



PSIDS submission on the guiding questions on Rules of procedure of the COP
PrepCom 2: August 2025

Distinguished Co-Chairs,

I have the honor to speak on behalf of the Pacific SIDS (PSIDS) and align our remarks with those made on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, as well as those on behalf of AOSIS. At the outset, I would like to thank the Co-Chairs for providing a revised aid to discussions and negotiations on the rules of procedure for the Conference of the Parties, contained in document A/AC.296/2025/12. We also found the guiding questions helpful and we will try to answer them as best we can.

First we turn to what element, if any, can be accepted as is. The draft Rules of Procedure for the Conference of Parties follows a format which we are generally comfortable with. The ruleset seems based on the rules of the General Assembly mixed with those of more recent Environmental Agreements, and they do look generally acceptable. I will therefore limit our observations to only a few.

Co-Chairs,

The main deliverable for the CoP rules is to allow a smooth running of the Conference of Parties. Thus we will now look at new elements, which have been provided in the updated aid to discussions.

Starting with rule 3bis, we are skeptical about the utility of going into such a level of detail. The PSIDS have asked for an opportunity to deliver general statements by virtual means, either by video link or through a pre-recorded statement. Such a provision has not been included and we continue to ask for it.

In rule 4, we have heard convergence in the room for the COP to start on an annual basis to deal with the workload and then to shift to a biennial format. It is generally acceptable, but we still have to agree on the actual framing. We note that the periodicity of COP meetings will have an impact on the budget cycle and the terms of office of members of subsidiary bodies, which we will address later.

The PSIDS continue to advocate for the inclusion of observers in the various meetings. We are pleased that the participation of the UN system in rule 6(2) is no longer bracketed.

In rule 22, which covers the bureau, we support the allocation of one seat to small island developing states and one to least developed countries. Similarly, we do support the inclusion of SIDS and LDCs in rule 29.

We also continue to note that “equitable geographical representation” does not necessarily mean equal numbers for each regional group. We also need to account for the total number of state parties from each group.

Regarding rule 34, PSIDS favors the lower quorum requirement for the CoP. Meetings should be able to proceed with one-third present, and decisions should be taken if a majority is present. This would safeguard the COP being in a position to make decisions.

On amendments to the RoPs in rule 60, we now have two options listed. PSIDS considers that such an amendment is a procedural action and should require a majority of those present and voting. We are thankful that the unnecessary double majority requirement is no longer reflected. As a group, we want the CoP to have flexibility in amending its rules if required.

The second question on what elements are missing; we find that the Rules of Procedure for meetings of the COP seem mostly complete. That said, we also need to pay attention to the various subsidiary bodies that are being established. Some might require discrete rules as well as Terms of Reference. We will go into more detail as we turn to them later in the session.

Finally, the PSIDS stress that the rules of procedure and all other documents issued by the COP and its subsidiary bodies must recognize the distinct status of Indigenous Peoples under international law as rights-holders rather than as mere stakeholders. The Agreement affirms that nothing in it shall be construed as diminishing or extinguishing the existing rights of Indigenous Peoples, including as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous Peoples are separate from local communities and are not the same as civil society organizations. So, for example, rule 6 should be revised to separate Indigenous Peoples more clearly from all other non-State actors listed in it. We will provide textual edits to this effect.

I thank you!