

Informal in-person meeting of Heads of Delegation to the INC on Plastic Pollution

held from 30 June to 3 July 2026

Chair's summary

Overview

From 30 June to 3 July 2026, I convened an informal in-person meeting of Heads of Delegation to the INC on Plastic Pollution at the United Nations Office in Nairobi. The informal meeting was preceded by regional consultations on 29 June 2026 at the same venue.

As outlined in my Note by the Chair, and Additional Note by the Chair, published in advance of the meeting, the purpose of our discussions was to provide an opportunity to exchange views and perspectives in preparation for the fourth part of the fifth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC-5.4) to develop an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment. The meeting sought to provide a platform for discussions on possible ways forward and was not a decision-making meeting.

The meeting included a range of modalities through which Members could come together for collective and focused discussions, including the opening **Pamoja** and closing **Umoja** sessions approach, four dedicated **Clusters** on specific topics, and daily **Review of Progress** sessions to take stock of the collective status of our work. As part of the discussions in each Cluster, Members were invited to share reflections and engage on a set of guiding questions, which are provided in Annex A to this summary. The meeting introduced a new approach to our ongoing informal work, and I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all Members for the enthusiasm and flexibility demonstrated throughout the week. The contributions of all Members were instrumental in achieving the objectives established for the meeting and in ensuring its overall success.

From the outset, it is important to clarify that this summary is provided for informational and record-keeping purposes only. It does not seek to reflect in full the richness and all nuances of the detailed positions expressed during the meeting, nor to prejudge any positions of Members of the Committee. I continue to encourage all Members to constructively engage with each other in order to better understand how these proposals may fit into the landscape of ongoing discussions.

I wish to thank all Members for their constructive and active engagement during the meeting. Your contributions produced an atmosphere of collaborative engagement, which we will continue to build on together as we move towards INC-5.4, including at the upcoming second informal in-person meeting of Heads of Delegation, to be held from 27 to 30 September in Bangkok, Thailand. I would like to particularly express my gratitude to the Co-facilitators, who provided great leadership and guidance to their respective Clusters throughout the meeting, and for their collaboration in the development of this summary:

Cluster A Abdulaziz Albutti (Saudi Arabia) and Victoria Hallum (New Zealand)

Cluster B Dinara Azhigaliyeva (Kazakhstan) and Marcelo Cousillas (Uruguay)

Cluster C Sivendra Michael (Fiji) and Elfriede More (Austria)

Cluster D Kathryn Youel Page (US) and Naomi Karekaho (Uganda)

I look forward to continuing drawing on their expertise and working together towards INC-5.4.

“Pamoja” opening session

The meeting opened in the spirit of **Pamoja** (meaning ‘togetherness’ in Swahili), reflecting the shared commitment by Members to re-engage in face-to-face dialogue after a 10-month interval and reinforcing the view that working together remains the foundation for advancing discussions towards INC-5.4.

At the opening, I recalled the working arrangements and objectives of the meeting, as set out in my Additional Note released on 16 June 2026. Thereafter, we heard statements from Members speaking on behalf of regional groups and groups of Members as well as from individual Members of the Committee. Following the Pamoja opening session, discussions under the Clusters commenced in the afternoon of the first day of the meeting.

Summary of Cluster discussions

Discussions across the four Clusters were constructive, with all guiding questions addressed during the meeting.

Cluster A – National plans, Reporting, Implementation and compliance, Information exchange, Effectiveness evaluation

Members discussed modalities related to the development, communication and publication of **national plans**. There was a broad understanding that national plans should follow a country-driven approach and be reflective of national circumstances, without prejudice to possible future guidance from the Conference of the Parties (COP).

Members also discussed whether there should be a mutually agreed-upon timeframe for submission of the first national plan, and the periodicity of updates, to be defined by the COP. National plans were broadly recognized as the primary implementation driver through which Parties would outline how they intend to implement the provisions of the instrument in a manner covering implementation actions across the instrument.

Members exchanged views on the specificity and the level of detail required in the instrument itself regarding the core elements of national plans. Some Members discussed the involvement of stakeholders as a component of the content of national plans.

