Informal in-person meeting of Heads of Delegation to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Plastic Pollution
30 June – 3 July 2026

Guiding Questions
23 June 2026

Reference is made to my Additional Note of 16 June. These questions are intended to support delegations in preparing for the Cluster discussions. They do not prejudge positions or future negotiations and are not intended to produce agreed text.

I will separately address scope and decision-making in dedicated consultations during the meeting.

Delegations are reminded to take into consideration the methodology of the "4 Cs"[1] and the guiding criteria of this process when preparing their interventions, in order to promote a constructive dialogue while avoiding the repetition of general statements.

I will encourage Co-facilitators to ask questions to clarify positions, and invite Members to refer to previous interventions if similar ideas are expressed, in order to allow for substantive forward-looking and solutions-oriented contributions.

Common approach for all Clusters

Consistency across all four Clusters will be important to provide a single vision as we move together throughout the meeting. At the same time, we recognize that topics can be different in different Clusters, and minor changes in methodology might be needed.

It is relevant to keep our sights on the objectives of the meeting: reviewing the state of progress overall, as a basis for the development of an informal reference document; and exchanging new ideas and a further understanding of proposals to advance towards possible landing solutions. This second objective will result in a summary note in which I as Chair will capture new ideas shared and that might be useful for future exchanges.

In terms of working modalities, dedicated cluster sessions will work on the basis of conceptual discussions, and solutions-oriented interventions that follow the guiding questions.

The proposed guiding questions represent proposals to start the exchange, and do not prejudge what elements Members may consider more relevant in the context of the Clusters. Co-facilitators, in consultations with myself as Chair, may develop further questions during the meeting, depending on the ideas shared by Members, including on clarification questions or on topics that Members identify as priorities and that may require further understanding.

[1] The 4Cs are referenced in the Chair's third letter published on 16 April 2026 and outlined as follows: 'Conceptual discussions'; 'Clarity in the text'; 'Connections between parts of the instrument'; and 'Comprehensive view of the instrument'.

If a Member brings a textual proposal on any given topic, and requests it to be projected on the screen, Co-facilitators can assess if the room would favor this approach, but in any case there could be no live editing, in any circumstance.

Members are invited to consider what elements need to be included in the instrument, and which topics may be developed later by the governing body.

After each Cluster session, time permitting, I will meet with the Co-facilitators in order to gather their perspectives on the session, and in order to have an idea of the main topics presented, bridging ideas and proposals that may arise.

Co-facilitators will be invited to provide a brief summary of their main takeaways every day in the Review of Progress segment.

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?