

Draft Outline of summary of submissions on potential response options for continued work for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly

Section 1. Draft Outline of summary of submissions on potential response options

In the letter by the Chair dated 11 December 2019, member States and stakeholders were invited to provide submissions of potential response options, pursuant to paragraph 10(d) of UNEA resolution 3/7, through the web portal. The Secretariat has received 14 submissions from member States and Specialized Agencies, and 6 submissions from Major Stakeholder Groups before the deadline of 15 August 2020, all the submissions are [available online](#).

The Secretariat has gone through the submissions, and identified some key words, Table 1 & 2 below provide an initial summary of those key words mentioned in the submissions received.

Table 3 further explains the key words identified in Table 1.

Table 1. Tentative summary of key words in the submissions from Member States and Specialised Agencies

Actions/approaches		Member States and Specialized Agencies													
		African Group	EU + MS	Nordic Council	Iran	Japan	Malaysia	Myanmar	Norway	Philippines	Singapore	Switzerland	Timor-Leste	US	Vietnam
Management across life cycle	Life-cycle Approach	√	√	√		√		√	√	√	√	√		√	√
	Producer responsibility						√	√	√	√		√			√
	Sustainable production and consumption (upstream)	√	√		√		√		√	√	√	√	√		√
	Environmentally sound waste management (downstream)	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√
Coordination and cooperation	International coordination and cooperation		√			√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√
	Building on existing efforts (synergy)	√	√			√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	
	Multi-stakeholder	√	√			√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√

	engagement, including the private sector and industry														
Scientific and technological knowledge	Science-based action	√	√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
	Strengthening scientific and technological knowledge	√	√			√	√	√	√	√					√
Means of implementation	Resource mobilisation (technical and financial), capacity building	√	√		√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√
	Development/implementation of national action plans	√	√		√	√		√		√				√	√
Nature of actions	Global framework/agreement/action	√	√	√			√	√	√	√		√	√		√
	Voluntary measures											√			√

Table 2. Tentative summary of key words in the submissions from Major Group and Stakeholders

Actions/approaches		Major Groups and Stakeholders					
		Association Welfare	CIEL, EIA, GAIA	India Water Foundation	International Council of Chemical Association	Somali Youth Development Foundation	WWF
Management across life cycle	Life-cycle Approach		√		√		
	Producer responsibility		√				√
	Sustainable production and consumption (upstream)		√	√	√		√
	Environmentally sound waste management (downstream)		√		√		√
Coordination and cooperation	International coordination and cooperation		√	√	√		√
	Building on existing efforts (synergy)	√	√		√		√

	Multi-stakeholder engagement, including the private sector and industry	√		√	√		
Scientific and technological knowledge	Science-based action	√	√		√		√
	Strengthening scientific and technological knowledge		√	√	√		√
Means of implementation	Resource mobilisation (technical and financial), capacity building	√	√	√	√		√
	Development/implementation of national action plans		√		√		√
Nature of actions	Global framework/agreement/action		√		√		√
	Voluntary measures						

Table 3. Key words explained

Actions/approaches		Expansion on the actions/approaches ¹
Management across life cycle	Life-cycle Approach	The life-cycle of plastics covers from sustainable production, (including design of materials and products) and consumption (including distribution and use of products), to environmentally sound waste and wastewater management (including waste collection)[EU], response options should also ensure that a life-cycle approach is considered in any path forward, so we to understand the environmental impacts of alternative technologies or materials [US]
	Producer responsibility	Producers of plastic products need to share the responsibility for a more sustainable plastic economy with governments and consumers. That could for instance imply that plastic products are required to meet some basic sustainability criteria both pre- and post-consumption in domestic markets, in order to fit for example national collection and recycling systems and thereby ease the burden for domestic waste management regimes [Norway]
	Sustainable production and consumption (upstream)	Sustainable production includes design of materials and products and consumption includes distribution and use of products [EU]
	Environmentally sound waste management (downstream)	Environmentally sound waste management includes sustainable practices for sorting, collection and treatment of waste and wastewater [EU], recycling is also considered under this category.
Coordination and cooperation	International coordination and cooperation	Efficient coordination to exchange on progress and best practices in order to streamline efforts to avoid duplication of effort and to provide a basis for informed decision-making by the governments and the international community at the global level . [EU]
	Building on existing efforts (synergy)	A coordinated and ambitious response that has a clear vision and objectives, sets priorities and targets, gives cohesion and context to numerous existing initiatives , while avoiding duplication of efforts, and most importantly fills identified gaps in a coordinated and structured manner [EU], examples of such existing initiatives: Basel Convention, the Global Partnership on Marine Litter, SAICM, regional seas programs, regional fisheries bodies, and river basin committees. There are existing regional and/or multilateral frameworks and initiatives that are currently functioning to combat marine plastic litters and microplastics. In order to move forward effectively and efficiently, it would be strongly recommended with the viewpoint of efficiency to learn from such existing frameworks and initiatives as a crucial first step [Japan].

¹ Some of the submitters did not further expand on the terms, the most generic explanations are given here, however, it is unknown if they would be acceptable to all.

	Multi-stakeholder engagement, including the private sector and industry	Cooperation for industry, academia, civil society, governments and other stakeholders together with governments with a view “to take immediate action towards the long-term elimination, through a life-cycle approach, of discharges of litter and microplastics into the oceans. [EU]
Scientific and technological knowledge	Science-based action	Guidelines and standards, develop/improve global industry guidelines (e.g. for the management of polymers and additives; adoption of global labelling schemes); Establish global standards for industry plastic producers (e.g. encourages the use of extended producer responsibility schemes or the polluter pays principle as well as providing information on adverse impacts caused by their products); Global monitoring, establish a monitoring system that includes review and accountability and speaks to the Precautionary Principle (enables a holistic land-to-sea approach view); Reporting, Standardize global, regional and national reporting on production, consumption and final treatment of plastics, address the whole life cycle [Switzerland] ; actions similar to Guidelines for Harmonizing Ocean Surface Microplastic Monitoring Methods [Japan]
	Strengthening scientific and technological knowledge	Strengthening scientific and technological knowledge either through a Global Science and Knowledge Base [Norway] , or through promoting the work of the scientific advisory committee [Japan]
Means of implementation	Resource mobilisation (technical and financial), capacity building	Facilitate availability of financial and technical resources necessary [EU] and/or identify innovative approaches to mobilize non-governmental resources and financing [US]
	Development/implementation of national action plans	Establish national action plans in which countries would set themselves targets and identify measures for tackling plastic pollution thereby committing to taking action best suited to their individual context, [EU] that may also facilitate action at the subnational or local level [US]
Nature of actions	Global framework/agreement/action	Development of a new global agreement taking into account the full life-cycle of plastics [EU] [Nordic Council] [Norway]
	Voluntary measures	As opposed to the legally binding approach, voluntary measures encourage and coordinate industry-led solutions and commitments; introduce voluntary national reduction targets [Switzerland] and member states make its best efforts to combating marine litter and microplastics, according to their circumstances [Japan]

Section 2. Draft compilation of submissions on potential response options

This section offers a compilation of submissions on response options, information in the submissions are grouped into 4 categories, namely, status quo, actions needed to address the gaps, expected AHEG actions and propositions on response options. Exact words in the submissions are reflected here in the table without change, to avoid misinterpretation of the submissions.

Organization	Status quo	Actions needed to address the gaps	AHEG actions	Proposed response options
Member States and Regional Groups				
African Group	-Africa is a leader in taking action on management of plastics, and nearly half of all States in Africa have introduced legislation aimed at tackling plastic pollution, including by prohibiting certain leakage-prone products like plastic bags. -However, this has come with some challenges such as influx of plastics from other regions through porous borders, inadequate enforcement and loss of jobs. The effects of these efforts have been further limited by the lack of a dedicated and coherent international regulatory framework. Tackling plastic pollution requires a comprehensive and		-UNEA-5 delivers the solution to move this forward by providing the negotiation mandate for a new legally binding instrument to combat plastic pollution. The African Group is committed to engaging constructively in the discussions on this issue going forward, and we welcome the recent establishment of a Group of Friends on marine plastic pollution in New York. We also have high expectations for an ambitious outcome from 5th session of United Nations Environment Assembly, which should pave the way for strengthened global action to address the problem of plastic pollution.	-A stronger global response is needed to enable the success of national initiatives. The voluntary initiatives that have been put in place over the past decades have fallen short, and the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans are not set up to deal with global supply chains, design standards or recycling requirements. Partly as a result of this, a growing number of States, including the African Group, have, over the past two years, signalled an interest in exploring the option of a new legally binding agreement -Possible elements in a new global governance architecture or agreement 1. Shared vision: Building on the zero-vision agreed to in UNEA resolution 3/7, the international community should articulate a clear goal of eliminating all discharge of plastic into the ocean, directly or indirectly, based on the principle of precaution and in recognition of the devastating impact plastic pollution has on ecosystems and livelihoods. 2. Reduction targets: Based on an agreed calculation method, the international community should set a clear and measurable reduction target, to be reached by a certain year.. The common reduction target should also be translated into national reduction targets, in an equitable manner, based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. It will be important to ensure, however, that the sum of national commitments are sufficient to achieve the common objective, something that other environmental issues have struggled with. Moreover, we believe that urgency is needed in the near-term in line with SDG 14.1 (“by 2025, prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, particularly from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution”). 3. National action plans: In order to improve long-term planning, predictability for business, and promote transparency, the new global governance architecture should facilitate the development of national action plans, which would serve as planning tools in efforts to achieve the national reduction targets. National action plans are also useful in terms of adapting policy measures and regulatory interventions to local and national context. 4. Monitoring and reporting: A new global governance architecture should provide for an agreed measurement, reporting (covering plastic production, use and management at the national and international level in order to measure