Members discussed inclusion of an article on the preparation and of **national reports**, with views expressed acknowledging such an article as a key tool for implementation rather than a punitive exercise. Some considered that reporting should focus only on the implementation of national plans, while some saw it as covering all obligations under the instrument. Others considered reporting as covering all provisions together with relevant COP decisions. Some Members supported development of a common framework, format or set of guidelines by the COP, pointing to the importance of transparency and comparability, while others did not support such harmonisation. Members discussed which specific features, including periodicity, should be left to the COP, with some underlining the importance of linking the implementation of reporting and national plans to the availability of means of implementation, connecting these discussions to those under Cluster C.

While discussing that **effectiveness evaluation** should be a non-punitive exercise assessing collective progress under the instrument, Members emphasized that there should be no comparison among Parties. Members expressed a variety of views on the specific number of years following the entry into force before the first evaluation, noting the need to ensure sufficient time before the first evaluation is conducted. Members discussed how evaluation

outcomes could inform and be considered by the COP . Views were expressed on whether sources of information for the evaluation would consist of national plans and reporting only, or also broader scientific data, as well as other relevant information, such as the knowledge of Indigenous Peoples. Some noted a preference to set out such details in future COP decisions rather than in the article itself.

Members discussed the importance of the requirement to nominate national focal points and considered the **exchange of information** both directly among Parties and through a clearinghouse mechanism. Regarding establishment of a clearinghouse or an online platform facilitated by the Secretariat, some Members considered that the details of any such platform should be left to the COP. Information exchange was viewed by some as a means of supporting national implementation, helping Parties overcome challenges, identify solutions, share experience and support compliance, rather than as an additional reporting burden or as a basis for comparability amongst parties, with others stressing that it should remain demand driven. Members expressed views on the parameters of what information exchange should support, with some favouring linking it to the instrument's objective, others to the objective and all provisions, and others limiting it to core obligations. Some Members supported inclusion of information exchange as a voluntary provision and not as a basis for new obligations.

Some Members proposed possible elements to fall under information exchange, including best available practices and techniques, scientific information, synthesis reports and guidance, national plans and reports, life-cycle assessments, capacity-building opportunities, available finance, and, with prior informed consent, Indigenous Peoples' and local knowledge systems. Some Members expressed support for the public availability of data, as well as calls for confidentiality safeguards concerning business information, intellectual property and nationally sensitive information, with some supporting an exception from confidentiality safeguards for information on health and environmental impacts. An existing international partnership on marine litter was referenced by some Members as a possible model, with others questioning the applicability of the model to the instrument. Views were also heard on merging this article with the article on public information.

Members discussed the interlinkages between national plans, national reports, compliance assessment and effectiveness evaluation, with views expressed on a possible feedback loop between effectiveness evaluation and national plans. Some Members viewed effectiveness evaluation outcomes as informing, as appropriate, the subsequent cycle of national plan development, on the understanding that such efforts remain Party-driven. Other Members did not consider that such interlinkages or feedback loops should be made.

Other considerations raised by Members included the need to take into account the periodicity of COP sessions, the relevant experience in other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), the importance of avoiding duplication of reporting and the need to stagger reporting obligations under other MEAs to reduce reporting burdens on Parties. References were also made to the linkages between the support arrangements and resources available for developing countries and their ability to meaningfully implement these provisions.

Cluster B – Releases and leakages, Existing and legacy plastic pollution, Plastic waste management, Plastic product design, Plastic products

Members' positions on a possible standalone article on **plastic products** remained a key point of discussion, with views ranging from no article, to establishing global criteria,

including through a global list with possible phase-out timeframes, a global list that can be amended over time, indicative lists, or alternatively, criteria to guide measures at the national level. In discussions on inclusion of a possible global list, it was noted that there remains the option to include exemptions and/or possible opt out /opt in mechanisms to allow for national flexibility and circumstances. Some Members also reflected on possible criteria for the identification of problematic plastic products and on a possible mechanism to support the phase-out of identified problematic plastic products, including approaches for adding identified products to a list, whether global, indicative, or otherwise. Some Members noted the importance for possible global criteria to address problematic plastic products which contain hazardous chemicals, intentionally added microplastics, are prone to leakage into the environment, pose a risk to human health or the environment, cannot be reused or recycled in practice and at scale, and that may disrupt circular economy approaches.

