

Statement by the Russian Federation
on the 1st Revised Draft of UNEA-7 Ministerial Declaration,
30 September 2025

Madame Chair, your excellency,

At the outset, let me express our sincere appreciation for the considerable efforts made by the Presidency in preparing the draft.

We note with concern, that the revised version obtained several unagreed and contentious ideas. We believe that at this stage, the viable way to arrive at consensual document in time is in applying “common denominator” approach. It means that if certain part of the declaration is arousing controversy among member states, it should be abandoned. This approach will also help make the declaration short and concise, which is a request of many delegations. Currently, however, we have to acknowledge that the text now looks heavy and needs shortening.

Now, let me go through the points of concern for my delegation.

1. My delegation with all respect has to reject references to **Pact for the Future** and its Annexes. The reason behind it is that this document is not consensual. It is a fact that several delegations including mine did not endorse it and dissociated themselves from the relevant GA resolution, because the document was developed with grave violations of mandating resolution of the GA. Unfortunately, the text of the Pact failed to reflect key concerns of the Member States, has compromised legitimacy, is non-binding in its nature (as a GA resolution, leave alone **non-consensual**) and we are not in a position to endorse the text with the reference to this document. This relates to Global Digital Compact in Para J as well.
2. We would appreciate the Declaration, which upholds the **principle of technological neutrality**, according to which the energy transition can only be achieved through a flexible approach to all available technologies, not limiting ourselves specific solutions. In line with this we respectfully request to reflect this principle in paragraph E, which should mention “*just transitionS*” (in plural instead of single form) and read “accessibility of renewable and low-emission energy solutions as well as energy efficient technologies”
3. My delegation cannot accept new language in para E on (I quote) “**ensuring traceability, transparency and accountability throughout value chains,**”. We would be satisfied with the following alternative “ensuring inclusive and fair value chains, including for critical minerals”
4. We note with concern that there was a roll back in citing goals of Paris agreement. Para H is now mentioning only 1.5 degrees goal, where as the original text is much more complex. We urge to cite full paragraph with the Paris Agreement goals or reference them in general.

We also have several terminology concerns:

- Para C dwells on “rethinking of product design across **its full life cycle**”. In our opinion the product design is a downstream category and cannot be applied to “full life cycle”. And yes, it can be improved to ensure efficient waste management after the product is used. In line with this understanding, it is more appropriate to speak about “rethinking of product design to ensure its sustainable utilization and disposal”.
- Enquiry on language in Action 4. Could you clarify why was the term “rules of international law” used – instead of more common “norms”?
- Para D mentions “sustainable, healthy diets”. Could you kindly advise on the source of this language.
- We urge to use the term “**hazardous chemicals**” instead of “**harmful chemicals**” in line with language of specific MEAs on Chemicals.
- Similarly, we support the use of term “**global environmental challenges**” instead of “**crises**”.

We kindly encourage the drafting team to take a look at our track-changes provided in a separate document, where we propose viable solutions for the draft.

Here are some of our key ideas, that still wait to be integrated into the text:

Firstly, we urge include references to the importance of fair, equitable and inclusive geographic representation in all UNEP staffing categories. We note that this idea is reflected in the latest version of the MTS draft, which means it is also welcomed by Member States in the Ministerial Declaration as well – in line with **UNEA Resolution 5/13**. Likewise, we propose to highlight the need for increased transparency and accountability within the Secretariat.

Second, it is our assured view that the draft should benefit from the statement that UNEP and its Assembly should remain neutral forum, free of politicization, that is free from geopolitical agendas, which are alien to the topic of environment. We think it’s vital to say that this Assembly is about cooperation, not confrontation.

At the same time, we believe it is only fair to acknowledge that any coercive measures, which are unwarranted by the Security Council, may impede the operations of UNEP in certain regions of the world and thus undermine achievement of environmental goals. Ladies and gentlemen, this proposal is not about condemning somebody, but about acknowledging this fact and encouraging UNEP to seek ways to neutralize adverse impacts of such measures on its operations in certain regions.

Your excellency, we remain grateful to Oman for dedicated effort to draft a balanced MD. We reiterate our support to the Presidency and readiness to finalize viable and concise document together.