	multilayered approach. -There is a limit to how much we can achieve on national level alone, and that is not only the case for African States. Plastic pollution is a transboundary issue, the entire value-chain of plastic is transboundary, with global trade in raw materials, global trade in manufactured products and global trade in collected plastic waste		progress toward a safe circular economy for plastics and the elimination of leakage.) and verification scheme for tracking marine litter and microplastics discharge and the progress made to eliminate them at a national and international level. 5. Scientific body: Monitoring of national discharge should be supplemented by the establishment of a dedicated international scientific body with a mandate to assess and track the extent of the problem, and collect state-of-the-art knowledge to provide inputs for decision-making and implementation. 6. Implementation support: A new global governance structure or agreement must include a system for supporting States in their efforts to achieve their reduction targets. This should include a financial mechanism and a scheme for transfer of technology and expertise. 7. Common rules and regulations: The international community should strive to develop common calculation methods, definitions, standards and regulations for an efficient and coordinated global effort to combat plastic pollution. To the extent that certain policy measures, such as banning primary microplastics in cosmetics or phasing out of certain single-use plastic items, are considered meaningful by a majority of States, the new global governance architecture should provide a platform for adopting uniform regulatory measures applicable to all States. Particular attention should be given to those categories of plastic products that are most prone to leakage and that pose a particular risk to the environment, including single-use plastics, fishing gear and primary microplastics. Suggestions for national or local response options 1. Regulatory or governance measures: ➤ Subscribe to the provisions of the National Coastal Plans and add to them a section related to marine litter in the context of the protection and preservation of the coastal ecosystems. ➤ Introduce taxes on the disposal of waste in the natural environment. ➤ Pooling efforts and creating synergies between various partners, and establishing national agencies dedicated to the coast with an entity dedicated to the issue of marine and microplastic waste if necessary. 2. Operational measures: ➤ Carry out collection campaigns at the beaches throughout the year and raise awareness among municipalities to introduce this waste as part of the National Household Waste Collection Programs, taking into account the collection time which must be before high tides to prevent litter from ending up at sea. ➤ Promote improved waste management systems (upstream sorting, recycling and recovery). ➤ Encourage managers in the private sector to set up companies dedicated to the recycling and recovery of plastic products through subsidies, and / or public / private partnerships. ➤ Strengthen reception facilities in ports and involve fishermen in the collection of waste at sea. ➤ Encourage coastal communities to obtain the “Blue Flag” label
--	--	--	---

				by improving waste management in their beaches. ➤ Make sure to cover all the beaches with the waste collection service (ideally selective), 3. Awareness raising measures: ➤ Strengthen the capacities of developing countries in general and of African countries in particular in terms of fundraising for pilot and development projects aimed at implementing the aforementioned operational measures in their countries, while creating job opportunities and improving the standard of living of the population. ➤ Continue and strengthen efforts to raise awareness among citizens of the impacts of marine litter in order to reduce their production upstream. ➤ Strengthen and perpetuate efforts to raise awareness and educate the environment on the issue of marine litter at beach level, for the benefit of all the public and schools. ➤ Encourage the development of ICT tools and information and awareness-raising materials for the general public, especially for young people. ➤ Support managers of marinas to obtain the “Blue Flag” label
EU+MS	-At its first meeting in May 2018, the AHOEEG agreed that the status quo was not an option. -The EU has already taken decisive policy and legislative steps in addressing plastic pollution within its jurisdiction. The European Green Deal - the EU's growth strategy – is based on a circular economy model that allows the economy to grow within the planetary boundaries, complemented by the precautionary principle of environmental policy. Even if we now have ambitious policies and legislation in this area, we recognize that	-An effective response should consist in supporting a full implementation of existing efforts and addressing remaining governance and policy gaps, the remaining gaps requiring action at a global level exist along the full life-cycle of plastics but are most prominent in the upstream part of it -A global response based on a resource efficient and circular approach to plastics would give the necessary	-Should be the focus of work of the next two AHOEEG meetings, where breakout sessions should be organised over several days to allow for fruitful and dynamic exchanges.	-Establishing a common vision and objectives -Action at local, regional, national and global level. Any new global framework should be flexible enough to take into account national circumstances as well as region-specific challenges -Building on existing instruments -Closing the gap-addressing the full lifecycle of plastics with a focus on prevention of plastic pollution. Elements to be considered: Sustainable production of the plastic value chain presents a major challenge, necessitating a special emphasis on how primary materials and actual products (including packaging) are designed and produced; Sustainable consumption plays a role in reducing the use of unnecessary and environmentally harmful plastics and it will be crucial for reducing plastic pollution leaking into the environment; There will however always be residual waste that needs to be properly managed. Environmentally sound waste management, including sustainable practices for sorting, collection and treatment of waste and wastewater, therefore needs to be a part of the solution; any global response must be based on sound science and a compilation of the knowledge regarding plastic pollution. -Structures. Holistic approach will require structures that provide venues for interaction and policy development, with clear roles and efficient coordination mechanisms in order to fulfil such tasks. Such structures will need to be able to accommodate both the need for a full participation and contribution of economic and civil society stakeholders as well as the need for intergovernmental and multilateral interaction. Coordination to exchange on progress and best practice of a number of instruments and various actors; multi-stakeholder platform, a cooperation platform for industry, academia, civil society, governments and other stakeholders together with governments; government action, dedicated single venue for governments at the global level

	action at national or regional level will not be sufficient to deal with a problem, which is transboundary in scale and nature and, as such, demands global action	leverage to national authorities wishing to effectively address the challenges they face, in particular countries that are primarily consumers of plastic products - The global response needs to be truly holistic in several ways. It should build on existing efforts, be multi-layered (action at all levels) and address all stages of the life-cycle of plastic- from sustainable production (including design of materials and products) and consumption (including distribution and use of products) - to environmentally sound waste and wastewater management (including waste collection). -All stakeholders should be fully		to meet and discuss, across all these clusters on the basis of the stakeholders' input and scientific advice, medium and long-term goals and targets, monitor progress in implementation and agree on joint action and commitments along the life-cycle of plastics. -Resource mobilization.
--	---	---	--	---

		associated with the process		
Nordic Council	-The Nordic Ministers called for a report to look into the possible elements that could be included in a new global agreement on marine litter and microplastics. The report aims to inform future decision-making, by sketching out the possible elements and approaches to a new global agreement taking into account the full life-cycle of plastics. The final report will be launched at the SDG 14 conference hosted by Portugal and Kenya on 2-6 June 2020 in Lisbon.		-It is the intention that the drafting of the report will inform and contribute to the discussions under AHEG. Thus it is our request that this work will be considered as a submission to AHEG-4, under proposed agenda item 5 "Consideration of submissions on potential response options pursuant to paragraph 10 d) of United Nations Environment Assembly resolution 3/7."	
Iran	Barriers and challenges: -Legislative gaps in combating land-based and sea-based litter and microplastic (1) A limited mandate on disposing garbage from land-based sources into coastal area (2) Potential legislative gaps in disposing litter and wastewater from different industries	-Explore all barriers to combating marine litter and microplastic, including challenges related to resources in developing countries; -Identify the range of national, regional and international		1. Improve dumping and dumping sites with best available techniques or technologies 2. Having litter and microplastic collection site in inshore and offshore areas 3. Installing litter and microplastic facilities in inshore and offshore areas 4. Clean up of microplastic floating in sea water vial employing advance collecting devises and new machinery 5. Replacement of plastic by environment friendly material such as biodegradable material textile bags and so on. 6. Caring on in a national bases of identification chemical properties, sources effect, fate and control of marine litter and microplastic 7. Implementation of marine litter and microplastic action plan

	into the coastal area pertaining to removing the existing garbage and preventing new pollutions (3) Lack of strategy framework for marine pollution (4) Potential legislative gaps on production and use of land-based materials causing marine litter (5) Mandate all vessels to carry GPS to facilitate location logging of lost gear for later retrieval (6) Mandate reporting of gear loss and facilitate sharing of this information to reduce gear conflict (7) Seeking a mandate for Prohibition of Discharge in the Marine Environment (8) Potential legislative gaps relevant to cargo residues include: • A lack of a strict requirement for shippers to declare whether or not cargoes they ship are “harmful to the marine environment” (HME) – this is within the Guidelines, but not mandatory; and • There is no list of solid bulk cargoes or	response options, including actions and innovative approaches, and voluntary and legally binding governance strategies and approaches; -Identify environmental, social and economic costs and benefits of different response options; -Examine the feasibility and effectiveness of different response options; -Identify potential options for continued work for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly.		
--	---	--	--	--

	assessment of individual cargoes that are HME: this causes potential variance in assessment. This list (potentially, as with dumping, a 'reverse list' which specifies cargos that are not harmful) may be developed outside legislation and subsequently referenced -Lack of proper information and reporting from land-based sources disposed to coastal environment -Technology: Such as satellite monitoring systems like Clean Sea Net focus primarily on detecting oil discharges, lack of proper technologies to replace plastics and microplastic to environmental friendly materials. -Financial: Lack of adequate financial resources to combat different items of litters and microplastic originated from land or sea.			
Japan	-There is a lack of scientific knowledge globally in common,	-There is no "one-fits all" solutions for this	-UNEA/UNEP should work proactively to implement the resolution of UNEA4	-National. As a major premise, every member state should make its best efforts to combat marine litter and microplastics, according to their circumstances and jurisdiction. National measures should cover entire life-cycle of plastics based on

	such as monitoring capacity; international harmonization of monitoring methodology; sources, pathways and fate of plastic waste leakage toward the development of global land and sea-based source inventories; and impacts to ecosystems. -Capacity of policy formulation and implementation including 3R and sound waste management practices in developing countries is insufficient.	issues as plastics are widely used in every aspect of economic activities and daily life according to diverse national circumstances. It is necessary for each country to identify issues based on scientific knowledge, and formulate and implement most appropriate tailored actions.	(4/6 “Marine Plastic Litter and Microplastics.” This should include UNEP to strengthen scientific and technological knowledge through convening existing relevant science advisory initiatives and to strengthen coordination and cooperation by establishing a multi-stakeholder platform, in addition to holding Ad Hoc Open-Ended Expert Group meetings. -In the consideration of AHOEEG, following points are important to build ground for further work by UNEAS: ✓ Consideration of all possible response options without prejudging possible outcomes at the UNEAS ✓ Collection of relevant information and good practices of functioning frameworks and initiatives at the regional and international scale through holding regional meetings ✓ Consideration of possibilities to strengthen and	circumstances and capabilities of each countries. It should be recognized that many member states have already developed their national action plans, however, there are still many member states who have not developed such plans. -Regional and international. Regional and international frameworks should have a role to support and facilitate each countries’ national plans and measures against marine litter and microplastics. Here, the following points are important for regional/international frameworks to function effectively: ✓ Sharing a long-term global/regional vision ✓ Understanding the importance of comprehensive life-cycle approach ✓ Allowing all countries to have opportunities to share information and learn best-practices and knowledge to strengthen their national measures ✓ Promoting international cooperation to support countries that need capacity building ✓ Strengthening scientific knowledge and innovative solutions There are existing regional and/or multilateral frameworks and initiatives that are currently functioning to combat marine plastic litters and micro-plastics. In order to move forward effectively and efficiently, it would be strongly recommended with the viewpoint of efficiency to learn from such existing frameworks and initiatives as a crucial first step. Such frameworks and initiatives include G20/G7, ASEAN/EAS and Regional Seas Programme². -Strengthening of scientific knowledge On floating microplastics, Japan, with the work of experts, has published the “Guidelines for Harmonizing Ocean Surface Microplastic Monitoring Methods” in May 2019 as one of the activities of G7. The guideline³ provides recommendations such as: ✓ to collect samples when sea conditions are as calm as possible ✓ to use a flowmeter to calculate the tow distance (if the tow distance is affected by a water surface current and not equivalent to that calculated between the start and end positions) ✓ to compare results of particles in the size range of 1 – 5 mm
--	--	--	--	---

² More details on the activities under these frameworks and initiatives can be found in the original submission.