While science-based approaches received support in principle, Members noted further discussion would be required to ensure a common understanding of what this means in practice for the design and implementation of a potential article, including consideration of the sciences, practices and knowledges of Indigenous Peoples, as well as local communities.

Some Members proposed the establishment of a technical and scientific body to review requests and provide recommendations to the COP for global action on identified problematic plastic products. An approach was raised on the possibility of starting from known common ground, such as pairing nationally determined measures with voluntary global science-based guidance, while preserving the possibility of strengthening the implementation of the article over time.

Members also noted the importance of ensuring the availability of environmentally sound, affordable and accessible alternatives to problematic plastic products.

There was support for a dedicated article on **plastic product design**, anchored in common global criteria, including durability, reusability, refillability, repairability and recyclability. Some Members reflected that the instrument's role is to provide guidance and standards to improve plastic product design over time. Other Members emphasised the importance of maintaining national flexibility to ensure plastic product design remains responsive to differing national circumstances, requirements and priorities.

Discussions identified a number of issues requiring further consideration, including whether global criteria for plastic product design should be mandatory or voluntary; how such criteria could be operationalised, whether through globally coordinated or nationally determined approaches; and the extent to which product design criteria should address chemicals of concern, microplastics and product safety. Members also considered whether chemicals of concern could be addressed, where appropriate, under plastic product design, to encourage safer substitutes of chemicals and provide a positive signal to industry to reduce chemicals of concern during design processes. While not discussed in detail, consideration of chemicals of concern was raised by Members and remained a recurring area of divergence. The issue of transparency regarding product composition was further raised by some Members.

There continues to be divergence on the inclusion of a standalone article on **releases and leakages**, with some Members opposing its inclusion, and others suggesting the content of the article could be addressed through dedicated measures under other articles, such as plastic waste management, plastic product design or possibly under both. Conversely, other

Members expressed strong preferences for each of these articles to remain as standalone options, though acknowledged opportunities to leverage potential synergies or further streamline areas of overlap across plastic waste management, plastic product design and releases and leakages. On this, Members recognised the linkages between releases and leakages and plastic product design and supported including measures to streamline the proposed articles. Some Members expressed their view that abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear should be addressed under the instrument, with some seeking this to be referenced directly under releases and leakages, and others noting some flexibility for its inclusion under other sections of the instrument, as appropriate.

There remains support for a standalone article on **existing and legacy pollution**, though distinct terminology preferences remained a key point of divergence. Some Members suggested to reframe the issue more broadly as 'plastic pollution'. Members views also varied in relation to whether remediation obligations should be voluntary or mandatory, who should bear responsibility for addressing pre-existing plastic pollution, and how to remediate plastic pollution in areas beyond national jurisdiction. Some Members noted the importance of ensuring cooperation in areas beyond national jurisdiction in accordance with existing international law and legal regimes.

Members suggested measures to identify, assess and monitor hotspots, with one Member proposing a dedicated programme of work (PoW) on technical support and/or guidance to identify sources of, and/or phase out cross-border plastic pollution. A proposal was presented on behalf of a group of Members, on a dedicated remediation fund. Some Members expressed a willingness to continue engaging on this proposal, while others noted a preference for a dedicated PoW over establishing a remediation fund. Another Member proposed the establishment of a dedicated PoW under existing regional sea conventions.

Members raised the importance of recognising the special circumstances of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), Pacific Small Island Developing States (PSIDS), and coastal countries, and of ensuring this is reflected in the article.

Although Members converged around the idea of having an article on **plastic waste management**, differences remained regarding its contents. Some ideas shared indicated that the article should support the collection, sorting, recycling, recovery and sound treatment of plastic waste, and avoid duplication with the Basel Convention. Members also highlighted the importance of linkages with upstream measures to enhance waste management outcomes.

Divergence remained on the strength of obligations under the article, the role and application of the waste hierarchy, approaches to operationalizing extended producer responsibility (EPR), among other considerations. A proposal was introduced to outline specific targets on waste reduction, recovery and recycling. Members expressed differing views on whether such targets should be established at the global or national level and whether they should be voluntary or mandatory. While some Members opposed the inclusion of global targets on collection and recycling, others noted support for further consideration of possible targets. Members reflected on the potential role of EPR as a tool to support improved wasted management, though some Members explicitly favoured nationally determined EPR systems, and others opposed global harmonization of EPR measures. Members also expressed different views on the waste hierarchy and how it should be reflected in any future measures.

