

EU+MS remarks and suggestions on the UNEP's draft document on UNEA-6 assessment and lessons learnt

The EU and its Member States would like to thank UNEP's secretariat for the revision of its document on UNEA-6 assessment and lessons learnt.

On this basis, the EU+ MS would like to make a few suggestions:

- Part I. A. i) It would be useful to add that the UNEA ministerial declaration should not only be action-oriented but also ambitious and forward-looking.
- Part I. A. ii) It would be important to allow enough time for the consultations on the ministerial declaration. It should also be ensured that the points raised by all delegations are reflected in the draft, with a view to achieving a balanced text.
- Part I. A. ii) b) It would be useful to add after "propose a structure and a zero draft", ***with support by the Secretariat***.
- Part I. A. ii) d) It would be useful to add after "come up with a first full draft, ***with support by the Secretariat***".
- Part I A ii) c) and e) we suggest adding "***inclusive***" consultations.
- Part I A ii) f) we assume that UNEA-6 is a typo and should be replaced by UNEA-7.
- Part I A. iv) EU+MS support a narrower focus of UNEA theme while being inclusive. There might be valid reasons to put forward a resolution that is not within the scope of UNEA theme.
- Part I A. v) We propose to slightly rephrase the text: "The UNEA Bureau and the Secretariat should provide clear guidance to Member States on the respective scope and objective of the i) ministerial declaration, ii) resolutions and decisions, ***and how the latter fit within UNEP's MTS*** to avoid creating overlapping or repetitive mandates."
- Part I. A. vi) UNEP secretariat's suggestion to organize interactive dialogues without a pre-established list of speakers may make it difficult to attract ministers to such dialogues, if their speaking slot is not guaranteed.
- Part I. A. vii) UNEA contribution to the consecutive High Level Political Forum (HLPF) should not be limited only to the submission of the adopted UNEA's ministerial declaration. It should be broader and consider UNEP's expertise as well as resolutions adopted at relevant sessions of UNEA (incl. previous ones), depending on the theme of HLPF and the Sustainable Development Goals under review.
- Part I. B. i) We do agree that ideally, proponents should be encouraged to seek support from other Member States for their proposals well in advance of UNEA. However, we would be cautious in setting this as an explicit condition. EU+MS do not support the

idea of limiting the number of draft resolutions to be submitted by a Member State to one.

- Part I. B. ii) Night sessions could also be considered whenever necessary, for all proposals, as in previous UNEA sessions, with the participation of all delegations.
- Part I. B. iv) It may be useful as well to provide information on existing resolutions and decisions from UNGA and other relevant bodies (not only UNEA ones), as well as identify possible gaps/ overlaps with existing MEAs. In addition, it would be valuable that UNEP Secretariat's interdisciplinary teams (relevant to the proposals) keep providing both technical and legal advice during the informal consultation and negotiation process.
- Part I. B. viii) Before the publication of technical notes by UNEP secretariat, it would be useful if the secretariat could consult with the proponent of the resolution to ensure a good understanding of the scope of the proposed resolution.

In addition, it would be valuable if UNEP secretariat could elaborate in its notes on the interactions between the proposed resolutions and existing work carried out or planned by other relevant MEA secretariats and international bodies.

- Part I. B. x. There should also be enough time left for outreach with UNEP and third countries, particularly during the 2 weeks before OECPR. This could be achieved by having only one round of introduction of the draft resolutions during the inter-sessional period, which would include a policy related discussion.
- Part I. B. xi) The EU+ MS support starting the selection process of cofacilitators early on (e.g. at least 3 months before the deadline for submission of resolutions). This would also provide valuable time for the UNEP Secretariat to organize training sessions. As the date of ASC may vary, we would not wish to link the training sessions to the date of the ASC.
- Part I. B. xii) Cofacilitators would benefit from factual advice from UNEP secretariat also during OECPR and UNEA, including on the process, planning as well as technical and legal support. As regards trainings of cofacilitators, UNEP secretariat should specify how many months in advance they plan to organize trainings (the earlier, the better) and on which topics the training would focus on. Cooperation with other MEAs could also be considered. Moreover, practical trainings for screenwriters could also be useful, e.g. with role plays or during other meetings, prior to OECPR/UNEA.
- Part I. B. xiv) UNEP secretariat could also help including Member States written submissions (made through the Resolutions portal) into the draft texts (in track changes / brackets). It is important that cofacilitators ensure that discussions start on operative paragraphs (instead of preambular paragraphs) and that this is enforced in all cluster groups.

- Part I. B. xvii) a) UNEP Secretariat could also help ensuring that adequate time is allocated to all resolutions / decisions *within* a cluster to give all of them a fair chance to move ahead.
- Part I. B. xvii) c) there could also be automatic notifications sent when there are updated technical notes (not just when revised resolutions become available).
- Part I. E. iii) EU+MS welcome detailed information from UNEP Secretariat during CPR subcommittees as well as the opportunity to ask questions and get clarifications. Such exchanges help understanding the purpose and content of draft resolutions. Pre-recorded videos do not allow for such interaction.