³ Available at : http://www.env.go.jp/en/water/marine_litter/guidelines/guidelines.pdf

			expand well-functioning types of frameworks/initiatives	
Malaysia	-Malaysia has rolled out a Roadmap Towards Zero Single-Use Plastics 2018-2030			-A collective vision to end ocean plastics supported by firm international action which can be explored through exhausting existing mechanisms and if there is still a need, a new instrument can be considered. -There is also a need to establish a strategic and centralized platform for information, knowledge and best practices sharing. This sharing platform could also be used to share, guide and collaborate on research, innovation and scientific studies that could help to develop and contribute solutions to the issues. -Another initiative to help boost the solutions are by having collaboration of nations in developing capacity building to tackle the issue, providing international financing mechanisms, recycling initiatives and to establish a global extended producer responsibility initiative. -On the regional scale, some of the response options recommended is to establish a regional sharing platform on knowledge, best practices, collaborative network in research and strengthening economic gains. This is important is driving a new plastic economy. -Every stakeholder's initiatives and objectives should be streamlined to avoid duplication of activities and addressing the gaps to ensure effective implementation. -There is also a need to map and monitor the flow and source of marine litter at regional level while continuing the cooperation on science and management of waste between countries (G2G). The involvement of non-state actors is important in complementing efforts of governments in addressing the issue. -In advocating behavioural change towards better managing plastic and plastic waste, mainstreaming Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) in all stakeholder engagements and public outreach programmes is important. A dedicated outreach and CEPA should be targeted to the industry players as well as consumers.
Myanmar	-Baseline data and material flow analysis. The consequences of production and consumption have caused an increase in plastic waste in Myanmar. Increasing the amount of plastic waste leads to the	-Based on our national context, the following areas cannot be addressed domestically but may effectively be addressed globally:	-The AHEG should also consider ways to facilitate the development and support of international frameworks and regional and national action plans to combat marine debris and microplastic effectively.	Myanmar is committed to the implementation of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda along with the mainstreaming of environmental issues into national and sub-national development planning through the implementation of the National Environmental Policy and Master Plan, Climate Change Strategy and Action 4 Plan, Green Economy Policy Framework, National- and City-level Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan, National Land-use Policy and National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan. Toward the achievement of Target 14.1 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Myanmar will develop the Plastic Waste Management Action Plan to prevent plastic from entering into the marine environment. This will contribute to the Bangkok

	higher cost of waste collection and creates a burden on the budget of the local government. Due to the lack of available/reliable data on waste generation and management (including marine litter data and recycling sectors/activities), it is difficult for policy makers to develop evidence-based policies to tackle marine litter/plastics issues. Identifying the flow and stock of plastic waste in Myanmar will be useful for the relevant authorities who need to make careful plans/decisions on waste management policy. -Plastic Waste Management Action Plan. The Government of Myanmar endorsed and issued the National Waste Management Strategy and Master Plan (2018-2030) with technical support by UN Environment and IGES/CCET. It emphasizes the importance of holistic waste management	i. Legislation and a governance framework Legislation and a governance framework at the international level is needed for combating marine litter and microplastics, with support by other countries to ensure the effectiveness of new national measures to address plastic pollution and regulation on the import and export of plastic materials (including fossil-based plastics), products and waste. ii. Monitoring and managing transboundary plastic waste There are limitations in effective management for transboundary plastic waste in our country because monitoring and reporting of transboundary	- Collect relevant response options of functioning frameworks and initiatives at the regional and international scale by holding regional meetings and make decisions at the AHEG meeting to submit to UNEA.	Declaration on combating marine debris and the ASEAN Framework of Action on Marine Debris. 2. Myanmar has recognized that the marine litter and microplastic issues are among the most threatening global challenges for sustainable development in our society. In order to address this issues, financial resources, capacity building and technology transfer are crucial. As also stated at the Third AHEG meeting in Bangkok in November 2019, there is a limit to how much we can achieve on national level alone. Plastic pollution is a transboundary issue, beyond national jurisdictions, because plastic that is discharged in one country can end up as litter or even as precipitation in another country. 3. The existing global legal framework pertaining to marine plastic pollution is fragmented and ineffective. Currently, none of the global treaties have detailed provisions explicitly aimed at preventing leakage of plastic into the ocean. Some of them cover part of the problem, but most marine plastic pollution sources remain largely unregulated. 4. The challenges of marine litter and microplastics are global and the solutions require initiatives within national and regional priority frameworks. Therefore, Myanmar supports building international frameworks within UNEA in order to help member countries address plastic pollution. The potential mechanisms for national, regional and international response options on plastic pollution are as follows; i. Policy Support and Planning a. The International Framework should have a common vision and commitments that are specific, measurable and time-bound. b. All parties commit to adopt and implement a national action plan setting goals and targets, which can follow the recommendations of UN SDG 14.1. c. Goals and targets should be differentiated between developed and developing nations. 5 ii. Public sector engagement a. Public-Private Partnerships can be a mechanism to facilitate cooperation between governments and private sector. b. Engage with the private sector, including the informal waste sector, and promote investment in waste treatment facilities and other infrastructure for waste management and material recovery. iii. Research, Innovation and Capacity Building a. Strengthen regional, national and local capacities to develop and implement national action plans/initiatives. b. Enhance scientific knowledge, transfer marine technology and promote innovative solutions to combat marine debris. c. Enhance science-based decisions and policies through the establishment of an intergovernmental scientific panel drawing on the knowledge and scientific research of all relevant institutions.
--	--	---	---	--

	promotion, actions to maximize proper collection, disposal of industrial waste, medical waste and other policies and a monitoring framework. 2 There are gaps and challenges in implementing plastic waste management in order to combat marine debris. Development and implementation of a long-term and robust strategy are necessary to prevent marine pollution and promote circular economy approaches. The Plastic Policy Option and Action Plan will be developed with the help of the World Bank, the Ministry of Environment Japan (MOEJ) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) to reduce and prevent plastic pollution for a better ecosystem and human health, improve plastic waste management systems and develop plastic laws, rules and regulations, and directives that are applicable within Myanmar contexts.	plastic waste flows, especially in international waters, is a major challenge. iii. Technical cooperation and financial mechanisms Technical cooperation and financial mechanisms, including capacity building and technology transfer, are important for solutions of alternative materials to plastic. iv. Regional and global coordination and cooperation As Myanmar believes that more collaboration, attention and resources are needed to combat marine debris, strengthening coordination and cooperation at the regional and international level is one of the key success		d. Consolidate knowledge and manpower by mapping out existing committees so as to prevent duplicates and over expenditure of funding. iv. Public Awareness, Education and Outreach a. Promote public awareness on the status and impacts of marine debris and microplastics. b. Encourage behavior change programs or strategies on using single use plastic. c. Create a knowledge sharing platform or strengthen existing ones to promote innovative technology. v. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting a. Establish a mechanism for monitoring and reporting of transboundary plastic waste flows, especially in international waters. b. Strengthen coordination and cooperation between various existing scientific platforms to harmonize reporting needs, data collection methods and to prevent future duplications and divergences where possible. c. Develop minimum standards for countries on reporting related to their national, regional and global commitments. 6 vi. Funding Mechanism a. Set up a global fund to support the efforts of countries to reduce plastic pollution. b. Countries' access to the global fund can be based on common but differentiated responsibilities and should consider national circumstances. c. Countries with greater means can potentially pledge funding. d. Eligibility to access the funds should extend even to land-locked countries to stop the leakage from rivers and waterways into the ocean. 5. Clean-up of plastic waste is one of the options to reduce plastic pollution but does not increase quantities of plastic entering the environment. Thus, reducing inputs of plastic to the environment must be prioritized and the following are potential policy measures covering the life cycle of plastics: i. Production a. Regulate certain types, composition and production methods of plastics. b. Introduce incentives for innovative, new products. ii. Consumption a. Create a labelling mechanism to promote better consumer choices. b. Reduce consumption of unnecessary single use plastic. iii. Waste management a. Create an international financial mechanism for waste management and recovery. b. Set international standards on waste management practices, including the export and import of recycled waste. c. Implement Extended Producer Responsibility schemes to support private sector participation. d. Set national targets for waste avoidance, diversion and recovery. e. Introduce national laws and regulations on waste management. iv. International Trade a. Regulate and control the import and export of plastic and plastic products.
--	---	---	--	--

	-Behavioural Change. Stakeholder awareness should lead to efficient and effective involvement in managing marine plastic debris due to the huge number of stakeholders spread out in all regions. In Myanmar, awareness raising and capacity building for local government and communities are conducted by the government, NGOs and other organizations. Behavioral change is a necessary component of long-term solutions to the challenge of eliminating plastic waste from the world's oceans and waterways. -Public Sector Engagement. An integrated approach across the value chain is needed to tackle marine debris issues. There are innovative ways in which the private sector can support the waste system in many areas such as reducing inputs into the system, enhancing collection rates for used plastics	factors for tackling marine litter and microplastics.		7 b. Introduce safety measures on the international trade of plastic and plastic products. c. Strengthen compliance to international standards in the trade of plastic waste, linked to the Basel Convention. v. Clean up a. Set up waste management systems that can support waste collection. b. Consider regional efforts for the removal of fishing gear. c. Provide data on the sources and types of waste to inform upstream measures.
--	--	---	--	--

	and creating value for waste reuse. Therefore, promoting collaborative actions with private sector and industrial associations is necessary to implement measures to address marine debris issues. -Financial Resources and Technical Assistance. In tackling marine litter and microplastics, Myanmar is in need of financial and technical assistance. Although it has many development partners such as the World Bank, MOEJ, ADB, the Embassy of The 3 Netherlands, etc. new and innovative financial mechanisms and technical assistance are still necessary to address marine plastic pollution sustainably based on the national context and circumstances.			
Norway	-The UNEA-process and discussions in the expert group so far have proven that there is broad agreement that "status quo" is not a sustainable option	- There is a need for stronger responses to the marine litter and microplastics challenge - A significant change in the	- AHEG 4 and 5 should focus its work on the response options at the global level that are necessary to produce more effective action at all levels. This includes the consideration of a	-Enhanced coordination and cooperation between states as well as between relevant international bodies and instruments is necessary, the most effective response option will be to establish a new global agreement