Two conceptual proposals were put forward on plastic waste management during the meeting. One proposal outlined measures to strengthen plastic waste management, including through an overarching recovery goal to reduce plastic waste and leakages into the environment. Another proposal outlined measures to address plastic waste management in relation to sources and drivers of pollution, alongside enabling measures to support the effective implementation of the instrument.

Across all topics discussed under the Cluster, Members consistently highlighted the importance of ensuring adequate, predictable and effective means of implementation to support the implementation of obligations. Moreover, Members underscored the importance of recognising national circumstances and capabilities when determining implementation of articles. In this context, some Members called for recognition of common but differentiated responsibilities, while others highlighted the need for recognition of the specific needs of developing countries, Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs), SIDS, and PSIDS.

Cluster C – Capacity-building, technical assistance, technology transfer, including international cooperation; Financial resources and mechanism

Members discussed various institutional arrangements to ensure effective **capacity-building** and implementation support for the instrument, with some Members framing capacity-building as needing to be institutionalized, country-driven, responsive to national needs, linked to implementation obligations and national plans, connected to technology transfer, technical assistance and financial support, long-term and not a one-off activity, and to draw lessons from existing MEAs. In this regard, some Members called for the establishment of national focal points, regional centres, and leveraging existing institutions.

Some Members suggested some form of a subsidiary body or dedicated mechanism on implementation that could identify needs; facilitate cooperation; and monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of capacity-building, technical assistance, and technology transfer, drawing on experience of other MEAs and conventions. Others cautioned against creating complex new structures and advocated utilizing existing institutions where possible to avoid administrative burdens and duplication.

On **technology transfer** specifically, there was divergence between those who see it as voluntary in nature, while respecting intellectual property, and those who do not accept that it can be confined to voluntary arrangements. A proposal for an international cooperation mechanism with a match-making function, tied explicitly to the financial mechanism, was also introduced.

There was a common understanding that implementation requires predictable and accessible **financial support**, although Members expressed differing views on how and if adequate financial contributions can be defined.

With regard to the design of the **financial mechanism**, some Members noted the existing Global Environmental Facility (GEF) should serve as the primary entity, pointing to its predictability, regular replenishment cycle and record of responding to COP guidance, questioning whether a new fund would meaningfully unlock additional resources, and noting the time it would take to establish one. Other Members called for a standalone dedicated fund, with some setting out a specific timeline for why such a mechanism would need to be established well ahead of the instrument's entry into force and raising concerns about how existing fund governance handles politically sensitive funding decisions.

Some Members supported a hybrid approach, in which an existing mechanism would play a complementary role alongside a new dedicated fund, although the modalities for designing such a hybrid approach also differed.

Members tested the practical implications of each option during the week and discussed the adequacy of existing funds in the context of falling replenishment levels. Members further discussed whether a new fund would be able to unlock resources beyond what is currently available. Discussions continued on whether the instrument's mandate, which would extend to the marine environment, should address implementation challenges and the additional burdens faced by LDCs, LLDCs and other developing countries, including in areas such as infrastructure and transition to alternative materials and technologies.

One proposal for a dedicated fund was elaborated in further detail, including how it would operate through existing multilateral development banks and regional entities rather than implementing projects directly, and how its steering committee would set eligibility criteria with specific provisions for SIDS and LDCs. Other proposals for a remediation sub-fund as well as a compensation sub-fund were raised for remediation of existing plastic pollution and compensation for economic and social losses resulting from the implementation of the instrument respectively. These mechanisms were proposed as operating under the financial mechanism and guided by the COP.

A time-bound proposal was also introduced, under which a new dedicated fund would be established while allowing a limited transitional period during which an existing mechanism could play a bridging role pending the fund's operationalisation.

Members emphasised that private sector participation is essential for implementation and that the private sector plays an important role in product design, innovation, waste management, recycling and technology development. On **private finance**, there was common understanding that it should complement, and not replace, public and international support. It was also highlighted by some Members that predictable, long-term policy signals are important to encourage and catalyse investment by the private sector. Other Members stressed that the instrument cannot create obligations for private entities and that implementation should be left entirely to Parties and be nationally determined. Several examples of enabling conditions for the role of the private sector were raised, including EPR schemes, economic incentives, public-private partnerships, and consultative bodies for private sector input.

