclear pollution, **if we have lack of coherence and weak global governance**. But we need the UN system. It is not the G8s and G20ties which will save the world, it has to be **a strengthened equitable global governance through the UN**, with strengthened participation of stakeholders, especially affected populations and vulnerable groups.