

16 February 2017

EU/MS Preliminary comments on the Structure and Organisation of the UNEA-3

Background document: UNEP 7.2.2017, Note by Secretariat on the Structure and Organization of the 2017 Environment Assembly

- EU/MS welcome the note on the Organization and structure of UNEA-3 and that it takes into account some of the key lessons learned from UNEA-2, including on management of the sessions and interventions.

- **The EU/MS have a preference for the proposed Scenario 1.** The Scenario 2 proposes parallel sessions of national statements, leadership dialogues and the CoW (four parallel sessions at most) which does not seem feasible, in particular for smaller delegations. It also seems scenario 2 would imply that the HLS lasts 3 days which is not compatible with GC27/2.

- It is also good that in Scenario 1 sufficient time is reserved for the work of the Committee of the Whole on the first day (4th Dec) of UNEA-3. This would facilitate smooth transition from the OECPR preparatory negotiations to the UNEA session, to overcome challenges placed by organizing the OECPR back-to-back with UNEA-3.

- EU/MS welcome the Leadership Dialogues which respond to countries' requests for a more interactive setup of the HLS after UNEA-2. EU/MS are interested to hear more on the set-up of these dialogues. It may be interesting to have both participants who have already stated clear commitments, and leaders intending to take action towards action on pollution but still seeking for suitable solutions. This setting could inspire discussion on whether successful examples of action could be applicable elsewhere. The dialogues could thus serve as a form of modern match making.

- EU/MS are wondering why no side events are planned during UNEA-3. The side-events are an important space for promoting solution oriented approaches towards pollution and in attracting Ministers, as well as relevant policymakers and stakeholders (incl. beyond the traditional environmental sector). Has UNEP given a thought on this?

- EU/MS welcome a possibility to announce pledges. However, this could also be taken up in national statements and as an integrated part of the leadership dialogues. Could UNEP elaborate more on the scenario for the suggested pledging session and on how would the invitations for pledges be handled?

- EU/MS would appreciate further clarification on the translation regime. National statements and leadership dialogues should benefit from translation.

- The ED's progress report on implementation of the previous UNEA resolutions does not feature in the proposed Scenarios and EU/MS would like to have clarification when the report will be presented. EU/MS could – on an exceptional basis for this shorter UNEA - support presentation of the ED's report in OECPR. This would allow MS to take this information into account in the negotiations as early as possible.

- EU/MS support UNEP's proposal to place a cut-off date for negotiations on 5th Dec. It seems however that consideration f) (the outcome of the HLS should be finalized before the start of the HLS session) and consideration g) (cut-off date on 5th Dec) may be conflicting. Could UNEP clarify this?