



MAJORITY MANIFESTS

THE AMBITIOUS MAJORITY BACKS CONCRETE TEXT PROPOSALS ON TREATY MUST-HAVES

NEWS IN BRIEF

- **CG1** met twice, resuming in the morning with a discussion on Article 3 (Plastic Products), then advancing to Article 5 (Plastic Product Design) in the evening session.
 - New proposals on Article 3 were presented. A clear majority expressed support for the [Swiss-Mexico proposal on behalf of 78 states](#) as the basis for textual negotiations. Some supported the [Australian proposal](#) on bridging ideas. Other new proposals were submitted by [Russia](#), [Iran](#), and [Brazil](#). The text by [Brazil and the Republic of Korea at INC-5.1](#) was also resubmitted. In the afternoon, an informal took place to discuss elements of Article 3.
 - Article 5 was discussed in the evening session. Proposals amending the chair's text were submitted by [Brazil](#), [Russia](#), and the [United Kingdom and Chile on behalf of 25 states](#). The co-chairs suggested presenting on screen a merge of new proposals and the Chair's text. There was no agreement, however, for this proposed way forward.
- **CG2** met once in the afternoon, conducting a line-by-line on Article 8 (Waste Management), as more time was requested in informal consultations on Article 7 (Releases and Leakages).
 - Many states expressed support for the binding language in the Chair's text and proposed the addition of a reference to the waste hierarchy, though divergent views were expressed. There was also support for binding language ("shall") on taking measures on EPR.
- **CG3** met once in the afternoon and continued discussion on Article 11.
 - New text proposals were submitted by [Palau on behalf of AOSIS](#), [Brazil](#), [Saudi Arabia](#) on behalf of the Arab Group and like minded countries, and [Egypt](#)—introducing various elements and options to the finance package.
 - Co-chairs will share a comparison of existing text and new proposals to the group for consideration.
- **CG4** met twice, addressing Articles 19-25 in the main group and Article 1bis in an informal.
 - The group discussed Articles 24-25 and 21-22 in the morning, although discussion on article 24 is postponed until CG1 discussions advance further. The group moved into informal discussions on Article 1bis. The key divergence in the group is between the majority of states that wanted to utilise precedent, standard MEA text for the final provisions, and a smaller group that proposed numerous changes.
 - In the evening, the group discussed Article 23 before covering Articles 20, 20 bis and 19. On Article 23, there was support for lowering the threshold for amendments to two-thirds or maintaining it at three-quarters. [Colombia and Peru on behalf of 118 states](#) formally introduced a proposal which adds a paragraph enabling the COP to make decisions by vote as a last resort.

PROGRESS ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

WWF's daily bulletins at INC-5.2 use the traffic-light system to track the status of essential elements for an effective legally binding global treaty to end plastic pollution. Progress will be rated for each element as:

- green (on track towards strong text for an ambitious treaty);
- yellow (on track towards strong text, but slow progress);
- orange (heading in a counterproductive direction); and
- red (regressing, on track towards weak treaty text).

Must-have elements	As of end of Day 2
Binding global bans and phase-outs of specific plastic products, including those containing chemicals of concern	On track towards ambitious text, but slowly
Harmonised requirements on product design and systems necessary for a non-toxic circular economy	Heading in a counterproductive direction
A comprehensive financing and means of implementation package	On track towards ambitious text, but slowly
Mechanisms to enable strengthening of the treaty over time	On track towards ambitious text, but slowly

ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON TREATY MUST-HAVES

Binding global bans and phase-outs of specific plastic products, including those containing chemicals of concern	On track towards ambitious text, but slowly
---	---

Summary: CG1 began discussion on Article 3 with an introduction of the [Swiss-Mexico proposal on behalf of 78 states](#), which received support from a clear majority of opinions expressed in the group. Some states also supported the bridging ideas proposed by [Australia](#), while some raised concerns on its connection towards global obligations. New proposals by [Russia](#), [Iran](#), and [Brazil](#) did not include any global obligation for phaseouts. The text developed by [Brazil and Republic of Korea](#) was resubmitted, which contains nationally-determined measures and a process to develop a global list—however, this would not necessarily be a global phaseout list, as measures to address the products are proposed to be recommended and submitted by a Review Committee “to the COP for adoption”.

The strong support in the room for the Swiss-Mexico proposal demonstrates progress on this must-have, with many states emphasising the critical nature of a binding Article 3 and defending the inclusion of a global obligation, an initial list of plastic products for global phaseouts, and a science-backed process for further global listings. Still, the challenges of the organisation of work—including time lost discussing the way forward after the informal—slowed down progress. An informal is set to continue with low clarity on how the article text will be produced.

Recommendations to progress: WWF urges member states to continue requesting that the Swiss-Mexico text is used as the basis for informal discussions and to avoid line-by-line on-screen text edits at this stage.

Harmonised requirements on product design and systems necessary for a non-toxic circular economy	Heading in a counterproductive direction
---	--

Summary: Both Article 5 (Plastic Product Design) and Article 8 (Waste Management, which includes EPR) were discussed. The [United Kingdom and Chile](#) introduced an Article 5 proposal on behalf of 25 countries, which improves upon the Chair's text by setting a timeline for the COP's schedule of work and requiring that parties ensure product design is in accordance with criteria, to be developed in an annex. This was supported by the [nonpaper submitted by the Republic of Korea](#). Additional proposals were introduced by [Brazil](#) and the [Russian Federation](#). The Brazilian proposal does not strengthen the Chair's text while the Russian proposal further weakens the text, focusing on waste and heavily weakening upstream measures.