Some Members highlighted that finance is the precondition for the other elements under the instrument to be effectively implemented. Some Members emphasized that the support required for implementation will depend on the obligations ultimately agreed. Members discussed maintaining separate legal provisions for capacity-building, technical assistance, technology transfer and finance while ensuring complementarity among these elements to enhance legal clarity, visibility, implementation, reporting and follow-up. Other Members proposed consolidating these related elements, explaining that they are inherently linked and that consolidation could reduce duplication and reflect implementation realities.

Views among Members differed on the level of institutional detail to be included in the instrument. Some Members supported establishing key arrangements in the instrument, while allowing operational modalities to be developed later. Others favoured relying on existing arrangements and postponing decisions on more detailed governance structures to

future COP decisions, cautioning against creating complex new institutions and administrative burdens.

Cluster D – Preamble, Objective, Principles and approaches, Just transition, Health, Public information, awareness, education and research

Members elaborated on the possible functions of the **Preamble** and of the **principles and approaches**, including in setting the context of the instrument and guiding how the substantive provisions could be operationalized, respectively. Some Members highlighted that the concepts of UNEA Resolution 5/14 should be reflected throughout the instrument, including in the Preamble and principles and approaches, as appropriate. Views were also heard from Members emphasizing that varying national circumstances, such as those of SIDS and LDCs, should be explicitly recognized in either or both of the Preamble and any principles and approaches.

Members engaged in discussions on the structural aspects of this topic, including whether to compile principles and approaches in a standalone article or to integrate them throughout the instrument in relevant operative provisions and, where appropriate, in the Preamble. Views in favour of the former approach emphasized that a standalone article on principles and approaches could provide legal clarity and operational guidance by establishing a clear basis for the consistent application of principles across the instrument. Members supporting the latter approach recalled that many other MEAs do not contain standalone articles on principles and highlighted that such an approach could help avoid inconsistencies in application of principles across various provisions in the instrument.

Members highlighted a range of substantive aspects of the principles and approaches that could guide implementation of the instrument, including, among others, common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, precautionary approach, polluter pays, science-based decision-making, right to development, intergenerational equity, Indigenous knowledge, local knowledge and traditional knowledge, with differing views on the extent that each might be included in the text as well as the specific formulation of any other principles.

Views on the **Objective** of the instrument varied in relation to form, with some favouring a minimal, aspirational formulation, some favouring a concise Objective drawn directly from UNEA resolution 5/14, and others preferring a fuller, MEA-standard formulation centred on protecting human health and the environment. Some Members did not support referencing health within the Objective, while others highlighted the relationship between plastic pollution, human health and the environment referenced in UNEA resolution 5/14. Some underscored the close relationship between the Objective and the scope of the instrument, stressing that the ambition of the Objective must be directly proportionate the ambition of provisions on means of implementation. Some Members also expressed views that the Objective provided guidance on what the instrument will aim to achieve, while the scope defines the boundaries of the Objective. Views were also expressed on whether the Objective should center on ending plastic pollution or addressing plastic pollution.

Members expressed views on the form and placement of **just transition** as an issue in the text, including whether text on just transition would centre on the social dimensions of affected or vulnerable communities, or on the trade and socioeconomic impacts on developing countries of implementation of the instrument, or both, taking into account the unique national circumstances of countries. Various approaches were heard on placement, such as in a standalone article, integrated into relevant operative provisions, contextualized

in the preamble, as a combination of these, or no text on this issue. Some Members commented on the role of subsidiary bodies in the context of just transition, including the possibility of a subsidiary body to assess the social and economic impacts of the instrument in the context of sustainable development. Some Members highlighted the cross-cutting nature of just transition, noting its linkages with means of implementation, warranting coordination with the cluster discussing that topic.

Views were also expressed on whether, where and how to reference the topic of **health** in the instrument. While some preferred no specific reference in the text, other Members favoured inclusion of possible references in the Preamble, in the Objective, in a standalone article, mainstreamed throughout the text, or a combination of these approaches. A variety of ideas were shared on how to integrate health aspects in the instrument, including through a dedicated committee with health-related functions; international cooperation and capacity-building in relation to health; employing a "One Health" approach; inclusion of a possible exemption for national health emergencies; consideration of ensuring affordability of healthcare products in implementation of the instrument; and adequate scientific evidence and means of implementation to facilitate implementation of health-related measures.

