Thank you Madam Co-Facilitator,

India would like to first congratulate both of you, co facilitators, for preparing a comprehensive summary report of the preparatory meeting that was held on 11 Nov 2023. It has captured the interventions on the topics that are being discussed again today. Nevertheless, as asked for, I would share the views on these topics once again.

On preamble:-

**Is there convergence around the objective of having a brief preamble providing context and setting the tone for the instrument? Is there convergence that elements highlighted in the synthesis report could provide a first basis, to be streamlined?**

There has to be the preamble as it would serve as the guiding spirit of the proposed instrument. It should reflect the collective mandate of all countries to work in collaboration, cooperation and partnership to end plastic pollution. The text may evolve as we have consensus on various elements of the proposed instrument. It should set the context and help achieve the objective of international legally binding instrument. The work of the text of preamble may be taken forward on a concurrent basis as we evolve consensus on other parts of the zero draft.

On definitions: -

**Is there convergence around the possibility of using relevant existing international definitions, and if so, which ones, for what purpose?**
How could any relevant work conducted in contact group 1 on substantive provisions inform our consideration of this question in this group?

Regarding the possibility of using relevant existing international definitions, it may be a good starting point. However, these need to be understood in reference of the context and hence need to be reviewed and examined before they are included under the proposed instrument. Indian delegation would like to seek more time to share comments/views on the definitions in the synthesis report as it was received only about two weeks back, and it requires internal consultations. In addition, more terms may come up during discussions on substantial provisions of the zero draft in the other contact groups. We may have some of those terms already as part of zero draft. However, these terms need to be understood contextually. And, that may need further discussions on any such definitions.

On principles: -

Is there convergence that principles are important to inform the text? How can we incorporate those principles in the text, whether in a dedicated provision, or in the preamble, or operationalized through substantive provisions? -

If some principles should be operationalized through substantive provisions, which ones and what specific provisions do you think they must be the part of the proposed instrument.

Regarding the principles, these must be part of the proposed instrument. It may be part of preamble or as a dedicated article. Indian delegation views that some principles should be operationalised through substantive provisions. It is important that principles must be part of the obligations/commitments which
would require to be understood in terms of national circumstances and capabilities and common but differentiated responsibility, particularly in respect of developing countries.

On scope:

Is there general convergence on the notion that resolution 5/14 should be the basis of the scope of the instrument? - If a scope provision is included, how detailed should it be? What would be the advantages or disadvantages of having a detailed scope? - To what extent should specific aspects be reflected or operationalized through the various substantive provisions, or included in a scope provision?

UNEA resolution 5/14 should be basis of scope of the proposed instrument. Scope need to be stated in an objective and clear manner in order to leave no room for interpretation, as it may impact the implementation of the instrument.

On all the above, India would like to provide specific submissions.