INTERVENTION BY THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA
SUBCONTACT GROUP 2.1
THE FOURTH MEETING OF
THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE
TO DEVELOP AN INTERNATIONAL LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT ON
PLASTIC POLLUTION, INCLUDING IN THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT

Ottawa, 24 – 27 April 2024

1. Financing

Intervention – 1

Thank you, Mr. and Madam Co-facilitators.

We are of the view that should there be categorization of the states in the current provision, Indonesia supports to have a recognition of countries with special geographical conditions or characteristics that are considered vulnerable to plastic pollution, including archipelagic states.

While we understand that the element of “archipelagic states” align specifically with our specific interest, we see that the aspect of “geographical conditions or characteristics that are considered vulnerable to plastic pollution” may possibly be considered to cover several different states, as appropriate.
We would also like to underline the importance of a provision regarding in the provision of the financing/financial assistance, there should be a consideration for national circumstances, or the previously mentioned specific needs and special circumstances of states with certain conditions, characteristics or vulnerabilities. In this regard, we see that merging para. 4 and para. 3 is a possibility that could be considered to further streamline the text.

Thank you.

**Intervention-2**

Thank you, Mr. and Madam Co-facilitators

First, we see that our point about the considerations for countries with special geographical conditions or characteristics that are considered vulnerable to plastic pollution being responded to by several other delegations and we are grateful for it and the discussions. We also understand that there are differing views about how this term could encapsulate different states due to their specific circumstances and vulnerabilities that are not limited to only geographical conditions, to which we would love to be able to discuss further so that we can have a better understanding on the issues.

Second, echoing the sentiment delivered by the Jamaican delegation to avoid using the term “largest capacity and governance gaps” since it might have unfavorable interpretations. In this regard, we would like to ask for your consideration in using the term “national circumstances and capabilities” since we believe it would hopefully be more general and neutral.

Thank you.
Option 0

Thank you, Co-facilitators.

We take note the request to park the issue of categorization under OP3, therefore we would like to underline that our intervention now is not to discuss the categorization of states.

For OP0, we are in favour of having this provision in the text. However, we also see the possibility of merging OP0 with OP4 that we have discussed previously, seeing that there are some similar elements. We see it as an effort to further streamline the text.

Thank you.

Option 0-Alt 2

Thank you, co-facilitators.

We would like to align ourselves with the sentiment made by the previous delegations, including Brazil, Paraguay, and Mexico in having this formulation in the text. We see it as not a new issue, since similar languages have been contained in various MEAs as discussed previously.

We would like to also underline that some aspects mentioned here, including economic and social development and poverty eradication are very important for Indonesia, and it should be ensured for us to be able to appropriately and effectively address the issue of plastic pollution.

Furthermore, while we understand that we are not discussing the principles at this point, however, we would like to support the sentiment made by Mexico to have these aspects
to be reflected in the Principles section. We have also conveyed this preference during the opening plenary.

Thank you.

Option 1

Thank you, Mr and Madam Co-facilitators.

For OP1, Indonesia is of the view that the OP1 formulation is more favorable, with an emphasis that the provision of the necessary financial resources is within the national capacities, and we support the mobilization of resources to tackle plastic pollution from the relevant sources for national implementation activities.

In this regard, we prefer this OP 1 to stop at the "including voluntary contributions" part, right in the middle, and preferable without references to domestic elements such as national budgets because we think it should remain a domestic affair. Because we see the remaining sentences to be a bit too prescriptive.

However, we also take note the views provided by the previous delegations, and Indonesia would also like to seek clarification from members on this provision, especially considering that there have been several concerns about the domestic aspects of this paragraph, as well as what it actually entails. That being said, we are also mindful of our discussion yesterday about the possibility of restructuring and moving OP4 to the beginning of this section. In which we are open to see it together with OP1 whether there are already existing elements that can be merged and streamlined.

Thank you.
Option 2

Thank you, Mr and Madam Co-facilitators.