Several countries requested that the obligation on EPR in Article 8 become mandatory (“shall” rather than “should”), demonstrating support for systems that will enable effective management of plastic products.

Recommendations to progress: We urge member states to support the elements of the UK-Chile proposal while also calling for further improvements. Specifically, member states should stand firm on the importance of making this an effective obligation, with reference to common global criteria and a clear process for the COP to develop them in an Annex. We recommend member states maintain the importance of a mandatory obligation on EPR.

A comprehensive financing and means of implementation package	On track towards ambitious text, but slowly
--	---

Summary: New text proposals were submitted by [Palau on behalf of AOSIS](#), [Brazil](#), [Saudi Arabia](#) on behalf of the Arab Group and like minded countries, and [Egypt](#). The proposal by [Africa Group, GRULAC, Cook Islands, Fiji and Micronesia](#) from INC-5.1 was resubmitted for consideration by the group. Some other proposals were shared in the CG but are not yet uploaded on the [in-session document platform](#). These proposals put forward different elements and options for the finance package, but no clear alignment has emerged amongst states’ views. The group however continued constructive engagements to find bridging solutions. A number of states expressed openness to consider another element in the financial mechanism, in addition to the inclusion of the [GEF](#). The co-chairs will share a comparison of existing text and new proposals to the group for consideration.

Recommendations to progress: States should support the AOSIS proposal as the basis for negotiation, as it provides the best starting point for constructive discussions towards a bridging solution. States should ensure the package includes both public and private sources, and to provide adequate and accessible finance, governed in a transparent manner by the COP, to enable effective implementation. Additionally, parties must aim to align both public and private financial flows with the treaty’s objective.

Mechanisms to enable strengthening of the treaty over time	On track towards ambitious text, but slowly
---	---

Summary: Several states supported either maintaining the existing threshold for Article 23 at three-fourth majority or lowering it to two-third, noting that the prior option was already a compromise. Some states pushed back, requesting the text to mandate consensus for Amendments. The Article 20 proposal by [Colombia and Peru on behalf of 118 states](#) was formally introduced, proposing a paragraph enabling the COP to make decisions by vote as a last resort. This proposal follows the precedent set by the [High Seas \(BBNJ\) Treaty \(Article 47, para 5\)](#) and is critical to enable the dozens of decisions that the COP may be tasked with. Other proposals include the [Like Minded Countries and Arab Group](#) (replacing the [Arab Group](#) proposal from the previous day), [Kazakhstan](#) and [Russia](#)—all insist on consensus as the only option for matters of substance. Discussions on Article 24 were postponed until discussions in CG1 on control measures progress further.

The overwhelming support for the Colombia-Peru proposal—from approximately two-thirds of all member states represented at this INC—signals progress toward an effective mechanism to strengthen the treaty. There is strong will to ensure that the COP can effectively make its decisions, thus enabling strengthening of the treaty over time.

Recommendations to progress: Member states must not compromise on the text proposed by Colombia and Peru in the informal discussion and in future contact group sessions. With 118 states supporting the proposal, and vocal support on the floor, this is by far the specific-text proposal that is backed by the largest group of states in this negotiation. This group of states must continue to defend this text—it could mean the difference between an effective treaty that adapts with future developments, and a rigid framework that would soon get stuck past knowledge. States are encouraged to join the growing list of supporters for this proposal. States should support the effort to lower the threshold in Article 23 to ⅔.

WHAT TO EXPECT ON DAY 3

- CG1 will resume at 3pm on Day 3. They will continue discussions on Article 5 and plan to do line-by-line edits. An informal on Article 3 is scheduled for 6-7pm.
- CG2 will resume at 10am on Day 3, advancing to Articles 9 and 10. An informal discussion on Article 8 is scheduled for Day 3 at 1pm, led by Chile.
- CG3 will continue its work on Article 12 at 10am on Day 3. Co-chairs are planning to upload a comparison of the proposals on Article 11 to be discussed in the contact group.
- CG4 will meet at 3pm to discuss Article 19 and Articles 13-18. Two informals have been set up to continue discussions on Article 20 (led by Peru and EU) and Article 20bis (led by Jamaica and Palau). Additionally, there is a possibility of an informal-informal, to be initiated by leads, with interested states during lunch time.
- WWF urges all states to constructively find an efficient way forward in CGs discussion, to come up with new text iterations that better capture the growing majority alignment rather than working incrementally through line-by-line edits on articles where divergences remain divergent.



or visit:

www.panda.org/plastictreaty

for information on the treaty
negotiation, including timeline, reports,
briefs and quick guide to the INC

For more information, contact:

Zaynab Sadan

Global Plastics Policy Lead
zsadan@wwf.org.za



Working to sustain the natural
world for the benefit of people
and wildlife.

together possible.

panda.org

WWF, 28 rue Mauverney, 1196 Gland, Switzerland. Tel. +41 22 364 9111

CH-550.0.128.920-7

WWF® and World Wide Fund for Nature® trademarks and ©1986 Panda Symbol are owned by WWF-World Wide Fund For Nature (formerly World Wildlife Fund). All rights reserved.