

Committee of Permanent Representatives  
Subcommittee Meeting  
Thursday 3 February 2022  
10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., 3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.  
Conference Room 2, United Nations Office of  
Nairobi Hybrid Meeting

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda.**

1. H.E. Mr. Erasmo Roberto Martínez, Vice Chair, Ambassador of Mexico to the Republic of Kenya and Permanent Representative to the UN Environment, opened the meeting.
2. The meeting [agenda](#) was adopted.

### **Agenda Item 2: Consultations on draft resolutions and decisions for UNEA-5.2.**

3. The secretariat presented a proposed [roadmap](#) of the scheduled meetings to informally discuss the draft resolutions within each cluster under the leadership of the co-facilitators, with the support of the secretariat.
4. The appointed co-facilitators in the lead for each cluster provided an update on progress made and on the organization of work for the informal consultations, including on the agenda and timings under each cluster, followed by comments and questions from Member States.
5. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the update and requested additional information on which resolutions will be discussed during the allocated time slots. Some delegations felt that some resolutions such as the plastic pollution cluster were of greater priority and requested more time to be allocated to the discussions on these resolutions. Another delegation stressed the need to treat each resolution with equal importance and with the appropriate allocation of time. One delegation also reminded that the meeting of the IGR will take place on 15 February which coincides with the informal consultations.
6. Under Cluster 1, a dedicated question and answer session was held with the proponents of the two draft resolutions on the topic of plastic pollution. After an overview of the key points of convergence and divergence between the two draft resolutions by the Co-facilitators, delegations raised the following questions and comments:
  - The relative importance of addressing plastic pollution in its entirety and not just marine litter, further requesting for clarification on which plastics are dealt with.

- Whether the mandate of the INC should be well defined or left for later discussions, and questions around the open or more closed nature of the foreseen mandate.
- More information on the establishment of a possible financial mechanism.
- The importance of emphasis on upstream measures and full-life cycle approach of plastic pollution.
- .
- The importance of legal clarity for the scope of a possible legally binding instrument global agreement on plastic pollution and the merits for a solid preparatory process.
- Reporting period for the INC, and the link to UNEA-6.
- The need to clearly define what is meant by plastic pollution, marine litter, and single-use plastic by the proponents as well as the terms “common objective” and “reducing additional marine plastic to zero” in the resolution by Japan.
- Reflections on how already existing bans on single-use plastic in some countries may be impacted during the INC negotiations.
- The articulation between the draft resolutions from Peru/Rwanda and Japan, vis-à-vis the proposal from India.
- 

The Co-facilitators and proponents took note of the comments received.

7. Japan considered that the legally binding nature of the agreement and the production design of plastic should be discussed under the INC and not by UNEA-5.2. Japan also considered that an agreement should focus on the pathways where plastic enter transboundary resources and that this should be discussed at the stage of the INC where the measures can be expressed. They noted that Japan does not perceive plastic itself as a hazardous object causing pollution, but rather that plastics are entering the environment due to mismanagement and inefficient waste management practices, further clarifying that microplastic is within the scope of the marine pollution discourse and the INC.
8. India provided additional information regarding the draft resolution on Framework for addressing plastic product pollution including single-use plastic product pollution and invited Member States to upload comments to the papersmart portal. In response, some delegations provided general comments and invited the proponents to consider how key elements in their draft could be incorporated into one single resolution under the plastic pollution cluster.
9. The Chair noted the divergence and convergence between the two resolutions on plastic pollution and welcomed informal consultation scheduled for the following day.
10. Under Cluster 5, one delegation invited the secretariat to present the report of the Executive Director on “Progress in the implementation of paragraph 18 of decision 5/2 pertaining to the application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution in the recruitment strategy of the United Nations Environment Programme”. Another delegation requested more information on further options that ensure alignment with the QCPR cycle.
11. Some delegations reiterated the importance of identify with track-changes any revisions made to the draft resolutions.

### **Agenda Item 3: Other matters.**

12. No other matters were raised.

**Agenda Item 4: Closing of the meeting.**

13. The meeting closed at 6:15 pm.