Thank you, Co-Chairs. I would like to reiterate the United States’ appreciation for your efforts to keep our discussions moving ahead as productively as possible. We are eager to make real progress on the revised draft text and would like to add our voice to those of our colleagues who have expressed a desire to get down to work in our subgroups as quickly as possible.

We appreciate your efforts, co-chairs, to identify possible areas of convergence and opportunities for streamlining the text. In this spirit, we look forward to receiving your technical streamlined version of the text and we would like to share our views on areas that could benefit from streamlining under all three subgroups.

With regard to Subgroup 1.1:

- The United States supports a concise preamble that provides context for the operational provisions set out in the instrument, and an objective that states in a simple manner what we would like the instrument to achieve. However, we think the discussions of both the preamble and the objective should begin only after substantive provisions are close to finalized.

- Within the preamble, we also think it is important to acknowledge the environmental and human health impacts of emissions and releases of hazardous pollutants during extraction. We will be submitting a new text proposal to this effect.

- With regard to definitions, the United States believes it is too early in the INC process to commit to inclusion of any specific terms and definitions. The need for definitions will be determined by the content of the substantive obligations.

- On Scope and Principles, in our assessment both of these sections include options reflecting intractable differences in views, with little prospect for convergence.

- In our view, the operative provisions of the instrument should reflect what we want the instrument to address, and certain principles and approaches could be mentioned in the Preamble. Such an approach would obviate the need for standalone sections on Scope and Principles.

- For the just transition article at Part II.12, Options 2 and 3 are largely duplicative. We would encourage a technical consolidation of these options.
With regard to the dedicated Programs of Work, we see a great deal of overlap with the Multistakeholder Action Agenda, and we would propose streamlining this section by moving this discussion over to the stakeholder agenda item under Contact Group 2.

Further, we note that there are provisions related to national action plans and means of implementation spread across the instrument. We think there is significant opportunity to streamline this language and would encourage consolidation of these provisions in the relevant articles in Parts 3 and 4.

My colleague will now provide our views on Subgroups 1.2 and 1.3.

For Subgroup 1.2:

- The United States views polymers, chemicals of concern, and plastic products as areas where there is a significant divergence of opinion. As such we see these three areas as being unlikely candidates for significant streamlining. We look forward to working together and are committed to finding obligations that are both meaningful and pragmatic.

- We appreciate the inclusion of the text on product design and non-plastic substitutes, and we believe there are opportunities for convergence and structural improvements within these areas. In particular, we believe that non-plastic substitutes should be incorporated into the article on product design.

- With regard to fishing gear, we note that there appear to be a number of elements across different options in Part II.9(b) that are not related to end-of-life management of fishing and aquaculture gear; we think these are better suited for consideration in Part II.8 on emissions and releases of plastic.

- The United States appreciates the role that trade measures can play in MEAs to support their objectives and the effectiveness of certain operative provisions.

- However, until we have a better understanding of the approach that the INC might coalesce around for a number of the other substantive articles under this instrument and there is a clearer picture of those other obligations and commitments -- in particular with respect to chemicals, polymers, and plastic products -- the United States is of the view that it is premature to discuss possible trade measures.

For Subgroup 1.3:

- On Emissions & Releases, we prefer to negotiate on the basis of Option 1, which already arguably captures and consolidates the majority of proposals from options 2-5. In our
view, this text would broadly oblige each Party to take measures to prevent or reduce, with a view toward elimination, the release of plastic into the environment throughout its lifecycle.

- The United States is also proposing a binding, universal obligation to control emissions and releases of hazardous pollutants from plastic production facilities under this article and a separate binding obligation to address facilities that manage plastic waste in the waste management article. We look forward to further discussion of this U.S. proposal over the course of the INC.

- On waste, we support a strong obligation on the environmentally sound management of plastic waste and preventing open dumping, littering and open burning and see opportunities for convergence on these issues.

- Regarding plastic pollution from fishing and aquaculture activities, the United States believes that these sources of plastic pollution should be addressed in the relevant articles of the agreement, rather than through a standalone article and could be distinguished and streamlined if others agree.

- We also support an obligation on Extended Producer Responsibility that takes into consideration how EPR can contribute to a just transition and be inclusive of waste pickers and hope the co-facilitators can look for opportunities to bring these concepts together.

We appreciate your leadership, Mr. and Madam Co-chairs, in making this a productive week for all of us. The United States reiterates our commitment to concluding negotiations on the instrument by the end of 2024.