

**Committee of Permanent Representatives Subcommittee meeting
14 December 2021, Nairobi**

EU and its MS contributions

**Agenda item: Member States updates on proposed resolutions and concept notes.
EU update on resolutions proposed by the EU:**

EU draft resolution on “Accelerated adaptation measures to secure water quality and strengthened climate resilience in aquatic ecosystems”

- At the 8th Annual Subcommittee meeting, the EU and its MS presented the concept note for a draft resolution “*Accelerated adaptation measures to secure water quality and strengthened climate resilience in aquatic ecosystems*”
- The focus and content of the resolution is highly relevant, especially in light of the COP26 held in Glasgow. The proposal is also in line with the UNEA 5.2 theme: “Strengthening Actions for Nature to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals”,
- Initial discussions on the resolution demonstrated that there is interest in the resolution. The EU would like to offer special thanks to Chile for recognising the importance of the topic.
- At the same time, the EU and MS recognise the need to sharpen the focus the resolution so it can effectively contribute to the work of UNEP, MEAs and other actors.
- We continue facing uncertainty regarding the COVID-19 pandemic and its possible impacts on the shorter resumed session of UNEA 5. In relation to this, Executive Director and a number of delegates called for a manageable work load for UNEA 5.2 in terms of reduced amount of resolutions.
- Taking the above into account, the EU and the MS decided to postpone the EU+MS resolution proposal on “Water and climate”, reconsider its pertinence and prepare to table it at the UNEA-6.
- Given the need to strengthen the link between climate change and aquatic systems, and in light of the theme of UNEA 5.2, the EU and it MS will seek to integrate the key messages of that resolution in other outcome documents of UNEA-5.2.

EU draft resolution on NBS:

- The EU is finalising consultations internally and intends to table a draft resolution on Nature Based Solutions, co-sponsored by Costa Rica, Colombia and Pakistan, as soon as possible and before the deadline of 20th December.

Agenda item: In-depth consultation on the draft resolution from Sri Lanka on Sustainable Nitrogen Management. EU and MS comments on the draft Resolution:

PP3 –

- EU and MS suggest to mention climate change as well. We suggest adding the following: *“identify synergies of nitrogen initiatives to efforts to combat climate change and hence facilitate more coherent actions and addressing multiple global challenges due to the close natural coupling of the Carbon and Nitrogen cycles”*.

PP4 –

- The EU and its MS propose to reconsider the need for this overview of efforts. One question that proponents could consider is how the outcome of the INMS underpins and supports the proposed coordination and what is the plan for sustaining it (as applicable).
- We believe it is useful to mention **all** relevant initiatives – including those that addresses the nutrients to the marine environment. However, we don't think it is appropriate to mention some of the institutes that provide support.
- We also believe that efforts already undertaken by countries in other existing fora should be recognized.

OP (no number) -

- It is more common and more appropriate to request the ED.
- There is a need to assess whether/how all elements below relate to POW/B, as well as identify if they are essential, also keeping in mind related costs. The estimation of costs provided is very rough and does not provide much clarity on the implications.

OPI (a) –

- We would like to ask for a clarification on which countries signed the Colombo Declaration, so we understand what is the basis for this proposal.
- The EU and its MS would like to ask for clarification on reference to Nitrogen Waste, we don't believe this is a clear, nor appropriate term.
- We wonder if reference to *‘Reducing nutrient losses by at least 50%,’* would be more appropriate.
- We would appreciate a further clarification on potential savings and to whom they apply. We prefer not to refer to unsubstantiated figures in resolutions.
- As regards to the proposed objective (“halving nitrogen/nutrient waste/losses) by 2030”, it must be specified that this would be at a global scale. The resolution should also consider that some countries have already reduced their losses considerably.

OP2 (b) –

- The EU and its MS asks proponents to clarify the intent of this paragraph and what action is proposed for UNEA?
- Our impression is that INCOM has not yet been established nor its establishment decided upon. Therefore, we would be grateful to know what is the status of INCOM, what exactly is proposed in that regard and who is requested to report to UNEA6?
- Though sympathetic towards enhanced communication between secretariats of MEAs and conventions, we would appreciate a clarification on what is meant by requesting

the Secretariat to enhance coherence across nitrogen policies. Can you clarify, which secretariat is referred to in this paragraph?

OP3 (c) –

- The EU and its MS would like to understand, what is exactly requested from the secretariat?
- Many types of resources and activities are referred to. It would be useful to know, what type of activities have been already undertaken?
- How does this relate to POW/B?

OP4 (d) –

- The EU and its MS note, that this proposal has strong links with the proposal expected from Switzerland and others to strengthen the SPI on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution.
- We also encourage Sri Lanka, to engage with Switzerland and co-sponsors, to see if/how this could be integrated under a strengthened SPI on chemicals, waste and pollution.
- Furthermore, we would like to get more clarity on the status of ongoing work on a global assessment through the GEF financed project “Targeted Research for improving understanding of the Global Nitrogen Cycle towards the establishment of an International Nitrogen Management System (INMS)” and other efforts linked INMS. We were under the impression that significant progress can be expected in that direction already.
- We would also like to include “education” to the list along with “scientific aspects, policy, regulation (...)” that need to be assessed, if building from this paragraph.

OP5 (e)

- Regarding “facilitation” – we would like to understand, why is coordination with UN organizations and MEAs only referred to in relation to sensitizing citizens? The scope of the draft resolution does not seem to be limited to that?
- Such coordination seems to be a prerequisite as would be discussions within the governing bodies of the respective organizations and between the State Parties of the relevant MEAs.
- Such coordination seems to be also relevant for OP1 b).
- Can the proponents provide any information about coordination in the UN system or amongst MEAs for implementing the previous resolution (UNEP/EA.4/Res.14), which would be helpful to assess the best way forward.

In-depth consultation on the draft resolution by Ghana on animal welfare-environment and sustainable development nexus. EU and MS general comments:

- The EU and its MS thank for the proposal and welcome the discussion on the draft resolution, which we see as an opportunity to obtain more clarity on the proposal.
- We need to understand the delineation between the mandates and potential complementarities of UNEP and other agencies such as FAO or OIE (World Organisation for Animal Health) and or other relevant agencies, in the spirit of streamlining the international agenda on animal welfare.

- If the work on animal welfare is to proceed, it would be useful to explore other options. For example: could UNEA ask OIE to do the study requested by the draft resolution?
- The EU and its MS believe that the work requested to the ED should be in line with UNEPs mandate and expertise and preferably in line with the MTS.
- We favour and can support resolutions, in particular those containing requests to UNEP, which are in line with the focus on climate action, nature action and pollution action, as outlined in the MTS.
- For the EU and its MS it would be important to ensure that UNEP can keep this focus and we would not support drifting away from the MTS that we have just approved at the online session of UNEA-5.
- We would like to know about resources implications if the request is brought in line with UNEPs mandate. The requested activities should be planned mindful of the availability of (financial and human) resources and not pre-empt its follow up.