In addition, some cited the need to take into consideration the work of other relevant multilateral instruments or international bodies in any future considerations related to health.

Views were expressed by some Members on how the issue of **public awareness, education and research** can drive social or behavioural change to facilitate effective implementation of the instrument. Members discussed the possibility of reflecting the topic in a standalone article, a two-article structure in a manner similar to some other MEAs, or as an integrated concept throughout the text without any standalone provision. Some Members favoured a non-prescriptive, facilitative approach in including the topic in the text. Members drew links between the topic and other topics under consideration, including health, just transition, Indigenous knowledge, traditional knowledge and the role of subnational governments, among others.

Members discussed private-sector information disclosure, with some favouring encouragement of voluntary information disclosure and others preferring to leave this to national determination. Some Members stressed that awareness measures will only be effective if paired with adequate finance, technology transfer, capacity-building and waste management infrastructure.

Overview of Chair's consultations

As outlined in the Pamoja opening session, I conducted structured consultations with all groups during the meeting to understand and explore their views on three issues: scope, decision-making, and the possible arrangement of elements in the text.

Scope

While divergence persists on the topic, there was genuine interest from all Members in making progress on the matter.

Many of the views expressed aligned with the exchanges heard during the virtual Heads of Delegation meeting held on 30 April 2026. As there remains a variety of views, I suggested that an entry point to have a structured discussion could start with a negative list of

elements. Many Members expressed openness to this idea, although there were clear divergent views on what could be reflected in the negative list.

Some Members assigned a high importance to having a standalone article on scope as a priority topic for consideration, as it would provide clarity and facilitate future implementation without ambiguity. Others held that the language of UNEA Resolution 5/14 makes this approach unnecessary, although some expressed flexibility to discuss a possible language in the instrument, either as a stand-alone article or as provisions that could be included in specific sections of the instrument.

The interlinkages of this element with the Objective of the instrument and definitions were also noted by some Members.

Decision-making

There was an understanding that consensus is the preferred approach for decision-making and should be strived for. Consensus was emphasized by some Members as the only possible approach for decision-making.

Other Members highlighted that the ability to vote when all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted is essential to enable operationalization, effective implementation and further development of the instrument. Some argued that the possibility of voting as a last resort can be an incentive to achieve consensus.

There were suggestions to look into practices and lessons from models in other existing MEAs, and explore specific conditions, requirements and thresholds for voting.

Opt-out and opt-in approaches were also noted as one consideration to enable flexibility.

Views were expressed that it might be useful to revisit this discussion when further understanding can be achieved in other relevant items due to their interlinkages.

Arrangements of elements in the text

The order of elements included in previous texts is broadly based on the chronological sequence of the full life cycle of plastics. Another possible approach could be to follow the logic of preventing plastic pollution from entering the environment, which is an idea that has been presented by some delegations in the past.

Many Members showed openness and flexibility with adjusting the structure, while different perspectives were expressed relating to possible reordering, noting:

- Content and substance are of priority, as form follows function; and
- Reordering the articles, including merging sections, could be considered where it brings added value, helps move negotiations forward, and improves clarity, noting that any restructuring should not change the substance, content, outcomes, visions and goals of the instrument.

Some Members signaled significant caution over changing the order of the articles, which in their view could prejudice the text. Moreover, they emphasized that no issue should be sidelined.

“Umoja” closing session

The meeting concluded in the spirit of **Umoja** (meaning ‘unity’ in Swahili), reaffirming our shared objective of developing an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment, through concerted action at both the global and national levels, while fully recognising different national circumstances, capacities and socio-economic contexts.

I recalled that two documents would emerge from the meeting: this summary as well as an **‘Aid to Negotiations’** intended as an informal reference document to support discussion and help structure our engagement as we move towards INC-5.4.