Indonesia is also in favour of OP2 Alt. The formulation of this current provision contains several aspects that are important for Indonesia, including:

- The provision of new additional financial resources is made by developed country Parties;
- Enabling developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing this instrument, in line with the language contained in UNEA Res 5/14;
- Recognizing different sources of financing, as well as recognition of finance, capacity-building, and technology transfer to implement this instrument;
- Providing flexibility for other parties to provide financial resources on voluntary basis and with their capabilities.

Thank you.

Option 5

Thank you, Mr and Madam Co-facilitators.

Indonesia prefers OP5, seeing that it is more concise and straightforward. We see that the OP5 Alt is already referring to specific mechanisms or sources of funds. However, in this vein, Indonesia is open to considering the relevant financing mechanism options and not to prejudice our discussions on the financing mechanism, whether it would be new and dedicated, or utilizing existing funds, or hybrid of both as we have discussed previously and in previous day.

We are also in favor of OP5 bis, but we want to underline that its important for the governing body to determine the initial resource mobilization goal on its first meeting.
Indonesia can positively consider OP5 ter, quater, and quinquies. We are also open to see if such paragraphs can be merged and further streamlined, as appropriate.

Thank you.

**Option 6**

Thank you, Mr and Madam Co-facilitators.

We are in favour of Option 2 OP6 Alt 2, considering that the current drafting includes a plastics implementation fund to assist members with their national implementation endeavour, and remediation fund to address the problem of legacy plastics.

As an archipelagic state, plastic pollution, including in the marine environment, is an important issue for us to address and would definitely benefit from a dedicated fund for it. That being said, again referring to the hybrid approach, we are also proposing to add a point under this OP6 Alt 2 to also include a newly established, dedicated fund to support the implementation of obligations under this treaty. We are currently still discussing the textual proposal for this matter because we’re also considering how the streamlining and the discussion goes, and we plan to submit such a textual proposal later on.

Mr and Madam Co facilitators,

We are also seeing this moment as a good opportunity to provide our rationale and considerations behind the hybrid approach for financing under the future instrument.

First, we see that a newly established, dedicated, and transparent multilateral fund under this instrument is crucial for its implementation, especially by the developing country members as also underlined by the UNEA Res 5/14. We see such a dedicated mechanism would be more focused and tailored for the implementation of the future
instrument. However, we also understand that establishing such a new dedicated fund will require a significant amount of time, and a lot of different technicalities. While the issue of plastics pollution goes on every single day.

Therefore, to be able to respond to the plastic pollution issue and help the implementation of this instrument in a timely manner for developing countries and other countries who are particularly affected by plastic pollution, we are also considering utilizing the relevant existing funds, as appropriate. This is where the hybrid approach consideration came from.

We are also open to see whether we can include certain provisions where for example the members, or the COP can conduct assessments on how to utilize the available funds, or maybe other aspects to ensure that the hybrid approach is operationable.

As a comparison, we are currently considering the approach of Paris Agreement in which it utilizes existing fund such as GEF, while then establishing dedicated funds such as the Special Climate Change Fund and Least Developed Countries Fund.

While we are not specifically saying that we should refer to GEF or that GEF is the most suitable one, but for the sake of the discussion here, we refer to it just as an example.

And we are looking forward to hear the members’ views on this.

Thank you.

**Option 9**

Thank you, Mr. Co facilitator

For this paragraph, we are more in favour of the OP 9 ter, considering that it is more in line with our national legislations. But noting the sentiment made by the Jamaican
Delegation that EPR should be discussed on other sections of the instrument on the EPR, we can be open for further discussions on that. We’re also considering that the discussions on EPR are still ongoing, so we believe it’s pertinent to ensure that it’s all aligned and not prejudice any ongoing negotiations.

As we have stated in previous days, we are not in favour to have OP9 bis, we are not in favour to have a global plastic pollution fee provision in this instrument. Furthermore, we are still having some concerns about how this will be operationalized.

Thank you.

**Option 10**

Indonesia is in favour of OP10 alt, we think that it is important for us to have a provision encouraging the increase of financial flows from various resources to assist with the project as set out in the current provision.

We would like to also propose the recognition of national capacities and needs in OP10 Alt, therefore the first sentence would read “Each Party is encouraged, in accordance with their national capacities and needs, to increase financial flows [...]” and so on.

Thank you.