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Thank you Co-Facilitators

It is an honor for me to speak on behalf of the 14 Pacific Small Island Developing States and we align with the statement delivered by Samoa on behalf of AOSIS. Being this is the first time my delegation takes the floor during this contact group, I extend our congratulations to you co-facilitators on your appointment for facilitating this important contact group. Rest assured that you have our group’s full support.

Means of Implementation are important provisions to determine whether the instrument we are negotiating will be implementable or aspirational. This is why we consider this discussion critical. PSIDS are mindful also that this discussion is contingent on the discussions in Contact Group 1 on core obligations and measures.

With that in mind, PSIDS are of the view that each obligation and measure might necessitate a specific MoI. At the same time, more “cross-cutting” MoI obligations can be identified in a stand-alone provision. This will be the focus of our interventions in this contact group and, as such, should not prejudice provisions in relevant substantial sections.

On Financial assistance in the options paper, the PSIDS believe that new, additional, stable, accessible, adequate, timely and predictable flows of financial resources are critical. Whether it is in a new Fund under this instrument or through an existing multilateral fund (or a combination of both), for our group the importance is that it provides adequate provisions of funds, is operational at the entry into force of the instrument, and provides access that takes into account the special circumstances of SIDS and responds to our needs as we would have identified them. PSIDS support the idea of identifying and utilizing innovative sources of funding, as well as including a wider range of sources and providers of funding.

Funding should be used to support the implementation of this instrument, including through funding capacity-building programmes and technology transfer, to respond to and address the needs identified by each recipient.

On capacity building, we favour the options presented. We also see benefits in strengthening them. At the moment, they seem to call for the goodwill of providers. However, PSIDS worry
that this would maintain the status quo. As a result, we are supporting a higher ambition on capacity-building provisions and would like to see more straightforward commitments on this issue. We also wonder whether technical assistance is indirectly included in capacity building and whether we should aim to streamline the options.

PSIDS have similar views on technology transfer. We believe that some technology transferred as a purely voluntary scheme might not help solve the issues at hand.

PSIDS values contributions from international, regional, sub-regional and sectoral instruments, frameworks and bodies in regard to the means of implementation. We believe that wider cooperation can ensure coherence in implementing potential solutions to resolve plastic pollution.

I thank you.