	-UNEA-3 stressed in its resolution 3/7 the importance of long-term elimination of all discharge of litter and microplastics into the oceans. Currently, there is no international framework that in a systematic and holistic way addresses all aspects of this complex problem with the aim to fulfil this global vision	way we use and dispose of plastic products needs to take place. We need to use plastic products smarter, recycle more, and better control and manage our plastic waste. To be effective, changes in plastics production and consumption patterns and plastic waste management need to be actively promoted and supported by stronger national plastic policies in all countries.	new dedicated global agreement -The agenda of the 4th and 5th Expert Group meetings should be tailored to allow for structured discussions on response options related to key areas of the life-cycle of plastic products -Discussions proposed to focus on: 1. Enhanced plastic waste minimization, recycling and management; 2. More sustainable plastic products; 3. How to share the responsibility fairly; 4. Microplastics, targeted measures are needed; 5. Building a global science and knowledge base, propose of a global science and knowledge base composes of a decision making body, steering committee, and a pool of specialists	
Philippines	-Since 2000, the Philippines has enacted and implemented a comprehensive, ecological solid waste management law, Republic Act No. 9003, aimed at holistically managing our wastes, to address leakage of marine litter and microplastics into our			-Addressing marine plastic pollution thus requires a comprehensive approach at the national, regional and especially at the global levels. As extensively discussed during past AHEG meetings, not one country alone can do it. -many voluntary initiatives have been implemented across the globe and across regions. But, they still have fallen short of bringing us closer to our goal of eliminating marine litter and microplastics. -Therefore, a strong global framework that takes into account the full life cycle approach of products and the shift towards a circular economy is urgently needed to solve this global problem of marine plastic pollution. -Together with an increasing number of countries and regional blocs, the Philippines reiterates its submission for the consideration of the feasibility and effectiveness of a potential international legally binding agreement on marine litter and microplastics (UNEP/AHEG/2018/2/5), and its support for the start of

	rivers, seas and oceans. -Across the country and over the past decades, a number of cities and municipalities have prohibited single-use plastic, among others. Many river, bay and coastal clean-ups and rehabilitation are also on-going. -National bills on country-wide bans on certain single use plastics and on the implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility are currently pending in Congress. -These national efforts, however, have not been effective in stopping the surge of plastic pollution, especially in our archipelagic country. -the entire value chain of plastic is global – international trade in source materials, international trade of manufactured products and even international trade, both legal and illegal, of waste materials. -for most developing countries like the Philippines, business		the negotiations of a new global treaty and the discussion of its elements to combat marine plastic pollution. -Some Key Considerations in a Global Agreement to Address Marine Litter and Microplastics • Guiding Principles. The following principles should guide the international community in crafting the legally binding global agreement, among others: - o precautionary principle approach - o prevention principle - measures should prioritize addressing the prevention of marine litter at source - o polluter pays principle - cost of pollution prevention, control, and reduction measures are to be borne by the polluter with due regard to the public interest - o participatory approach - general public (local communities, private sector, CSOs, and local authorities) and private sector will be involved in the development and implementation of efforts - o ecosystem-based approach-cumulative effects of marine litter coming from both land- and sea-based sources on the marine and coastal ecosystem, habitats, and species with other contaminants and substances that are present in the marine environment should be fully considered in management of marine litter - o common but differentiated responsibilities • Shared Vision. Consistent with the agreement in UNEA 3 Resolution 3/7 on the long-term elimination of discharge of litter and microplastics to the oceans and of avoiding detriment to marine ecosystems and the human activities dependent on them from marine litter and microplastic, the global agreement should state the same agreed multi. • Reduction Targets. Following this shared vision, the international community should agree on a timebound measurable target to reduce marine plastic pollution, using a standardized baseline and calculation method. All countries should then contribute to this reduction targets, as they may nationally determine based on their national circumstances and contexts and come up with national action plans to achieve such target. • Common Global Standards and Regulations. Given the global transboundary nature of plastic products that eventually make up most of the marine litter and microplastics, common standards, rules and regulations should be considered for an integrated and coordinated response. These should include regulations on sustainable source materials including setting minimum percentage of recycled plastic content in feedstocks, certain types of plastics such as unnecessary single-use plastics and microbeads in beauty products, common labelling, etc. that would be applicable to all countries. These should also include developing common regulations on plastic sachet packaging, especially prevalent in developing countries in Asia, can achieve an effective, feasible, culturally appropriate, sustainable transformation across the board globally. These should
--	---	--	---

	decision-making of multi-national corporations are made or at least heavily influenced by their head offices in developed countries.		also extend to the global promotion and adoption of the Extended Producer Responsibility, customised based on country conditions, and using a phased approach. • Standard Monitoring and Reporting. For comparability, inter-operability and a way to effectively measure global progress in addressing marine plastic pollution throughout the full life cycle of products towards shift to a circular economy, the international community should harmonize and agree on standard monitoring and reporting mechanisms. These should include global standards for monitoring plastic production, consumption, management including recyclability and recovery back into the circular loop, and elimination of leakage. All countries should then use these for measuring and reporting national progress to provide figures that are comparable globally. • Scientific body. Similar to the UNFCCC's IPPC, a dedicated inter-governmental scientific body that will provide widely-accepted scientific and technical guidance to implementing states should also be considered. Their functions can also include tracking progress against global reduction targets and monitoring leakage of litter and microplastics into the ocean. • Support especially for Developing Countries. Mechanisms for financial and technical support for implementing countries should be included in the global framework. This should also include capacity building and technology transfer specially to support actions by developing countries especially in terms of material reduction, recyclability improvement, redesign of materials as well as sustainable low-carbon waste/material management schemes. • Plastic Waste in High Seas. Accountability for managing plastic waste that ends up in high seas is also a relevant issue for island or archipelagic countries like the Philippines. Thus, transboundary movement of marine litter across high seas is more likely to end up on our shores. However, the resolution for this issue should be further fleshed out in a formal negotiation process. Recommended Regional Response The Philippines recognizes the important work of the different regional programs and bodies to address marine plastic pollution. Specific to the Philippines, the country is engaged with the ASEAN, the COBSEA, the PEMSEA, and the CTI-CFF, among others. Since a comprehensive, integrated and multi-tiered approach is needed to address marine plastic pollution, it is critical that these various regional programs as well as the national interventions are aligned and build on each other. Regional governance/coordinating bodies should create synergy among themselves. These could include strengthening communication and coordination among programs, rationalizing plans to avoid duplications and address gaps, consolidation information and minimizing redundant reporting, These regional efforts, however, are not enough. An overarching legally binding global framework must eventually guide these regional as well as national interventions to address marine litter and
--	---	--	--

				microplastics. Recommended National Response At the national level, all states should consider the following, among many others: • National Action Plan and Reduction Target. All countries should develop and implement a national action plan that sets out a measurable and time-bound target to reduce marine litter and microplastics. As a global framework is developed that will standardized calculation methods for setting baselines and tracking progress, countries should shift towards adopting such for comparison globally. • National EPR Scheme and Industry Engagement. Following the polluter pays principle, manufacturers and brand owners shall be accountable for the end-of-life impacts of their products and packaging before they are allowed to place them in the market. This is a critical and innovative way of engaging industries. • Incentives to Reduce Demand/Consumption for Unnecessary Plastics. Levies may be imposed on certain single use plastics which levy will be plowed back to support waste management programs or marine litter reduction programs. Incentives may also be provided for innovative, sustainable, indigenous designs especially using indigenous local materials. • Strengthening Waste/Material Management Infrastructure and Systems. At the local level, countries should be responsible for managing materials and wastes to ensure the use of these materials for as long possible and to prevent leakage into the environment. • Behavior Change. To promote a whole of nation approach, whereby all sectors contribute to the elimination of marine litter and microplastics, all stakeholders should be informed and educated, through formal and informal channels, optimizing the use of information and communication technology to change behaviors towards transformative business models in the use of source materials, production and design of plastic products, the use of less single-use or unnecessary plastic, and the management of waste/recovery of materials back into a circular loop.
Singapore				Singapore continues to support the work of the AHEG and our reflection on potential response options is as follow. 1. Establishing a common vision An effective response to the global problem of marine litter and microplastics would require a common global vision. While such a vision has been laid out by UNEA-3 with Resolution 3/7 stressing the importance of the long-term elimination of discharge of litter and microplastics into the oceans, UNEA-4 could not develop the vision further. Therefore, Singapore is of the view that AHEG should conscientiously continue to develop a common vision to rally a concerted global action in addressing marine litter. A common vision would also galvanise targeted actions. 2. Identifying barriers and challenges AHEG should consider identifying the barriers and challenges to addressing marine litter so that measures and actions taken would be more targeted and effective. We understand that there exists a

				lack of consensus and scientific knowledge on a number of issues in addressing marine litter. For example, there is no international harmonisation of monitoring methodology. Global understanding on the sources, pathways and impact of plastics in marine ecosystems and health also remains to be strengthened and there is no globally accepted definition for microplastics. By identifying the barriers and challenges to effectively address marine litter, AHEG should then be able to pave the way and provide the direction for further studies and actions to plug the gaps in our global capacity as any global response should be based on sound science. 3. Building on existing instruments There are numerous existing regional and multilateral instruments and frameworks that have been adopted to address marine litter i.e. the ASEAN Framework of Action on Marine Debris and the G20 Action Plan on Marine Litter, annexes to the Basel Convention, MARPOL's London Convention and Protocol to regulate the dumping of waste at sea. These frameworks continue to be strengthened and implemented by countries and organisations under their respective agreements and mandates. To avoid duplication in effort, AHEG should take into consideration existing frameworks to ensure efficiency and build on what we already have. 4. Consideration of all response options AHEG should be mindful that different regions and countries are faced with different circumstances and as such any global response should take into consideration all response options without prejudging possible outcomes at UNEA-5, especially if there are still significant knowledge gaps in the global understanding to addressing marine litter. In addition, AHEG should also bear in mind that a combination of response options might be effective in addressing marine litter at various levels i.e. local, national, regional. 5. A holistic approach Given the multi-faceted nature of the global marine litter issue and the diverse circumstances across different regions and countries, AHEG should take a holistic approach in addressing marine litter for the long-term. Apart from strengthening global capacity and remaining open to all options to addressing marine litter, AHEG should also consider taking a life-cycle approach to promote sustainable consumption and production, including circular economy approaches to reduce the upstream production of litter.
Switzerland	-The status quo is not sufficient, non-action is no longer an option. Gaps and barriers: -The lack of clear binding standards on plastic pollution mitigation, especially from land-based	-The overarching aim must be to work towards clear, comprehensive, coherent, efficient and effective international		- Overall the response options must account for (a) adopting an integrated approach to waste management at the national level; (b) embedding a life-cycle approach and reduce-reuse-recycle thinking into all aspects of the economy, including producer responsibility; (c) using a source-to-sea approach given the importance of rivers as conduits for the delivery of plastic litter to the marine environment; (d) building on successful regional and global mechanisms such as the Regional Seas and Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management and others; (e) creating a global architecture that includes existing

