

## EU/MS 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*

### Comments

- EU/MS welcome the note on the Organization and structure of UNEA-3 and the fact that it takes into account some of the key lessons learned from UNEA-2, including on management of the sessions and interventions.
- EU/MS like to highlight the importance that the set up for UNEA-3 is organized in a manner that it is attractive to Ministers and Leaders to participate, that it catalyzes action and facilitates a successful, communicable, action-oriented outcome of UNEA. In light of this, UNEP may wish to reconsider finding a right balance of a set up that is also facilitating side events related to the theme that will help attract Ministers and other relevant Leaders interesting to pledge actions that will contribute to the outcomes of UNEA. Furthermore, we would like to encourage UNEP, following the background document to issue a clear and visible call for action to address pollution to MS and stakeholders.
- **In view of the 2 scenarios on the table, the EU/MS have a preference for the proposed Scenario 1, but we would encourage the Secretariat to give it further thinking, keeping in mind the comments provided.** 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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 would welcome side events to be organized 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). While taking into account the lessons learned from UNEA-2, we would encourage the Secretariat to give further thought to this.
- EU/MS welcome a possibility to announce pledges. However, to ensure maximum contributions, 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 call for action and 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> Dec) may be conflicting. Could UNEP clarify this?