In addition, in the closing session I outlined the next phase of the Roadmap to INC-5.4. Members were informed that the outcomes of the second informal in-person meeting of Heads of Delegation in Bangkok, to be held from 27 to 30 September, would help inform development of a second iteration of the Aid to Negotiations document. Throughout October and November, I intend to continue my consultations with Members to further assess opportunities for narrowing remaining differences in advance of INC-5.4.

I also noted the possible convening of a third informal in-person meeting of Heads of Delegation during the week of 25 January 2027, before resuming negotiations at INC-5.4 in March 2027. I also reaffirmed my intention to continue working closely with the Co-facilitators to refine future work modalities and facilitate focused discussions aimed at identifying areas of convergence and exploring possible bridging approaches.

The meeting concluded with statements by Members speaking on behalf of regional groups and groups of Members as well as from individual Members of the Committee.

From my side, I reiterate my appreciation for Members’ constructive engagement throughout the week. While differences remain, the meeting reaffirmed the shared commitment of Members to advancing efforts to reach an agreement on an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution.

Annex A: Guiding questions

Members engaged in an informal exchange of views based on guiding questions, circulated to Members ahead of the informal meeting, on 23 June 2026. The [guiding questions](#), available on the INC webpage, appear as follows:

Cluster A:

- **National plans**
- **Reporting**
- **Implementation and compliance**
- **Information exchange**
- **Effectiveness evaluation**

1. What minimum common essential elements should be included in National Action Plans to ensure comparability while preserving national flexibility?
2. How can National Action Plans be structured so that reporting, implementation and compliance, information exchange, and effectiveness evaluation reinforce each other, rather than operating as separate obligations?
3. What practical mechanisms would ensure that information exchange contributes to improved implementation at the national level?
4. How can reporting requirements be designed to directly support compliance assessment and effectiveness evaluation rather than functioning as a standalone exercise?
5. What characteristics should effectiveness evaluation have in order to be a useful tool for improving the implementation of the instrument?

Cluster B:

- **Releases and leakages**
- **Existing and legacy plastic pollution**
- **Plastic waste management**
- **Plastic products design**
- **Plastic products**

1. How can provisions on releases, leakages, and waste management systems be reinforced by provisions on product design and products?
2. What type of provisions should be considered to identify plastic products that may lead to plastic pollution? To what extent can the instrument create a common approach to this, while at the same time respecting different national circumstances and prerogatives?

3. How can plastic product design be a useful tool to avoid plastic pollution? What mechanisms can be envisaged in the text to disseminate good practices in this field?
4. What role, if any, should the instrument play in addressing existing/legacy plastic pollution – and through what types of provisions?
5. How can the instrument contribute to more effective waste management, including collection of plastic waste?

Cluster C:

- **Capacity-building, technical assistance, and technology transfer, including international cooperation**
- **Financial resources and mechanism**

1. Can capacity-building, technical assistance, technology transfer, and financial support be integrated into a single coherent implementation package that directly enables action under the instrument or is it preferable to structure these as distinct but complementary obligations?
2. What institutional arrangements would be adequate to ensure that capacity-building efforts contribute effectively to the implementation of the agreement?
3. How can the instrument create the incentives and send effective signals to the private sector to align with the objective of the instrument?
4. What conditions would a financial mechanism deliver predictable and adequate support for implementation; and what criteria would be needed to assess adequacy?
5. What structure in the financial mechanism would be most appropriate for the purposes in the instrument? What could be the role or roles of the GEF or a dedicated multilateral fund? Are the proposals presented so far mutually exclusive options, or can they coexist in a hybrid approach?

Cluster D:

- **Preamble**
- **Objective**
- **Principles and approaches**
- **Just transition**
- **Health**
- **Public information, awareness, education and research**

1. Which general principles and approaches are essential to guide consistent decision-making across all provisions of the instrument? How should they be operationalized

(e.g. in a standalone article, in the Preamble, or integrated within each substantive provision)?

2. What division of content can exist between the Preamble on one hand and principles and approaches on the other, to avoid repetition of elements and enhance coherence in the text?
3. How should the instrument address the social and economic dimensions of the transition envisaged under the instrument; and what form should that take in the instrument: a standalone provision, preambular language, or integration within substantive articles?
4. How should the instrument address the relationship between plastic pollution and human health and through what type of provision, if any?
5. How can public information, awareness, education, and research be structured to directly support implementation and behavioral change at scale?