	sources: this encompasses industry regulation, waste and wastewater management, reduction of non-recoverable microplastics, and human rights implications; -Missing or inadequate chemicals and waste management, including wastewater management; -The lack of science-based product design and production in order to avoid unintentional loss of plastic throughout supply chains or through wear of products; -Geographic gaps in the scope of existing conventions. Many inland waters and watersheds are not always covered, areas beyond national jurisdiction are only marginally included, the main polluting areas are not covered by a legally binding convention; -The lack of a strong capacity-building scheme; -Ineffective compliance and	rules with corresponding institutions to effectively address this environmental issue of global concern. -We are in need of response options that consider existing and new, voluntary or potentially legally binding elements, concern the governments and other stakeholders (including the private sector and consumers) alike and that work on national, regional and international levels as well as across the time scale.		and new, voluntary or potentially legally binding elements, in a multi-layered, governance approach, that could be extended to other institutions. -Waste Management and Prevention. Mainstream prevention, collection, separation and environmentally sound disposal of waste into national development strategies. -Ban of microplastics in cosmetic products. -Recycling. Consider recycling rates. -Voluntary commitments. Industry-led solutions and commitments; voluntary national reduction targets. -Advocacy and action on overarching concepts including Green Economy, Life Cycle Approach, and Sustainable Consumption and Production, including product design; Link with the overarching concept of pollution and the associated risks to health, including human and environmental health; -Reporting. Standardize global, regional and national reporting on production, consumption and final treatment of plastics, address the whole life cycle; -Collaboration among member states in existing conventions, organisations, and fora, this includes a coherent national position across the responsible ministries; and among existing conventions, organisations, and fora in order to address the issue in a coherent and complementary way, in particular with Basel; -Existing frameworks. Review, revise, and build on relevant existing instruments; Harmonize international legal instruments and approaches; -Guidelines and standards. Develop/improve global industry guidelines; Establish global standards for industry plastic producers -Global monitoring. Establish a monitoring system that includes review and accountability and speaks to the Precautionary Principle (enables a holistic land-to-sea approach view); -Overarching Sustainable Consumption and Production. Engage in existing overall mechanism and programmes that speak to sustainable consumption and production -Global architecture. Establish a new international architecture that includes response options as presented above, of voluntary or potentially legally binding nature. In parallel, take action in the interim and apply other response options.
--	---	--	--	--

	enforcement mechanisms in multilateral environmental agreements; -Insufficient implementation of the polluter-pays principle tailored to the issue at stake; -Solutions focus mainly on adaption measures instead of mitigation. The overall source-to-sea point of view needs to be established to consider the full life cycle, i.e. the upstream design phase of plastic products to the final treatment of plastic; -Fragmented and/or partial consideration of the problem in existing instruments, organizations and fora and lack of coordination among existing initiatives. Collaboration and discussions among member states, among organizations and instruments, and of member states with organizations/instrument; -Current consumption and production patterns drive the issue of marine			
--	--	--	--	--

	pollution. Life cycle approaches and Green Economy principles have not been addressed.			
Timor-Leste	-Several key barriers to tackling this challenge include; a. The lack of harmonised standards in the production/ product content of plastic based products which hence require a range of different waste recovery/ management mechanisms b. The linear economic model of use and throw and the nature of global trade has introduced increasing plastic products into countries without factoring country capacity and resource in handling potential waste or ability to recycle. This results in an inequitable distribution of environmental and social costs and risks c. no effective method of measuring the pollution, monitoring the pollution flow as well as in measuring and monitoring progress towards			-RANGE OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE OPTIONS, INCLUDING ACTIONS AND INNOVATIVE APPROACHES, AND VOLUNTARY AND LEGALLY BINDING GOVERNANCE STRATEGIES AND APPROACHES: At the national level, all countries should work towards setting national targets and should transition towards a circular plastics economy. TL has numerous national level policies which has been introduced and remains committed towards achieving plastics pollution free by 2023. As a Coral Triangle country with rich marine biodiversity, and further , in recognizing the transboundary nature of plastic production and consumption as well as marine pollution, we believe that it is important that global level response options are identified to complement national and regional response measures. Such global response option should also build upon previous body of work of the Open Ended Working Group and should facilitate access to financial and technical support for countries, facilitate the adoption of harmonized standards, foster collaboration, help in avoiding duplication of efforts, and provide a mechanism to measure the progress of achieving global goals such as the Sustainable Development Goals. We believe that a legally binding international framework which helps countries set clearly defined targets and helps set and harmonize standards to be a key global response option. in seeking to achieve effectiveness at the international level, a multi layered approach needs to be taken in strengthening governance through the strengthening of existing international, regional and national measures, as well as through enhancing larger collaboration with civil society and the private sector. -FEASIBILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT RESPONSE OPTIONS ABOVE: National measures are crucial but will need to be backed by transparency and good governance where in there is effective implementation and enforcement. However, there is no single silver bullet and a multi layered approach is very much needed. national, regional and international frameworks will need to be strengthened in parallel to introducing new comprehensive frameworks. It is crucial that significant investment is mad in science, research and development and these form the basis of developing measurement and monitoring tools. If global production and trade in plastics is not effectively transitioned into a circular economy at the international level, socio economic challenges and conflicts may arise within the frame of global trade with some countries potentially being left behind in effectively addressing the challenge of f marine litter and micro plastic.

	addressing this challenge d. lack of financial resource and capacity for especially developing countries to effectively implement , and enforce action plans			-POTENTIAL OPTIONS FOR CONTINUED WORK FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT ASSEMBLY: It is hoped that investments are made in helping with identifying cost effective and environmentally sustainable alternatives to plastics in addition to developing technology which is efficient for waste management and recovery. Science , research and development is also needed to develop key monitoring tools and in identifying efficient pollution mitigation and elimination measures.
US	-Continues to support practical and effective action by all countries to reduce discharges of marine plastic litter (MPL) to the ocean	-There is no one-size-fits-all approach that will work for every country and situation, and many solutions will be carried out or are best implemented at regional, subnational and local levels of government or by nongovernmental entities	-AHEG should consider the potential for numerous approaches to help solve this problem, prioritizing actions that are cost-effective, and that focus on large-scale reductions in major source countries. -Future meetings should be informed by the prior deliberations in the AHEG on response options. For example, the Annex of the AHEG-2 report identifies a range of issues and possible response options, and appropriately does not endorse any specific approaches. The AHEG should continue its work with the purpose of informing the broader policy discussions rather than pursue a specific recommendation. -The AHEG should consider the role for existing, enhanced, or new public private partnerships that can promote targeted actions	- Response options should promote enhanced on the ground actions that will: (1) build capacity for environmentally sound waste management, (2) incentivize recycling and support the global scrap market, and (3) promote innovative technology and business models. -Response options should also ensure that a life-cycle approach is considered in any path forward, so we understand the environmental impacts of alternative technologies or materials. - A combination of response options of differing size and scope will be most effective to achieve reductions in MPL discharges. Those options should encompass regional, national, sub-national, and local governments, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and philanthropic foundations. -Do not view a legally-binding instrument as the most effective approach to achieving reductions of MPL due to the inherently localized nature of waste management and the need to continue to accrue best practices in waste management rather than prioritize identifying international obligations. -Should consider options, including existing forums, for collaboration tailored to spur regional, national, sub-national and local action and to include appropriate participation by non-governmental actors. The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management SAICM multi-stakeholder model (or the SAICM body itself) could be considered as a possible approach that would allow for broad participation across government and non-government interests. If there is a need for traditional government to government engagement, it could be accommodated by handling some issues outside of the multi-stakeholder model. - Continue to emphasize the benefits of regional, national, sub-national, and local approaches that can take into consideration circumstances on the ground, rather than press for universal approaches

			and capacity building or assist with resource mobilization. -The AHEG should consider innovative approaches to mobilize non-governmental resources and financing. The business community has already committed more than a billion dollars of finance that will help countries reduce their MPL discharges. Foundations and non-governmental organizations can further compliment private sector investment and engagement. -The AHEG should recognize and build on the current work undertaken by the Global Partnership on Marine Litter to reduce MPL. This effort could be given further attention and strengthened to improve its reach and effectiveness. -Regionally, the AHEG should consider the existing instruments such as regional seas programs, regional fisheries bodies, and river basin committees as effective options to galvanize action. -The AHEG should also consider ways to facilitate	
--	--	--	---	--

			the development and support of national action plans that may also facilitate action at the subnational or local level.	
Vietnam	Barriers: - How to mobilize sufficient financial resources to combating marine litter and microplastics? - Need a Roadmap for transition towards circular economy for plastics within Vietnam's conditions. - For combating marine litter and micro plastics, there are some barriers cannot be addressed domestically (but may be effectively addressed across the board globally). 1. Legislation and governance framework needed at international level 2. Call for industry engagement. 3. Science and Knowledge 4. Managing Transboundary Plastic Waste 5. Methodology on monitoring, standards, regular reporting, stocktaking. Currently, all over the world,		- It is suggested that UNEA apply expert judgment methodology to assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the different response options. - COVID-19 poses significant challenges for continued works by the UNEA as it imposes significant limitations in terms of movement, access and association. This will require rethinking of plan and work delivery mechanisms across all areas and sectors during the affected time.	- Support for building a global treaty within UN in order to help UN's member nations addressing plastic pollution. We suggest response 3 options, actions within global treaty, which of these should be voluntary, which of these should be binding, in the below table:

Vietnam and other States have begun to introduce policy measures and regulatory interventions aimed at curbing the leakage of plastic into the environment. 6. Technical Assistance and Technology Transfer. 7. Capacity building - Viet Nam has made great efforts through strong political commitments as well as practical activities in managing waste reduction. Viet Nam has recognized the issues on “marine litter” being highly priority as reflected in the issued policies. We has adopted a development strategy to promote maritime economy in parallel with protecting maritime environment and ecosystem. One of specific objectives until 2030 settled out by the Strategy is “Preventing, controlling and significantly mitigating marine environmental pollution; being a regional pioneer in reducing ocean plastic				I. Transition towards circular economy for plastics Policy measures can change the linear global economy for plastics into one that is circular, by ensuring global cooperation and creating consistent global standards from source materials to waste management and recovery			
				The life cycle of plastics	Recommended Global Activity	Should this be binding?	Should this be voluntary
				1) Source material	- Promote the use of raw materials with low carbon, low environmental footprint for plastic production		X
					- Introduce regulation on subsidies and incentives for fossil-based primary feedstock	X (minimum requirement)	X
					- Identify better or equal alternative materials	X (minimum requirement)	X
				2) Production	- Innovate and redesign plastics.		X
					- Regulate certain types, composition and production methods of plastics		X
					- Reduction of production of certain LDPEs	X	
				3) International trade	- Introduce eco-labelling standards for plastic products	X	
					- Regulate and control the import and export of plastic and plastic products.		X
					- Strengthen compliance to international standards in the trade of plastic waste, linked to the Basel Convention.	X	
				4) Consumption	- Reduce consumption of unnecessary single use plastic.		X
					- Ban on certain LDPEs, problematic plastics	X	
					- Create a labelling mechanism to promote better consumer choices		X
				5) Waste management and material recovery	- Implement Extended Producer Responsibility schemes to support private sector participation	X	
					- Set international standards on waste management practices, including export and import of recycled waste.	X	
					- Create an international financial mechanism for waste management and recovery.	X	
				6) Clean-up/removal	- Introduce national laws and regulations on waste management to ensure compliance by waste management facilities.		X
					- Consider regional efforts for the removal of fishing gear and plastic litters.		
					- National action on clean up	X	

	waste". The National Action Plan (NAP) on marine plastic litter management through 2030 sets requirements of "Successfully implement Viet Nam's initiatives and international commitments to address plastic waste issues with a focus on marine plastic litter", "Maintain and develop cooperation with international organizations on the sea issues; proactively sign and implementing international treaties; and coordinate in the control and management of marine plastic litter" -The challenges of Marine Litter and Micro-plastics are global, and require global solutions and initiatives framed within national and regional priorities. At the G7 Summit in Canada in June 2018, the Prime Minister advocated for a "plastic free ocean" initiative, and called for a Global Cooperation Mechanism for Plastic			11. There are some barriers cannot be addressed domestically (but may be effectively addressed across the board globally)			
					Recommended Global Mechanisms:	Should this be binding?	Should this be voluntary?
				1) Mobilize sufficient financial resources to combating marine litter and microplastics	- Developed countries to be called upon to contribute to financial mechanisms - Financial organizations have commitments for contributions	X	
				2) Legislation and governance framework needed at international level	- Support from other countries to ensure effectiveness of new national measures to address plastic pollution - Regulation on the import and export of plastic materials (including fossil-based plastics), products and waste. - Reduction in the production and consumption of certain plastics	X	X
				3) National Commitments	- All commitments should be specific, measurable and time-bound. - All parties commit to adopt and implement a national action plan with set goals and targets, which can follow the recommendations of UN SDG 14.1. - There should be strong national commitments regarding contributions to match the ambition of the global goal. Differentiate between targets of developed and developing nations. - Regular reporting that includes general guidelines for methodology of monitoring and verification, as well as voluntary methodology as appropriate in the national context. - Legal framework upgraded to match with the global treaty.	X X X	X X
				4) Call for industry engagement	- Global rules, standards or recommended practices for "Industry engagement" and need to extend producer responsibility - Public-Private Partnerships - Polluter-Pays Principle - Consider mandatory reporting/verification of companies' compliance with regulations or commitments, including those on eco-labelling	X (minimum requirement) X X	X X

	Litter Mitigation with joint actions from all relevant countries for ever-blue oceans full of fish and shrimps and free from plastic, serving as valuable assets for future generations. The Government made a request to Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE), including “Proactively, actively participate in and propose for implementing cooperation initiatives at international and regional forums”, “Promote the formation of a regional and international cooperation framework on prevention and mitigation of ocean plastic waste”.				- Remove investment barriers for industry to promote innovative solutions to material recovery and recycling		X
				5) Science & Knowledge	- Innovative researches and methodologies regarding plastic waste/micro plastics e.g. plastic characteristics ecological, health impacts, harmful plastic waste leakage linked to key sources or pathways, etc. - Sharing, announcement of achievement to relevant authorities and parties. - Building an Regional – level Plastic Study Centre in order to exchange science & knowledge between nations of region	X	X
				6) Managing Transboundary Plastic Waste	- An international or regional mechanism for monitoring and reporting of transboundary plastic waste flows, especially in international waters	X	
				7) Measuring Progress - monitoring, standards, regular reporting, stocktaking	- Adoption of Common Standards for Measuring Progress - National regular report - Transparent Reporting and Review System - Capacity considerations	X X X	X
				8) Capacity-Building/Technology Transfer –	- Sharing information/data and technologies obtained to each other; - Technology transferring; - Building platforms for information exchange - Capacity building programmes	X X	X
Major Groups and Stakeholders							
Association Welfare					-Option 1: Status quo -Option 2: Existing mechanism(s) with some modification -Option 3: New Global Mechanism - Our position on Option 1 This is logically, technically and morally un acceptable - Our Position on Option 2 This is the best of the 3 options. There are many existing mechanisms that can be used to take the lead and guide the international community and national governments. We believe the current group at the UNE Secretariat in Nairobi is capable of playing this role if it is given the necessary support. It can work together with the SAICM Secretariat and secretariats of BRS Conventions. It will save us a lot of time and other resources. -Our position on option 3 This option has a lot of bottlenecks. First nobody is 100% sure how many years it may take to negotiate such a global treaty. The		

				possibility of wasting many years negotiating are there. The Paris Agreement is something that we shouldn't forget or repeat. It took 21 years to reach an agreement. Second nobody can guarantee that at the end of the day we will have a legally binding agreement. Again the Paris Agreement is a bitter example. After 21 years of protracted negotiations we ended up with a non-legally binding treaty though expectations all along the way were on a legally binding agreement. Another example is SAICM. For almost 3 years of negotiating on the expectation of a legally binding SAICM we ended with a voluntary SAICM. Third is that even when a treaty is perceived to be 'legally binding' in practice its isn't. Non-compliance with 'legally binding' treaties and failure to hold those who don't comply are a common practice. The legally binding nature of an international treaty is based on the ability to enforce its provisions and to hold accountable and take corrective measures on those who defy it. We do not see a chance for such a treaty to come out if we decided to embark on negotiations. However we leave the door open for any of the 2 last options so long as the following key elements form part and parcel of any of these two options: 1. The option provides clear and measurable support to other agreed international initiatives particularly Agenda 2030 (17 SDGs) and the Paris Agreement. 2. The option embraces all and not only one or two of the 3 pillars of sustainable development i.e. social, economic and ecological pillars. We are concerned in particular about the trend to down play the social pillar and give more attention to ecologic and economic pillars. We have seen interest on actions such as bans of single use plastics without due consideration to jobs and livelihoods. Developing countries are facing masses of unemployed youths threatening peace, security and social harmony. Many women earn their living within the plastic industry (upstream and downstream). An option that may result into increased rates of un employment and widening of inequalities is not only nonproductive but also ethically incorrect. 3. The option must be supported by a robust and long term financial mechanism that is accessible to all Parties and all stakeholders including CSOs and communities. The mechanism must also have a good balance between adaptation (e.g. cleanup) and mitigation (e.g. technologies) measures. 4. The options must recognize the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities between and within countries. 5. Lastly but not least the agreed option must avoid the mistake of downplaying the role of business and industry that is common in many other initiatives.
CIEL, EIA, gaia	- A number of existing conventions and agreements could be or are actively taking steps to address	-It is increasingly clear, however, that to prevent plastic pollution in the marine and		Pillars explained below:

