

US Inputs to UNEA-7 Ministerial Declaration

- The United States believes a President's summary would be preferable to a ministerial declaration, as it will be difficult to achieve consensus on many elements that we expect Members States to propose for inclusion (e.g., references to triple planetary crisis). A negotiated declaration will be divisive and not conducive to UNEA's goal of bringing countries together towards common solutions.
- If a President's summary is not pursued, a ministerial declaration should be concise and clearly focused on UNEP's mandate.
- We cannot support language "reaffirming" the Rio Principles, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), or the Paris Agreement.
- At this time, the United States must reserve on any language related to climate change and the impacts of climate change.
- We urge UNEP to focus on efforts to ensure the equality of women and girls, and insist upon not including language on Diversity, Equality, Inclusion, Gender Ideology or Environmental Justice. DEI itself is a form of immoral discrimination. Gender ideology is at odds with biological reality, as it denies the basic fact that there are only two sexes. Organizations should avoid delving into these divisive cultural causes.
- We cannot support calls for expanding UNEP's mandate or language supporting new initiatives that the existing budget does not fund. The United States is currently reviewing U.S. participation in and funding for international organizations to ensure they are advancing U.S. national interests.
- Any explicit or conceptual mention of "common but differentiated responsibilities" (CBDR), including language identical to that in other negotiated outcomes, is entirely unacceptable. Such language is often

highly prejudicial to Member States' interests and suggests a need to differentiate responsibilities or rules between "developed" and "developing" countries in a way that undermines the global effort needed from all countries – and in particular major economies – to address environmental challenges.

- Suggestions that so-called "means of implementation" (MOI) -- e.g., financial or technical assistance supported by donor countries – are required to achieve environmental or social outcomes, including fulfillment of the legal obligations of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), or that obligations undertaken by countries are contingent on foreign assistance, are unacceptable.
- Any calls for UNEP to support or assist with the implementation of MEAs need to ensure the proposed activity is within the relevant MEA's mandates and consistent with the decisions of their governing bodies, since MEAs have their own respective governing bodies.
- "Scientifically verified evidence" is not agreed language. Such a term seems to introduce a new ambiguous threshold given it is unclear who or what body would make such verification. The United States proposes either using "science-based approaches" or "best available science," as used in past UNEA declarations and resolutions, including the ministerial declaration from UNEA-5.2 and UNEA resolution 5/14.
- We cannot accept any mention of "unilateral coercive measures" or language with similar intent that would seek to infringe on Member States' use of legitimate, legal, and appropriate tools for responding to harmful activity and addressing threats to peace and security.
- We cannot accept language calling for the United States to implement frameworks that we have not joined such as the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGB). We do not accept references to "outcome documents" issued during the first part of the conference

in Kunming, which were not internationally negotiated and were issued by the host.