Operative Paragraph 10 of decision 4/2 reads as follows: “Decides that the scope of the consideration during the review process will be:

(a) The preparation, working arrangements, and scheduling of sessions of the Environment Assembly and the objectives, preparation, working arrangements and the scheduling of meetings of its subsidiary body, namely the meeting of the Open-ended Committee of Permanent Representatives and the regular and annual meetings of the subcommittee of the Committee of Permanent Representatives;”

Guiding questions for subparagraph 10 (a):

1. How can UNEA and its working arrangements be leveraged to further enhance its ability to take strategic decisions and provide political guidance?
2. What steps can be taken to meaningfully enhance stakeholder engagement, including from the scientific community, at UNEA?
3. Are the designations of the subsidiary intersessional bodies – i.e. OECPR and the annual subcommittee – adequately reflecting their roles and functions?
4. Should the respective roles of the OECPR and the annual subcommittee be further clarified and reinforced? If so, how?
5. Are the timing and duration of the meetings of the different UNEP governing bodies optimal, or should they be reconsidered, including with respect to facilitating meaningful stakeholder participation? If so, how?

Provided inputs:

- The Secretariat should maintain a centralized, publicly available, and continuously-updated online calendar with all upcoming meetings – CPR, Bureau, and other – including meeting agendas and decisions to be taken.
- On significant resolutions, the Secretariat or resolution sponsors could arrange science-based discussions between policy makers and members from the stakeholder community including recognized technical experts and scientists to discuss technical aspects of the resolution. These information sessions could be held either in advance of or during the UNEA sessions.
- The CPR should play a more active role in reviewing and consolidating resolutions before the OECPR – it would be preferable if all available resolutions had a first read-
though before the OECPR to identify key issues as early as possible in order to facilitate negotiations at UNEA.

- The UNEA bureau and CPR should continue to look to optimize the scheduling and length of the meetings of the OECPR and UNEA to ensure meeting and cost efficiency.
  
  - Long meetings make it burdensome for member states to send the correct staff to attend the meeting. It is difficult for experts to be away from their positions for such a long period of time and the high costs in time and expense associated with such a long trip may limit participation.
  
  - There may be ways to structure the scheduling of OECPR and UNEA sessions, including making use of weekend days or overlapping some portions of the OECPR and non-high-level UNEA segments, to reduce the overall duration of future meetings.

- The bureau should consider scheduling the science-policy-business forum to avoid overlap with the OECPR or UNEA. Alternatively, the science policy forum activities could be streamlined into the agenda of UNEA itself rather than held as a separate meeting.

- With most UNEA resolutions directed at programmatic solutions, there is little time to undertake strategic discussions at UNEA. Strategic direction and political guidance to UNEP should be undertaken in frequent discussions of the CPR on the Program of Work and Budget, particularly through the annual CPR subcommittee meeting.

(b) The respective roles and responsibilities of the Bureau of the Environment Assembly and of the Bureau of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, including those related to interactions with their respective constituencies;

**Guiding questions for subparagraph 10 (b):**

1. *Should the respective roles and responsibilities of the CPR and UNEA Bureaux and their Chairs be more distinguished and clarified, including with regard to representation of regional constituencies?*

2. *Should the two Bureaus further strengthen their working relationship? If so, how?*

3. *How can individual Bureau members contribute to enhancing the visibility of UNEA as the leading global environmental authority in other international fora?*

Provided inputs:
No written comments on this subparagraph.

(c) Criteria, modalities and timing for presenting and negotiating draft resolutions and decisions;
Guiding questions for paragraph 10 (c):

1. What should be the key criteria and focus for draft UNEA resolutions and decisions, and how should they relate to the theme of the Assembly?
2. How to better ensure that informal deadlines for submitting draft resolutions are respected?
3. How to ensure that resolutions and decisions are complementary and not duplicative to the UNEP programme of work and budget?
4. How can the secretariat better support the chairs of the working groups that negotiate resolutions including through possible submission of proposals for suggested action?

Provided inputs:

- There were too many draft resolutions put forward at UNEA 4 for Member States and for the Assembly to meaningfully consider and negotiate the issues proposed.
- Difficulties managing the volume of draft resolutions were compounded by the fact that many resolutions are circulated with very little time to review.
- Merging overlapping draft resolutions can be a helpful method of reducing the overall number of resolutions, but the merging process can also produce confusion and leave little time for internal review by delegations, particularly if done late in the negotiating process.
- UNEA Members, the UNEA and CPR bureaus, and the Secretariat may wish to consider a variety of measures that could make the presentation and negotiation of draft resolutions and decisions more manageable. Among them:
  - The deadline of submitting draft resolutions eight weeks in advance of the OECPR, as specified in resolution 4/2, should be widely publicized and emphasized during the intersessional period.
  - The CPR should prioritize consideration resolutions submitted before this deadline.
  - The CPR should prioritize consideration of resolutions that relate to the chosen theme of the UNEA session.
  - The OECPR should prioritize consideration of resolutions already reviewed by the CPR and those provided before the eight-week deadline, taking up discussion of resolutions submitted after the deadline only after all resolutions submitted before the deadline have been considered.
  - Similarly, UNEA should prioritize consideration of resolutions already considered by the OECPR before taking up resolutions not yet considered.
  - Resolutions should have a clear objective that highlights what is different from prior resolutions on the same topic. Member states should be encouraged to
submit concise resolutions, moving away from text that mirrors past outcomes to focus on new content to advance environmental objectives.

- The CPR, OECPR, and UNEA should prioritize draft resolutions that address issues of global concern, that have broad-based support, and that have been endorsed by at multiple Member States;

- Both member states and the Secretariat should enhance consultation with other international organizations, other UN specialized agencies, and MEAs, both in advance of and during consideration of draft resolutions. For example, many of the draft resolutions related to agriculture appeared to be duplicating ongoing efforts at FAO or advocating undertaking efforts that would normally fall within FAO’s competence. Having other UN fora undertake these efforts in the agricultural realm would be duplicative and not cost-effective. Resolutions in the area of agriculture should support FAO’s work. This would help to ensure awareness and leverage ongoing work, as well as assist in informing Secretariats and technical experts of relevant agencies and organizations of resolutions that will undoubtedly feed into their work. This is in keeping with SG Guterres’ vision for greater coherence across the UN system.

- Consider refining the UNEA rules of procedure, including Rule 44, to promote better adherence with established guidelines and deadlines for the submission or draft resolutions and to strengthen the hand of the UNEA President in limiting discussion and consideration of proposals that deviate from those guidelines. We anticipate that such improvements to the rules would also help address the current high number of resolutions being submitted and would have the additional benefit of enabling all delegations – particularly small ones – to be well prepared for all resolutions that will be considered during the meetings.

- Continue the practice of grouping resolutions with similar themes and having UNEP technical experts in the room to answer questions and clarify scientific text.