	aspects of plastic pollution. However, none of the existing frameworks is specifically designed to prevent increasing flows of plastic pollution into the biosphere, nor to comprehensively manage the plastic pollution already present in the biosphere -	other environments, the global community will need a dedicated instrument, a Convention on Plastic Pollution, that addresses the full lifecycle of plastics from production and design to waste prevention and management. ^{15, 16} The Convention on Plastic Pollution should build upon and complement existing regional and global frameworks, allowing them to contribute within their core competencies, while otherwise filling the significant gaps that must be addressed in order to eliminate the long-term discharge of plastic pollution into our oceans and promote a safe circular economy for		<table><tr><th>PILLAR 1 MONITORING AND REPORTING</th><th>PILLAR 2 PLASTIC POLLUTION PREVENTION</th></tr><tr><td>Monitoring and reporting on the state of the environment and implementation</td><td>Measures to reduce plastic pollution and promote a safe circular economy for plastics</td></tr><tr><td>Harmonisation • Definitions • Methodologies (monitoring, reporting) • Standardised formats Environmental monitoring • Baselines (seafloor, seawater, shoreline, biota, freshwater, soils) • Indicator species • Evolution of plastic pollution in marine and other environments National data reporting • National inventories and sources: - virgin plastic production and use - recycled plastic production and use - plastic-waste management - plastic-waste trade - land-based sources - sea-based sources - microplastics • Evolution of circular economy and leakage Reporting on national action • Submission of national action plans • Periodic review and update Periodic comprehensive assessments • Progress toward global objectives • Scientific and socio-economic reviews </td><td>Global objectives • Long-term elimination of discharges • Safe circular economy for plastics National action plans • Policies and legislation: - targets and market restrictions - waste prevention and management - recycling and secondary markets • Sustainable financing mechanisms • Infrastructure investments • International and regional commitments Microplastics • Intentionally added (e.g. microbeads, fertilisers) • Wear and tear (e.g. tyres, textiles) • Mismanagement (e.g. pellets) Standardisation • Labelling • Product design and additive restrictions • Certification schemes • Voluntary industry standards Virgin plastic production and use • Controls and quality standards Remediation and legacy pollution • Protocols and guidelines </td></tr></table>	PILLAR 1 MONITORING AND REPORTING	PILLAR 2 PLASTIC POLLUTION PREVENTION	Monitoring and reporting on the state of the environment and implementation	Measures to reduce plastic pollution and promote a safe circular economy for plastics	Harmonisation • Definitions • Methodologies (monitoring, reporting) • Standardised formats Environmental monitoring • Baselines (seafloor, seawater, shoreline, biota, freshwater, soils) • Indicator species • Evolution of plastic pollution in marine and other environments National data reporting • National inventories and sources: - virgin plastic production and use - recycled plastic production and use - plastic-waste management - plastic-waste trade - land-based sources - sea-based sources - microplastics • Evolution of circular economy and leakage Reporting on national action • Submission of national action plans • Periodic review and update Periodic comprehensive assessments • Progress toward global objectives • Scientific and socio-economic reviews	Global objectives • Long-term elimination of discharges • Safe circular economy for plastics National action plans • Policies and legislation: - targets and market restrictions - waste prevention and management - recycling and secondary markets • Sustainable financing mechanisms • Infrastructure investments • International and regional commitments Microplastics • Intentionally added (e.g. microbeads, fertilisers) • Wear and tear (e.g. tyres, textiles) • Mismanagement (e.g. pellets) Standardisation • Labelling • Product design and additive restrictions • Certification schemes • Voluntary industry standards Virgin plastic production and use • Controls and quality standards Remediation and legacy pollution • Protocols and guidelines
PILLAR 1 MONITORING AND REPORTING	PILLAR 2 PLASTIC POLLUTION PREVENTION									
Monitoring and reporting on the state of the environment and implementation	Measures to reduce plastic pollution and promote a safe circular economy for plastics									
Harmonisation • Definitions • Methodologies (monitoring, reporting) • Standardised formats Environmental monitoring • Baselines (seafloor, seawater, shoreline, biota, freshwater, soils) • Indicator species • Evolution of plastic pollution in marine and other environments National data reporting • National inventories and sources: - virgin plastic production and use - recycled plastic production and use - plastic-waste management - plastic-waste trade - land-based sources - sea-based sources - microplastics • Evolution of circular economy and leakage Reporting on national action • Submission of national action plans • Periodic review and update Periodic comprehensive assessments • Progress toward global objectives • Scientific and socio-economic reviews	Global objectives • Long-term elimination of discharges • Safe circular economy for plastics National action plans • Policies and legislation: - targets and market restrictions - waste prevention and management - recycling and secondary markets • Sustainable financing mechanisms • Infrastructure investments • International and regional commitments Microplastics • Intentionally added (e.g. microbeads, fertilisers) • Wear and tear (e.g. tyres, textiles) • Mismanagement (e.g. pellets) Standardisation • Labelling • Product design and additive restrictions • Certification schemes • Voluntary industry standards Virgin plastic production and use • Controls and quality standards Remediation and legacy pollution • Protocols and guidelines									

		plastics which is just and safeguards the climate system. ¹⁷		<table><tr><th>PILLAR 3 COORDINATION</th><th>PILLAR 4 TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT</th></tr><tr><td>Coordination with other international and regional instruments on relevant topics</td><td>Technical support to policymakers and financial support to developing countries</td></tr><tr><td>Sea-based sources (including fishing gear) • International Maritime Organization (IMO) • Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Plastic waste trade • Basel Convention • Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and regional instruments Chemicals and additives • Stockholm Convention • Strategic Approach to Integrated Chemical Management (SAICM) Biodiversity • Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) • Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) • International Whaling Commission (IWC) Climate change • United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) • Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Agriculture • Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Cross-regional knowledge exchange • Regional seas conventions and programmes • Regional fisheries management organisations </td><td>Scientific Assessment Panel • Periodic comprehensive assessments • Ad hoc reports Socio-Economic Assessment Panel • Periodic comprehensive assessments • Ad hoc reports Implementing and bilateral agencies • Technical assistance: - capacity-building and training - policy development - monitoring and reporting • Best practices and knowledge exchanges Financial resources and mechanism • Enabling activities: - capacity-building and training - policy development - monitoring and reporting - institutional strengthening - Pilot and demonstration projects • Incremental costs Implementation and compliance mechanism • Implementation guidance • Assistance for countries in non-compliance </td></tr></table>	PILLAR 3 COORDINATION	PILLAR 4 TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT	Coordination with other international and regional instruments on relevant topics	Technical support to policymakers and financial support to developing countries	Sea-based sources (including fishing gear) • International Maritime Organization (IMO) • Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Plastic waste trade • Basel Convention • Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and regional instruments Chemicals and additives • Stockholm Convention • Strategic Approach to Integrated Chemical Management (SAICM) Biodiversity • Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) • Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) • International Whaling Commission (IWC) Climate change • United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) • Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Agriculture • Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Cross-regional knowledge exchange • Regional seas conventions and programmes • Regional fisheries management organisations	Scientific Assessment Panel • Periodic comprehensive assessments • Ad hoc reports Socio-Economic Assessment Panel • Periodic comprehensive assessments • Ad hoc reports Implementing and bilateral agencies • Technical assistance: - capacity-building and training - policy development - monitoring and reporting • Best practices and knowledge exchanges Financial resources and mechanism • Enabling activities: - capacity-building and training - policy development - monitoring and reporting - institutional strengthening - Pilot and demonstration projects • Incremental costs Implementation and compliance mechanism • Implementation guidance • Assistance for countries in non-compliance
PILLAR 3 COORDINATION	PILLAR 4 TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT									
Coordination with other international and regional instruments on relevant topics	Technical support to policymakers and financial support to developing countries									
Sea-based sources (including fishing gear) • International Maritime Organization (IMO) • Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Plastic waste trade • Basel Convention • Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and regional instruments Chemicals and additives • Stockholm Convention • Strategic Approach to Integrated Chemical Management (SAICM) Biodiversity • Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) • Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) • International Whaling Commission (IWC) Climate change • United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) • Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Agriculture • Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Cross-regional knowledge exchange • Regional seas conventions and programmes • Regional fisheries management organisations	Scientific Assessment Panel • Periodic comprehensive assessments • Ad hoc reports Socio-Economic Assessment Panel • Periodic comprehensive assessments • Ad hoc reports Implementing and bilateral agencies • Technical assistance: - capacity-building and training - policy development - monitoring and reporting • Best practices and knowledge exchanges Financial resources and mechanism • Enabling activities: - capacity-building and training - policy development - monitoring and reporting - institutional strengthening - Pilot and demonstration projects • Incremental costs Implementation and compliance mechanism • Implementation guidance • Assistance for countries in non-compliance									
India Water Foundation	-Going through the existing and potential response, the current options and activities are not contributing enough with regard to marine litter and microplastics at global level. -Stressing that the solution to addressing marine litter requires	-Eritrea had discussed measures to reduce and eliminate marine plastics through legislation and regulatory enforcement and working with the private sector to		- There is a noted consensus on the impacts of global microplastics contamination and their effects on the environment and human health, there is the need for urgent action based on current research and understanding. The chemical additives in plastics are hazardous to human health and the environment. -New legally binding instrument is still not an ideal solution due to the time it takes to negotiate a new instrument, citing the 13-year negotiations towards a legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity. - The adoption of circular economy via Reduce reuse and recycling is one of the most effective tool to combat pollution. Private sector should be encouraged and engaged to introduce recycling effectively						

	global and transboundary action, Liberia had noted before that the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) only addresses some aspects of pollution in the protection of the marine environment. -It has been discussed previously by several representatives the difficulties faced in attempting to calculate and place a monetary value on the costs and benefits of various response options, particularly when including environmental and social costs in addition to economic costs. -For some countries like Bangladesh, the alternatives to plastic carrier bags had proved to be more expensive. -The US showed studies have shown that the price for alternatives to some plastics can be as high as four times, and noted that some alternatives also contain harmful substances.	introduce recycling. -Liberia underscored the need for cost effective solutions to reduce marine litter in order to ensure sustainability. -Haiti had called for a more holistic approach, involving regional and international cooperation. -Another NGO Major Group noted the consensus on the impacts of global microplastics contamination and their effects on the environment and human health, stressing the need for urgent action based on current research and understanding. The chemical additives in plastics are hazardous to human health and the environment.	- Countries must foster a coordinated governance strategy towards a more holistic view of the cause-effect pathways, evaluate socio-economic environmental consequences, strengthen awareness and share knowledge, share innovations and case studies, technology transfer, adopt circular principles and enhance capacity building to address the issue of marine plastic litter and microplastics. -Countries should come to a consensus to tackle plastic pollution and incorporate environmentally sound best practices within the national context. Two-thirds of the plastic pollution entering our oceans from across the world come from the 20 most polluting rivers, out of 10 highest polluting rivers, Ganga stands 2nd this is not surprising when India annually dumps 6 lakh tonnes of plastic which finally enters the oceans and with a vast India's coastline of 7516.6 km stopping plastic waste from entering the ocean is a huge challenge. NGO's like us are constantly working among grass roots, communities residing on the banks of rivers and along the coasts line to inculcate behavioural change and create awareness about plastic use and marine litter. For example in India the northeastern state of Sikkim was the first state to ban plastics bottles & disposable foam products to reduce its plastic footprint and manage its waste in a more efficient and eco-friendly manner.
--	--	--	--

International Council of Chemical Association				-Chemical and plastics makers are committed to working with member states and other stakeholders to take immediate action towards the long-term elimination of discharges of litter and microplastics into the Ocean as called for by UNEA resolution 3/7. -We also fully support the consensus reached in resolution 3/7 that: “environmentally sound waste management should be given the highest priority and that that is especially important in geographical areas with the largest sources of marine plastic litter, and recognizing that technology and effective measures already exist that may provide cost-effective, environmentally sound and locally and regionally adapted solutions.” -We agree that plastic waste does not belong in our ocean or anywhere in the environment. Solutions to address plastic waste are available, with collaboration between government and private sector needed to replicate solutions at scale. Plastic makers understand the concern and recognize plastic waste in the environment is a significant problem, but we believe it is a solvable one. Technologies and systems for increasing collection and utilization of post-use plastics are available and being implemented. Policy changes and increased levels of financing are needed to accelerate deployment of solutions globally. -When considering possible response options: • We believe plastic waste is a solvable challenge. The most effective responses will focus on establishing integrated waste management systems to capture all materials. • Immediate improvements in inclusive waste management systems will deliver results more quickly and efficiently than a contentious, multi-year negotiation that will not deliver results for a decade or more. • Engage the private sector to collaborate on improved waste management by developing innovative new recycling and recovery technologies, funding models, and new value streams to help end plastic waste in the environment. • A global framework addressing plastic waste in the environment should establish a clear vision and objectives, with high level goals to improve coordination, harmonize science and data collection, and build capacity for environmentally sound waste management. <u>Support Integrated Waste Management Systems</u> -The single most important action a member state can take in addressing marine litter and microplastics is establishing an integrated waste management system to capture all used materials, including but not limited to plastic packaging, and to achieve universal access to such systems. Together with developing the appropriate infrastructure, incentivizing and developing markets for scrap materials will help make sure that all products are sustainably produced, used, and recovered into increasingly circular systems. The AHEG should consider ways to facilitate the development and support of national action plans that may also facilitate action at the subnational or local level.
---	--	--	--	---

