

Feedback on revised AHEG intersessional roadmap

Japan

1. Intensive discussions by the Bureau members

Bureau meetings should be held for intensive discussions. Email communication alone is not enough to discuss the issues and to reach clear understanding. Perhaps holding an online meeting once (or twice if necessary) shortly may be reasonable.

2. Clarification of the contents and changes of the draft roadmap

The Chair and the Bureau members should have common understanding and explain to the member states on the following points:

- How the roadmap fits the mandates given by UNEA resolution 3/7 subparagraph 10 (d) and 4/6 subparagraph 7 and the prepared agenda of the 4th session of AHEG (AHEG 4) arranged during the AHEG 3 in Bangkok.
- Why and how the roadmap dated on June 10 has been changed from the initial one (dated on May 13). I don't mean that every single detail of wording has to be explained. Just major changes need to be comprehended by all the stakeholders. In particular, we need to explain the primary intention of "a guidance note." My understanding of an idea to create "a guidance note" is NOT something that endorses and/or evaluates particular policy direction, rather aims to summarize possible response options based on the submissions and discussions among member states. Such initial intention to develop "a guidance note" does not need to be changed and actually has not changed.
- How this intersessional activities alter the format and agenda of the meetings. We assume that the intersessional works don't replace either AHEG 4 or 5 and having two meetings (AHEG 4 and 5) before UNEA 5 is not feasible,
- What comes after September? How we will work after the completion of intersessional activities.
- What the revision of intersessional roadmap at the end of September means. As the roadmap is namely intersessional, does that revision aim at further continuous work until possible AHEG 4? I would rather propose to have a sort of outputs/result of 5 months period of intersessional work (May-September) by the end of September.

We need clarification of and explanation on the above items.

3. Ways to discuss on potential response options

Among 4 action items (Stocktaking, Technical and financial resources and mechanisms, Effectiveness, Response options), surely potential response options are the biggest concern where opinions are most diverse.

In the first place, since intersessional works haven't been conducted in a meeting format, but in separate webinars and the purpose of this series of webinars is to keep momentum and share information presented by member states. A "meeting report on potential response options", which is to be drafted by the end of September, is more like a summary note. A summary table simply reflecting submissions should be helpful for grasping overall picture.

Also, I suppose "identification of various elements for further discussion on potential response options" planned to be drafted in the end of July need to be very carefully implemented with respect to the fulfillment of the given mandate of ours. Since the mandate given to the expert group is to "analyse the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities(4/6)" and to "identify range of national, regional and international response options(3/7)", we should be policy neutral focusing on analysis and identification based on the submissions and feedbacks from the member states.

4. Time and support for regional consultation

We appreciate that the Secretariat has been showing willingness to assist Asian and Pacific regional meeting. We are preparing a concept note for that. In addition, I propose to restore the deleted text regarding regional meetings from the roadmap. The deleted part is at the very end: "To better facilitate regional views and accommodate differences in time zones, virtual regional discussions and briefings may also be useful, possibly under the leadership of a member of the Bureau. Subject to the availability of resources, the Secretariat may facilitate such meetings virtually, upon request."

We need more time and space for regional consultation. The Asia-Pacific Group has launched the preparation of a mailing list for further discussions inviting member states that participated in AHEG 3 in Bangkok. Would you be able to provide us with a full contact list of all the AP countries that UNEP has in hand?