				<u>Consider the Impact of Alternatives</u> -When developing national marine litter action plans and waste management plans and policies, member states should carefully consider the environmental impact of alternatives to plastics, applying a full lifecycle approach. - o TruCost's 2016 study, which updated a similar study for the U.N. in 2014, found that replacing plastics in packaging and consumer products with alternative materials could raise environmental costs nearly fourfold. - o Imperial College London's report, Examining Material Evidence The Carbon Fingerprint, reviewed Life-Cycle assessments comparing different packaging types. The report found plastic packaging generally outperformed alternative materials, with plastics having lower greenhouse gas impacts. The study authors also found improvements can be made to further reduce the impact of plastic packaging, highlighting the need to focus on removing, reducing, reusing, or recycling plastic packaging. - o Environmental costs can include more food and packaging waste, more fuel used in transportation, more litter, higher energy and water use during manufacturing, and increased greenhouse gas emissions. <u>Increase Coordination</u> -Should a new global framework be developed it should focus on areas where additional coordination at the global level would be useful. We believe that such a framework should develop linkages with, and where gaps exist complement, multilateral environmental agreements such as the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions, while respecting their legal structures. Regionally, the AHEG should consider the existing instruments such as regional seas programs, regional fisheries bodies, and river basin committees as effective options to galvanize action. -We also see a potential role for a new global framework to help coordinate and organize scientific information and harmonize monitoring methodologies. We support the need for more harmonized data collection methodologies, standards, common language, common units, material flow certification, metrics to measure outcomes to support transparency, as well as mechanisms to increase access to relevant data. The plastic industry supports the convening of existing scientific advisory initiatives with input from UNEP Member States and compiling available scientific data and information to prepare assessments on sources, pathways, and hazards of marine litter. <u>Facilitate Funding and Promote Public-Private Partnerships</u> -The new global framework could serve a role in encouraging multi-national development banks, sovereign wealth funds, and other investors to prioritize investments in solid waste management systems. Industry supports UNEP's efforts to bring relevant stakeholders together to enable innovative, transparent funding approaches and support public-private partnerships.
--	--	--	--	--

				-We believe the initiatives below can and should be implemented at scale in order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and to address marine plastic litter and microplastics pursuant to UNEA resolution 4/6. -Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Policy Recommendations APEC has developed a robust work stream on promoting investment in waste management systems and eliminating marine debris. In 2016 APEC Ministers endorsed a set of policy and practice recommendations for establishing the political, economic, and legal/regulatory conditions to incentivize investment in waste management solutions in APEC economies by private investors, multilateral development banks, and other sources of capital. The nine recommendations include: 1) Setting ambitious attainable targets; 2) Measuring and rewarding progress; 3) Determining shared terms; 4) Streamlining decision making; 5) Increasing funding and improving outcomes by financing all phases of integrated waste management systems; 6) Enabling innovative, transparent funding approaches; 7) Rewarding recycling and innovative, environmentally sound waste management; 8) Incentivizing entrepreneurial waste pickers; and 9) Enforcing strong environmental standards to guide innovation. -Alliance to End Plastic Waste The Alliance to End Plastic Waste (AEPW) is an industry-led not-for-profit organization that is joining forces with the financial community; governments at the national, regional and municipal level; as well as civil society to bring new ideas and new ways of thinking to combat marine debris. The Alliance is committed to raising and spending \$1.5 billion dollars over five years, focusing on infrastructure development, technological innovation, education, and clean-up, particularly in emerging economies. Nearly 50 companies have joined the Alliance. Two examples of AEPW projects are below. -STOP Jembrana – The Alliance partnered with Project STOP in Jembrana, Indonesia to improve waste collection, bring collection services to households, create permanent local jobs in the waste management industry, and clean up areas littered with plastic pollution. -Zero Plastic Waste City Project – The Alliance partnered with Grameen Bank to create financially self-sustaining ways to enable improved municipal waste management systems in two pilot cities– using approaches that could scale these systems more broadly across multiple cities in the future. -Circulate Capital Circulate Capital is an investment management firm dedicated to financing innovation, companies, and infrastructure that prevents the flow of plastic waste into the ocean while advancing the circular economy. The firm has
--	--	--	--	---

				created the Circulate Capital Ocean Fund (CCOF), a \$106 million fund investing in companies that prevent plastic pollution and advance the circular economy in South and Southeast Asia, catalyzing significant capital into the solutions. The Ocean Fund is a blended financing mechanism, bringing together the public and private sectors to invest in solutions for maximum impact. Founding investment partners include Pepsico, P&G, Chevron Phillips, Coca-Cola, Danone, Chanel, Unilever, and Dow, among other organizations. <u>Global Framework Structure</u> -We believe there is no one-sized fits all solution to combatting marine debris, and thus a legally binding and overly prescriptive governance structure would not permit the flexibility needed for countries to find the solutions that are most relevant for their conditions. We do support a global framework with a clear vision and objective, similar to the Osaka Blue Ocean Vision goal of zero discharge of plastic waste to the marine environment by 2050. The International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA) stands ready to work with governments to facilitate cross-value chain collaborations to elevate the priority of waste management, minimize inadequate disposal, improve solid waste infrastructure, improve livelihoods of waste collectors, and enable sustainable growth in markets for recycled materials for a circular economy.
Somali Youth Development Foundation	-Barriers to combating marine litter and microplastics, including challenges related to resources in developing countries: 1. Land run off: Surface run off from farming as well as urban runoff and run off from construction of roads, building, ports, channels, and harbors, can carry soil particles, laden with carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, and minerals, This nutrient rich water can cause fleshy, algae and phytoplankton to thrive, in coastal areas known as algal blooms,			-Range of national, regional and international response options, including actions and innovative approaches, and voluntary and legally binding governance strategies and approaches: (a) To explore all barriers to combating marine litter and microplastics, including challenges related to resources in developing countries; (b) To identify the range of national, regional and international response options, including actions and innovative approaches, and voluntary and legally binding governance strategies and approaches; (c) To identify the environmental, social and economic costs and benefits of the response options; (d) To examine the feasibility and effectiveness of the response options; (e) To identify potential options for continued work for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly and National organizations including Somali Youth Development Foundation (SYDF) -Feasibility and effectiveness of different response options above: (a) To explore all barriers to combating marine litter and microplastics, including challenges related to resources in developing countries; (b) To identify the range of national, regional and international response options, including actions and innovative approaches, and voluntary and legally binding governance strategies and approaches; (c) To identify the environmental, social and economic costs and benefits of the response options; (d) To examine the feasibility and effectiveness of the response options;

	which have the potential to create hypoxic conditions by using all available oxygen.			(e) To identify potential options for continued work for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly and National organizations including Somali Youth Development Foundation (SYDF) -Potential options for continued work for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly: To identify potential options for continued work for consideration by the United Nations Environment Assembly and National organizations including Somali Youth Development Foundation (SYDF)
WWF	-Existing legal framework covering marine plastic pollution is fragmented and ineffective -Lack of systematic scientific research and monitoring ✓ Most of the data available on leakage rates and sources of plastic pollution are rough estimates and extrapolations ✓ No internationally agreed methodology in place for measuring leakage of plastic into the environment ✓ There is no agreed format for how such data should be reported for comparison and interoperability -Lack of coordination, transparency and reporting	-A legally binding framework that clearly stipulates the direction (goal of zero discharge of plastic into the ocean), the ambition (reduction targets), and the required measures for getting there (a comprehensive implementation support architecture) -Continuously improved knowledge about the problem and its causes -Make sure necessary data is collected, organized, compared and published, and that scientific research and recommendations are made available to decision-makers	- Urges member states to use the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Expert Group to discuss the scope, parameters and possible elements of a legally binding instrument to eliminate the discharge of marine plastic pollution into the ocean – both from land-based and from sea-based sources. - Lessons and inspiration should be drawn from other international conventions that have proven successful in catalysing progress towards the resolution of global environmental problems. This includes, but is not limited to, the Montreal Protocol, MARPOL, the Stockholm Convention, the UNFCCC (incl. the Paris Agreement), and the Minamata Convention.	-An obligation to develop and implement effective national action plans, on prevention, control and removal, sufficiently ambitious to achieve the national reduction targets. -An agreed measurement, reporting and verification scheme for tracking marine litter and microplastics discharge and the progress made to eliminate them at a national and international level. -The establishment of an intergovernmental panel of experts that can assess and track the extent of the problem, and collate state-of-the-art knowledge to provide inputs for decision-making and implementation. -A global funding arrangement to support the effective implementation of the treaty by all States, including for infrastructure development, international clean-up operations and innovation into alternative product design, product technology and waste management. -An explicit ban on certain acts considered to defeat the object and purpose of the treaty, including deliberate dumping of plastic waste in river systems and internal waters that flow towards the sea. -A commitment to develop common methods, definitions, standards and regulations for an efficient and coordinated global effort to combat marine plastic pollution, including, for instance, specific bans on certain high-risk categories of plastic deemed to be impossible to safely collect and manage.

	✓ There is a general lack of knowledge about and overview of the policy measures implemented by States in order to prevent, control and recover marine plastic pollution, and considerable uncertainty in terms of the progress made towards the long-term goal of eliminating all discharge of plastic litter and microplastics into the marine environment ✓ No proper overview of efforts exists, and we don't know if they are working -The current aid flows are currently insufficient to solve the problem, and are also scattered and largely uncoordinated. Lack of technical expertise and support. Limited sharing of know-how and best-practices RESOURCES RULES-GAP	-A set of harmonized methodologies for measuring and monitoring the problem, and a platform for assessing and communicating to this information, -A dedicated intergovernmental scientific body tasked with reviewing the extent of the problem, evaluating trajectories towards achieving the vision of zero discharge of plastic into the ocean, and advising on action required		
--	---	--	--	--

	- Lack of agreed and globally applicable rules, standards and obligations for tackling the problem			
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT