

## Quick Views on Obligations and Control Measures of the UNEP Options for Elements Paper (Cluster 1)

### Expectations of the Second Session of Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC-2)

Heading into INC-2, there are several desired outcomes from the meeting, including:

- Working agreement on objective(s) for the new legally binding instrument;
- Fully adopted Rules of Procedure (RoP), or at a minimum, continue with the provisional RoP adopted at INC-1;
- The election of a fully formed Bureau after the inability to elect all members at INC-1;
- Agreement amongst Member States on the next dates, duration and locations for the INCs;
- A request to the Chair, in consultation with the Secretariat, for a zero draft of the text for the new legally binding instrument for INC-3.

The last item on the list is critical and relies on substantive and productive negotiations at INC-2. An “Options for Elements” Paper ([UNEP/PP/INC.2/4](#)) has been prepared for INC-2 by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair, and aims to reflect views expressed by Members during the INC’s first session and subsequent written submissions on desired elements for the new treaty. The final [submissions](#) to INC-2 included 62 governments, five groups of governments,<sup>1</sup> and 176 stakeholders.

Members can consider the Options Paper as the basis for discussions during INC-2, with the document used to structure negotiations. There will likely be a request to form two working or contact groups to deliberate various options further: One group (**Cluster 1**) on core obligations / control measures (actions to be taken to achieve the objective) and another (**Cluster 2**) on implementation elements and means of implementation (financial, technological or capacity building required to deliver the actions).

A key outcome for INC-2 will be progressing negotiations to the point where Member States can request the Chair and/or Secretariat to prepare a zero-draft treaty text for INC-3, including potentially outlining a plan for intersessional work such as working groups or submission processes that will support the negotiations. The Options Paper proposes that the Committee may wish to consider substantive elements, which have been divided into twelve categories of possible core obligations, each with potential options for elements, based on the country submissions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Including the European Union (27); Africa Group (53 - excluding Egypt); AOSIS (39); GRULAC (33); HAC (20) representing 169 individual states

A companion document has been prepared by the Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) and the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) to support countries in identifying who said what and a guiding color code to identify the proximity to the language reflected within the Options Paper.

## Reflections and Recommendations on the Options Paper

### Strong Elements

- **Good objective(s).** The Options Paper proposes three objectives for the negotiators to consider, all of which capture the environmental and health aspects of plastic pollution. For clarity, we would favor option a).
- **Inclusion of chemicals.** The document contains ambitious language on chemicals of concern, including reference to regulating groups of chemicals and the need for chemical simplification. We recommend that work takes place intersessionally to start populating potential criteria on chemicals and polymers of concern — these could include a whitelist or ‘positive list’ approach combined with a ‘negative list’ approach that also captures groups of chemicals. Such a step, in parallel with the preparation of the zero draft, would save time during negotiations and ensure Member States seek the input of technical experts.
- **Options for international trade restrictions between Parties and Non-Parties:** Plastic feedstocks, polymers, additives, plastic pellets, plastic products, and waste are largely traded internationally, and the liberalization of trade in plastics and their feedstocks and precursors supports the rise in production and consumption of plastics. It will be important for the new instrument to not only restrict the production and use of plastics not covered under the Basel Convention but also to prohibit, restrict and control international trade (i.e., import and export). As reflected in the Options Paper, the future treaty will require non-party provisions to be truly effective. Trade bans or restrictions with non-Parties are an effective tool to prevent Parties from circumventing treaty obligations through import and export with non-parties. In return, it incentivizes non-parties to implement the treaty regime.
- **Scope to reform waste management and trade to protect the environment and human health.** While, in general, there is a preference for recycling within the options explored in the paper, several ambitious proposals on restrictions on harmful approaches and/or unproven technologies to waste management, such as chemical recycling, incineration, and others, are outlined. The treaty provides a great opportunity to define truly environmentally sound plastic waste management protective of human health. The Options Paper suggests restrictions, reporting obligations, and other specific requirements, for the import and export of plastics waste not covered under the Basel Convention, focusing on closing the regulatory loopholes that facilitate recycling capacity displacement and outsourcing, illegality and waste mismanagement and establishing a timeline for the phase out of waste exports from developed to developing countries.

## Recommendations for Improvement

- **Create a logical structure for negotiators.** The current structure of the document does not lend itself well to breaking out into groups, in the meeting, or intersessionally. To facilitate break-out (contact group) discussions, we recommend bundling several categories into thematic conversations based on life cycle stage, overlap, and relationship, thus facilitating a comprehensive approach toward addressing the full life cycle of plastic. For example, a discussion bucket on upstream, including production and chemicals of concern; another on midstream, including design, circularity, and alternatives; another on downstream interventions focused on waste management, reduction, reuse and repair; microplastics and emissions; and remediation. Means of implementation and the related interventions within that work stream should also happen via a parallel contact group.
- **Look further upstream.** In the background (Appendix 2, para 5), the document defines a life cycle approach as beginning at raw material extraction and covering processing, including refining and cracking, yet there's very little within the core obligations that would cover this phase. For instance, several Member States (Ecuador, Cook Islands, Norway, New Zealand, and Rwanda) proposed including provisions on fossil fuel subsidies and petrochemical subsidies moving to the plastics industries, but this is captured simply as the removal of 'fiscal incentives' in the document. Furthermore, the upstream components could be further elaborated for more robust negotiations. In our view, during negotiations, more time should be given to discussion of upstream interventions such as reduction in production and phase-outs, given the significant impact of such obligations.
- **Seek safe circularity.** The control measures strongly emphasize circularity, which is clearly one of the mainframes used to conceptualize the new instrument in the document. We welcome the inclusion of this option but encourage negotiators to consider circularity in the context of toxicity and material safety first and foremost. Toxic additives and hazardous chemicals create a major barrier to achieving any true circularity for plastics, and recycling of plastics, as it currently exists, is effectively downcycling, with very few polymers able to be readily and functionally recycled. Criteria and guidance negotiated and established in the agreement should include specifications on safety in parallel with circularity. Plastics cannot be circular if they are not safe. Further, circularity criteria should also encompass design and guidance for safe and inclusive reuse systems, refill and repair rather than focus solely on recycling.
- **Health is a cross-cutting issue.** Despite the fact that an overwhelming number of country submissions and interventions highlight the need to cover the health dimension in the treaty, this aspect was not adequately portrayed in the text or the core obligations. For instance, health is reduced to evaluate the risk and impacts of plastic and plastic pollution. In addition, the Options Paper neglects to include the obligation to use the best available techniques (BAT) to minimize the environmental and health impacts of extraction, processing, and production of fossil fuels and petrochemicals for virgin polymer production. Finally, the health dimension should not only be covered under a risk-based approach to plastic pollution, as currently is portrayed in the Options Paper, but complemented through a hazard-based approach to plastics and plastic pollution.

- **The chosen language does not reflect the variety in submissions.** In some options, the language presented for the obligations or control measures does not reflect the variety of submissions, which may produce unintended outcomes when utilized as a starting point for negotiations. For example, under the control measure on reducing microplastics, the Options Paper says “*minimise the risk of leakage of plastic pellets*” rather than “*regulation to prevent the losses*” or “*take the steps to eliminate the releases,*” which can vary the degree of responsibility and legal consequences.
- **Control measures and voluntary approaches.** The Options Paper conflates control measures and voluntary approaches. Nearly every Member State submission distinguished between binding versus voluntary obligations and control measures. While a few countries submitted that core obligations and control measures should be voluntary, a larger number specifically called against voluntary measures. Therefore, including permissive voluntary language ahead of each option misrepresents views and runs the risk of creating unnecessary negotiating burdens, further exacerbated by the time constraints of the negotiating processes. Negotiations of the zero draft should proceed without the voluntary approach option and leave that consideration for future negotiations.

This compilation was authored by Rachel Radvany, Amy Youngman, Andrés del Castillo, Chris Dixon, with assistance from Jacob Kean-Hammerson, Hélonor de Anzizu, Giulia Carlini, Daniela Durán González, Merel Terwisscha van Scheltinga, and Nicolas Finnemore Gaulin.

Errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of CIEL and EIA. This compilation is for general information purposes only. It is intended solely as a discussion piece. It is not and should not be relied upon as legal advice. While efforts were made to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this analysis and the above information is from sources believed reliable, the information is presented “as is” and without warranties, express or implied. If there are material errors within this document, please advise the authors. Receipt of this analysis is not intended to and does not create an attorney-client relationship.

Please send comments or questions to [Andrés del Castillo \(adelcastillo@ciel.org\)](mailto:adelcastillo@ciel.org) and [Amy Youngman \(amyyoungman@eia-international.org\)](mailto:amyyoungman@eia-international.org) to be sure of a reply.

### Annex 1. Companion Table for Cluster 1

This document provides a textual compendium of the 12 listed groups of core obligations, control measures, and voluntary approaches contained in the *Options for Elements Paper* as those will be likely to be discussed at INC-2 to develop a zero-draft for the international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution.

Despite the template for countries, the nature of contributions was not homogeneous. This companion table puts forward an indicative list of Member State submissions. The first column includes the possible core obligations and control measures presented in the Options Paper. The second column lists countries or groups of countries that supported the option, with highlighted text indicating if the option reflects the same language from their submission (see key below). The third column includes analytical comments and some extracts of submissions to show the variance in the Options Paper and Member State submissions.

- **Core Obligations:** Lists all countries or groups of countries that refer to the option. Of those listed, the country or groups of countries highlighted in green specifically call for the option as a core obligation in their submission. Those not highlighted include the option but not as a core obligation in their submission
- **Control Measures:** Lists all countries or groups of countries that refer to the issue. The highlights reflect the language used in their submissions.

**Green:** Country or group of countries submission with the same language.

**Yellow:** Country or group of countries submission with similar language.

**Blue:** Country or group of countries submission with generic but related language.

\*Country or group of countries which suggest this as a voluntary action.

Group of country abbreviations in submissions:

- High Ambition Coalition (Norway + Rwanda): HAC
- Alliance of Small Island States: AOSIS
- Africa Group (excluding Egypt): Africa Group
- European Union and its 27 Member States: EU
- Pacific Small Island Developing States: PSIDS
- Group of Latin America and Caribbean Countries: GRULAC

Possible Core Obligation and Control Measures	Countries or Group of Countries Supporting Option in their Pre-Session Submission	Comment(s) and Some Extracts of Original Submissions
<p><b>1. Phasing out and/or reducing the supply of, demand for and use of primary plastic polymers</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bangladesh*, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Cook Islands, Egypt, Ecuador, EU, Gabon, Ghana, Georgia, Guinea, HAC, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Micronesia, Monaco, Moldova, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Tonga, Türkiye, Uganda, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countries like <b>Thailand</b>, and <b>Norway</b> (at INC-1) see control measures to “minimize the virgin plastic production and utilization” and not to “reduce.”</li> <li>• <b>Egypt</b> calls for a “[r]eduction of overall plastic production and consumption, based on the availability of the alternatives,” while <b>Morocco</b> calls for “[r]estricting plastic production to sustainable levels.”</li> <li>• <b>Kenya</b> mentions establishing control measures for “polymer production, consumption and use.”</li> </ul>
<p><u>(a) Options for targets:</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two options can be complementary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>(i) Establishing global targets to reduce production</b> of primary plastic raw material.</p>	<p>Armenia, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Georgia, HAC, Indonesia, Moldova, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Tonga, Türkiye, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some countries also suggested “controlling and reducing the overall global plastic production” or keeping “production and consumption of plastic polymers at sustainable levels.”</li> <li>• <b>Monaco</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, <b>Norway</b>, and <b>Uruguay</b> submit that “[e]ach Party should be required to take effective measures to reduce the production of primary plastics polymers to an agreed level to reach a common target.”</li> <li>• <b>Moldova</b> suggested “set global baselines and targets for sustainability throughout the life-cycle of plastics, as well monitoring and reporting obligations,” and <b>Georgia</b> suggested plastic reduction targets in the means of</li> </ul>

		<p>implementation section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>Philippines</b> says, “production and use of polymers and chemicals are to be phased out.”</li> </ul>
(ii) <b>Establishing nationally determined commitments or targets.</b>	AOSIS, Bangladesh*, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Cook Islands, EU, HAC, Iceland, Japan, Norway, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Türkiye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the listed countries included the word “determined,” which might have different legal implications.</li> <li>• Nearly all submissions said that national action plans should include targets, which could be explored further through implementation options.</li> <li>• <b>Rwanda</b> recommended that the INC “avoid voluntary measures and nationally determined contributions, particularly for the upstream and midstream stages.”</li> <li>• <b>Monaco</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
<u>(b) Options for regulating primary plastic polymers:</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option requires clarification on whether primary plastic raw material is the same as primary plastic polymers.</li> </ul>
(i) <b>Impose a moratorium</b> on primary production of plastic polymers, or <b>ban, limit or reduce</b> the manufacture, export and import of virgin plastic polymers.	Africa Group, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Guinea, HAC, Kenya, Indonesia, Micronesia, Moldova, Morocco, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Rwanda, Switzerland, Tonga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the submissions include the conjunction “or” thus, the list of measures can be cumulative and complementary.</li> <li>• Although some countries include a broad list of options as control measures, others specify a ban, a limit, or a reduction.</li> <li>• <b>Gabon</b> and <b>Guinea</b> suggested the “establishment of international regulatory standards for the manufacture, import, export and production of plastics.”</li> <li>• <b>Ecuador</b> says that “[e]ach Party should be required to phase out the manufacture, export, import, and placing on the market of polymers, chemicals, and plastic products listed in an annex.” Similarly, <b>Switzerland</b> says, “[e]ach Party should be required to implement effective</li> </ul>

		measures to limit the manufacture, export and import of primary production of plastic polymers to an agreed level.”
(ii) <b>Apply import and export requirements to parties and non-parties</b> on a non-discriminatory basis.	Cook Islands, Ecuador, Georgia, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Rwanda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option uses broad language. The <b>Cook Islands</b>, for example, proposed non-parties trade controls in case of “non-compliant chemicals, polymers, products, and wastes,” which the Options Paper reflects in options 2(d), 3(a)(ii), and (iii) too.</li> <li>• <b>Mexico</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
(iii) <b>Track types and volumes</b> of plastic polymers, precursors, and feedstocks manufactured, imported, and exported as well as the quantities and type of chemicals applied in production through transparency and reporting requirements.	Africa Group, AOSIS, Australia, Colombia, Ecuador, EU, Kenya, Morocco, Papua New Guinea*, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tanzania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tanzania</b> and <b>Sierra Leone</b> suggest setting measures to facilitate tracking of plastic and ingredients, and volumes of natural capital / plastic feedstock and polymers, respectively.</li> <li>• <b>Africa Group</b> suggests “[t]racking and transparency on types and volumes of plastic feedstocks, polymers, recycles.”</li> <li>• <b>Panama</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
(iv) <b>Establish licensing schemes</b> for production, import and export of virgin and secondary plastic polymers.	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cook Islands, Ecuador, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Peru, Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This language comes directly from the <b>Cook Islands</b>, in their means of implementation section calling for “publicly available inventories of plastic-related chemicals, polymers, and products, as well as emissions throughout the full life cycle of plastics.”</li> <li>• Similarly, <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> want to introduce “a system of licensing and permits to control the production, import, export and use of plastic products.”</li> </ul>
<u>(c) Option for economic tools:</u>		



<p><b>Set market-based measures</b> such as price-based measures, production permits, licenses, removal of fiscal incentives and a mandatory fee, tariff or tax on virgin plastic production.</p>	<p>Australia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Georgia, Ghana, HAC, Monaco, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Switzerland, Uganda</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Peru</b> and <b>Switzerland</b> specify market measures such as production permits, licenses and removal of fiscal incentives, while <b>Ecuador</b> mentions a “global fee/tax” on production.</li> <li>● <b>Australia</b> focuses exclusively on “unnecessary primary plastics” with reporting on virgin plastic production and trade-related measures.</li> <li>● <b>Uganda</b> broadly speaks of “economic disincentives for virgin plastic production,” while the <b>EU</b> suggests “market-based measures” with no concrete examples.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Banning, phasing out and/or reducing the use of problematic and avoidable plastic products</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, AOSIS, Australia, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, China*, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Gabon, Georgia, Guinea, HAC, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan*, Kenya, Malaysia, Moldova, Monaco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore*, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>EU, Canada, New Zealand,</b> and <b>Peru</b> submissions do not propose concrete policy options but instead suggest to “eliminate” and/or “restrict” problematic and avoidable plastic products.</li> <li>● <b>Australia’s</b> submission seemingly limits “problematic” to single-used plastics exclusively.</li> <li>● <b>Thailand</b> suggests phase-outs/downs as “one among other” solutions, while <b>Burkina Faso</b> calls solely for “phasing out certain problematic plastics.”</li> <li>● <b>Argentina, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, the HAC, Micronesia, Norway, Peru, Switzerland,</b> and <b>Uruguay</b> all made oral interventions supporting this option at INC-1. The <b>EU</b> raised the “banning” and “phasing out” of problematic plastics at INC-1.</li> </ul>
<p>(a) <b>Inventory and monitor production</b> of raw materials, including those used in plastic commodities, and establish a global baseline.</p>	<p>Cook Islands, Kenya, Moldova, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Tanzania</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> and <b>Rwanda</b> stress reporting of “origins of raw materials” to produce plastic polymers.</li> <li>● <b>Kenya</b> and <b>Qatar</b> suggest inventories as part of the “means of implementation.” For <b>Qatar</b>, “[t]he national inventory developed should contain information on the production, recycling, and imports etc.”</li> <li>● <b>Tanzania</b> suggests as part of “[t]echnical assistance in terms of provision of guidance in undertaking national</li> </ul>

		assessment on production and consumption patterns of plastic including undertaking of inventory of plastic.”
(b) Establish <b>criteria to determine unnecessary and problematic plastic products</b> , including avoidable or short-lived products.	AOSIS, Canada, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Georgia, HAC, Iceland, Monaco, Norway, Peru, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Uruguay</b> proposes an expert group to develop prioritization criteria “to support the decision-making process related to [...] plastic products of concern.”</li> <li>● <b>Egypt</b> does not use the terms “unnecessary” or “problematic” but rather “plastics subject to quality control/restrictions.”</li> <li>● <b>Switzerland</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
(c) <b>Ban, phase out, reduce or control</b> the production, sale, distribution, trade and use of specific problematic and avoidable plastic products by identified dates (the criteria under (b) above and the list and phase-out dates hereunder could be identified in an annex to the instrument);	Africa Group, AOSIS, Australia, Argentina, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cook Islands, EU, Gabon, Guinea, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Moldova, Monaco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Palau, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tonga, Tunisia, United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many countries called for restrictions on single-use plastics products, but the Options Paper does not reflect this option. For example, <b>Nigeria</b> submitted the “[e]limination and banning of unnecessary single-use plastics and difficult plastics.”</li> <li>● Many countries have called for reducing, eliminating, or banning unnecessary, problematic, or avoidable plastic products in more general terms. For example, <b>Peru</b> suggests “[m]easures aimed at eliminating plastic goods that are considered problematic or unnecessary and to minimising their production.” Further, <b>Japan</b> calls to “avoid production and use of...problematic plastics.” <b>Tonga</b> proposed to “implement bans on single use plastics (where practical).”</li> </ul>
(d) <b>Apply import and export requirements</b> for listed products to parties and non-parties on a non-discriminatory basis;	Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Georgia, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Rwanda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This language was pulled directly from the submissions of <b>Ecuador</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, and <b>Norway</b>. However, the <b>Cook Islands</b> also proposed non-parties trade controls in case of “non-compliant chemicals, polymers, products, and wastes.”</li> <li>● In addition to a general non-party provision, <b>Rwanda</b> supports prohibiting the export of plastic products not in</li> </ul>

		<p>conformity with criteria on the design and use of plastic products and transparency to other countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>EU</b> also includes broader non-party trade provisions in their submissions, as seen in option 2(e) below.</li> </ul>
(e) <b>Apply import and export requirements to parties and non-parties</b> on a non-discriminatory basis.	Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Georgia, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Rwanda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rwanda, Georgia,</b> and the <b>EU</b> include broad non-party trade provisions in their submissions.</li> <li>• Note that the other country submissions on this option are more specific and can be found listed in option 2(d).</li> </ul>
<b>3. Banning, phasing out and/or reducing the production, consumption and use of chemicals and polymers of concern</b>	Africa Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Gabon, Georgia, Guinea, HAC, Iceland, Indonesia, Kenya, Libya, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Palestine, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Qatar*, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Nigeria</b> wants a core obligation to be “[t]he right to know and appropriate information about chemicals additives in plastic production.”</li> <li>• <b>Sri Lanka</b> and <b>Australia</b> include the precautionary principle as a core obligation.</li> <li>• While <b>Canada’s</b> submission predominantly centers on plastic products rather than precursors and primary polymers, it mentions the need to stop unnecessary chemical substances.</li> </ul>
<u>(a) Options for regulating chemicals and polymers of concern:</u>		
(i) <b>Ban, phase out, reduce or control</b> specific polymers and chemicals of concern, or groups of chemicals, <b>based on criteria identified</b> to determine polymers and chemicals of concern (list and phase	Africa Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, China*, Cook Islands, Colombia, Ecuador, EU, Gabon, Georgia, Guinea, HAC, Iceland, Indonesia, Kenya, Libya,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some countries like <b>Switzerland</b> and <b>Peru</b> consider the “phase-out [of] specific polymers and chemicals of concern” as a general obligation, not a control measure.</li> <li>• The <b>EU</b> and <b>Norway</b> suggest including “[g]roups of chemicals.”</li> <li>• Others, like the <b>PSIDS</b> (INC-1 intervention), suggested</li> </ul>

<p>out date could be identified in an annex to the instrument).</p>	<p>Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Palestine, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Uruguay</p>	<p>“elimination in the use of harmful chemicals in the production of Plastic” more generally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Kenya</b> suggests a positive/negative list <i>or</i> sustainability criteria, while the <b>Cook Islands</b> suggests the “development of hazard criteria” to determine polymers and chemicals of concern.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) <b>Apply import and export requirements</b> for listed polymers and chemicals to parties and non-parties on a non-discriminatory basis.</p>	<p>Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Georgia, HAC, Monaco, Norway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This language was pulled directly from the submissions of <b>Ecuador</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, and <b>Norway</b>.</li> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> suggest restrictions in trade with non-Parties of non-compliant chemicals and polymers (in line with the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions).</li> <li>● The <b>EU</b> uses less specific language, and <b>Georgia</b> wants the “[d]evelopment of party/non-party trade measures and rules.” These options are perhaps better represented below in the more general option 3(a)(iii).</li> </ul>
<p>(iii) <b>Apply import and export requirements to parties and non-parties</b> on a non-discriminatory basis.</p>	<p>Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Georgia, HAC, Monaco, Norway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● See commentary from option 3(a)(ii) directly above this box.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(b) Options for increasing transparency:</u></p>		
<p>(i) Track types and volumes of polymers and chemicals applied in production, including through disclosure requirements for plastics throughout the supply chain, and plastic production, use, and additives, (...)</p>	<p>Africa Group, Australia, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Kenya, HAC, Monaco, Morocco, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, United States, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>HAC</b>, <b>Ecuador</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, and <b>Norway</b> submit, “Parties should require producers of polymers and plastic products to provide full and correct information on the properties relevant to the criteria and guidelines.”</li> <li>● <b>Australia</b> introduces language for mandatory disclosure requirements. While the <b>United States</b> calls for “[m]easures to publish and update, in a transparent manner, relevant and available information on plastic production, use, and additives, consistent with national</li> </ul>

		<p>laws.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Egypt</b> mentions “Tracking and transparency on types, ingredients and volumes of plastic products” but doesn’t mention chemicals applied in production.</li> <li>● <b>Morocco</b> wants “[to strengthen] the field of data and information including the development of tracking and transparency on types and volumes of plastics.”</li> <li>● <b>Norway</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
(...) consistent with national laws.	United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many countries supported measures on transparency of chemicals in plastics, but only the <b>United States</b> mentioned: “consistent with national laws.”</li> </ul>
(ii) Increase transparency through marking (digital watermarks, tracers) and harmonized labelling of products, material safety data sheets, product passports and publicly available databases.	African Group, AOSIS, Armenia, Australia, Cambodia, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Iceland, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore*, Switzerland, Tonga, United Kingdom, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Nigeria</b> includes stronger language not represented in this option: “The right to know.” This includes “appropriate information about chemicals additives in plastic production.”</li> <li>● Many countries supported measures to increase the transparency of chemical constituents in plastics through labeling. Only the <b>EU</b> mentions product passports.</li> <li>● <b>Armenia</b> calls for “harmonized product labelling.” While the <b>EU</b>, <b>Qatar</b>, and <b>Singapore</b> call for labeling to support waste management (including recycling).</li> <li>● <b>Ecuador, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland, and Uruguay</b> want Parties to be required to ensure the availability of information on the chemical and material composition of plastic products along the value chain for manufacturers, importers, users, consumers, and recyclers through for example (marking or) labeling.</li> </ul>
<u>(c) Options for accelerating and supporting the transition</u>		

(i) Establish measures to foster innovation and incentivize alternative and substitutes, including through <b>sustainable or green chemistry</b> (...)	United States, Thailand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>United States</b> was the only submission that called for “measures to foster innovation and incentivize sustainable or green chemistry to further reduce the use of hazardous substances in plastic and further the development of more sustainable alternatives to plastics.”</li> <li>• <b>Thailand</b> says, “[t]he core provisions should cover all stages of [the] plastic life cycle aligning with green chemistry principles, waste management hierarchy, and sustainable production and consumption pattern.”</li> </ul>
(...) and chemical simplification;	Ecuador, Gabon, Guinea, Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chemical simplification references were made during the context of measures on product design (<b>Switzerland</b> and <b>Ecuador</b>) or as “principles that will form the basis for the execution of the national action plans” (<b>Guinea</b> and <b>Gabon</b>).</li> </ul>
(ii) Incentivize research and development of sustainable additives and polymers.	Qatar *, Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This exact language doesn’t appear in any submission. Rather Member States only include language about sustainable alternatives.</li> </ul>

<p><b>4. Reducing microplastics</b></p>	<p>AOSIS, Africa Group, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China*, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Indonesia*, Monaco, Morocco, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In a section on reducing microplastics, the Options Paper only provides options to address intentional use and unintentional releases. However, the EU called to “limit the releases of microplastics” and Indonesia for “[p]reventing marine litter and discharge of microplastics.” With these general statements, this option would likely be better organised and capture more Member State submissions if it was categorised using four categories of microplastics with different leakage issues: (i) plastic pellets (mismanagement), (ii) intentionally added microplastics (intentional), (iii) use-phase microplastics (wear and tear) and (iv) degradation- based microplastics (degradation). Member States may wish to divide these sections for the zero-draft negotiations.</li> <li>● The Africa Group, Ecuador, the HAC, Kenya, Monaco, and Switzerland submissions called for a sectoral strategy for microplastics, or to include it under the provisions to eliminate the release of plastics including in an annex, thus the more general category may be better suited to fit into option 9 on eliminating the release and emission of plastics to water, soil, air.</li> <li>● Other submissions considered banning products that contain certain intentionally-added microplastics, so option 4(a)(ii) might be considered with option 2 on banning, phasing out and/or reducing the use of problematic and avoidable plastic products.</li> <li>● Further, many countries like Libya, Moldova, Oman, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay mentioned nanoplastics. For example, the Cook Islands call for a phase-out of “unnecessary and avoidable primary micro- and nanoplastics”; however, the Options Paper does not</li> </ul>
---	---	---

		differentiate between micro and nanoplastics.
<p><u>(a) Options for addressing intentional use:</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It is unclear why the two options in this section are separate because they differentiate in creating a ban or control on the use of microplastics in products versus on the production, sale, distribution, and trade of those same products. The first suggests an annexed approach, and the latter appears to include all intentionally-added microplastics in products.</li> <li>● However, six submissions included both approaches. For example, <b>Switzerland</b> includes a “[g]eneral obligation to phase-out specific plastic products. The manufacturing, import, export and placing on the market of plastic products listed in an Annex should be phased out by a specified date.”</li> <li>● Thus, the two options likely can work together to achieve the underlying objective in all submissions, and highlighted countries should not be read as solely supporting that option.</li> </ul>
<p>(i) <b>Ban, phase out, reduce or control the use of intentionally added microplastics</b> to avoid the potential release of microplastics into the environment from certain sources (list could be identified in an annex to the instrument).</p>	<p><b>Africa Group, AOSIS, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China*, Colombia, Cook Islands, EU, HAC, Libya, Monaco, Peru, Philippines, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uruguay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This option, which includes an annex listing, does not accurately reflect any singular submission. For clarity, submissions asked for “<i>plastic products</i>” that may include intentionally-added microplastics or are at a higher risk of becoming microplastics to be listed in an annex rather than listing intentionally-added microplastics. For example, the <b>United Kingdom</b> suggests including global bans on specific plastic items, which could include intentionally added microplastics.</li> <li>● <b>Ecuador, the HAC, Monaco, Norway, and Switzerland</b> consider criteria for plastic products of concern, which includes products containing intentionally-added microplastics. Those submissions envision a phase-out</li> </ul>



		<p>for placing those products on the market. <b>Uruguay</b> has very similar language but includes products with “nanoplastics” to be listed and suggests “[s]ome types could be immediately banned like microbeads often found in personal care products.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> suggests establishing an assessment of microplastics in products and the environment, banning microplastics from hygiene products in industries and markets, and including mandatory labels on packaging for products containing microplastics. To achieve this, it underscores the need for proper monitoring and reporting of the entire life cycle of plastic, including plastic pollution in the environment, by measuring the current concentration of microplastics in the environment.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) <b>Ban, phase out, reduce or control the production, sale, distribution, trade and use of microplastics and products</b> containing intentionally added microplastics.</p>	<p>Africa Group, AOSIS, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, China*, EU, Libya, Monaco, Philippines, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Products containing intentionally-added microplastics are often consumer products, such as cosmetics and hygiene products, detergents, and fertilizers (<b>EU</b>). Countries reflecting product controls are included in this option but may also prefer option 4(a)(i) with slightly amended language.</li> <li>● To achieve this option, <b>Colombia</b> believes “Parties shall take the necessary legal and administrative measures to prohibit the production, entry to the market, trading and distribution of microplastics and products containing intentionally added microplastics.”</li> <li>● The <b>Philippines</b> want “[r]egulation on the use of microbeads and single-use packaging used in personal hygienic kits and other household products,” and <b>China</b> and <b>Uruguay</b> support prohibiting products with microbeads.</li> <li>● The <b>EU</b> supports restrictions and, where possible, bans on these consumer products but thinks this should also</li> </ul>

		be included in the instrument as a core obligation, not a control measure.
<u>(b) Options for addressing unintentional releases:</u>		
(i) <b>Minimize the risk of leakage of plastic pellets</b> from production, handling, transport and the use of certain products.	Bangladesh, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Indonesia, Libya, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Oman, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>Cook Islands</b> requested the “minimization of losses,” not “the minimization of the risk of leakage,” which can be seen as an obligation of means instead of an obligation of results. Negotiators should consider the legal implications of minimizing risk versus leakage.</li> <li>• The <b>HAC</b> refers to needing measures for point or non-point sources using “releases that occur through the handling, storage, transport, and processing of plastic pellets, flakes and powders” as the example.</li> <li>• Several submissions, like <b>Libya</b> and <b>Tunisia</b>, include measures on the “elimination and minimization of the total volume of high-risk and leakage-prone plastic products and materials,” which will likely include pellets.</li> <li>• <b>Bangladesh</b> speaks more generally about assessing and funding downstream measures to manage the pollution associated with the transboundary movement of microplastics.</li> </ul>
(ii) <b>Support innovative wastewater treatment mechanisms</b> to prevent the release of microplastics into waterways.	Africa Group, Cook Islands, Ecuador, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Peru, Russia, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ecuador</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, <b>Norway</b>, <b>Switzerland</b>, and <b>Uruguay</b> all consider this to be part of addressing point and non-point sources of microplastics in option 9. These countries suggest taking a sectoral approach to create “guidance to reduce microplastic release from point sources such as wastewater treatment facilities or industrial facilities.” For example, list “wastewater treatment plants” (<b>Norway</b>) or “wastewater and sewage” (<b>Ecuador</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, <b>Peru</b>, <b>Switzerland</b>, and <b>Uruguay</b>) as a category in that annex where countries</li> </ul>

		<p>could then take measures and adopt guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Brazil</b> supported this measure in their INC-1 intervention.</li> </ul>
<p>(iii) Developing guidelines on best available technology and best environmental practices to reduce release of plastics, including for design, in the washing, textile, tyre, and road marking industries.</p>	<p>Africa Group, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Thailand</b>, in a proposed control measure for unintentional plastic pollution, said, “[focus] on the best available technology (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP) used to minimize and eliminate pollution. These include the environmental and emission/effluent standards from all stages of plastic.”</li> <li>● Similar to some above-mentioned options, many countries called for a sectoral approach for unintentional releases of microplastics to be listed in the annex where countries can develop guidance and best practices and technology. <b>Ecuador</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, and <b>Monaco</b> listed examples of possible unintentional plastics to be regulated as “roads, textiles and other sources.” <b>Norway</b> used “non-point sources such as synthetic textiles, vehicle tyres, road markings, paint, marine coatings, personal care products and others,” <b>Switzerland</b> said, “roads, textiles and agriculture,” and the <b>Africa Group</b> said “tyres, textiles and paint, among others.”</li> <li>● The <b>EU</b> “stress[es] the need for... measures to reduce unintended release of microplastics. This could include, for example, measures to minimize the use phase of certain products (for example tyres, synthetic textiles, antifoul paint and fishing gear). In addition, addressing existing plastic pollution is relevant in order to avoid the potential release of microplastics in the environment from these sources.”</li> <li>● The <b>United Kingdom</b> made an intervention that the treaty should include microplastics, including tire wear, at INC-1.</li> </ul>

<p><b>5. Strengthening waste management</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cambodia*, Cambodia, <b>China</b>, Colombia, Cook Islands, EU, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, HAC, <b>Iceland</b>, Indonesia, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Libya, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Palestine, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore*, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand*, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yemen</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Options Paper did not include many critical elements related to the nuance of strengthening waste management. Notably, those related to human rights, the waste hierarchy, the need for transparency for achieving a circular economy, the importance of the means of implementation, or the submissions which noted that strengthening waste management alone will not be enough to address the plastic issue.</li> <li>• <b>Argentina</b> and <b>Armenia</b> focus on strengthening waste management but emphasize including local stakeholders in the process and improving targeted waste reduction targets. <b>Cambodia</b> includes environmentally sound waste management and a just transition with green job creation. <b>Oman</b> and <b>Sri Lanka</b> want to address worker safety in the waste management sector, and <b>Palestine</b> supports increased monitoring and inspection at facilities.</li> <li>• The <b>Africa Group</b>, <b>AOSIS</b>, <b>Equatorial Guinea</b>, <b>Papua New Guinea</b>, and others made INC-1 interventions recognizing that better waste management systems will be necessary, especially for developing countries, but not enough to tackle the plastic problem on its own. <b>Micronesia</b> and the <b>Philippines</b> agreed with this in their submissions. The <b>EU</b> and <b>Uruguay</b>, in calling for reductions of polymer production, emphasize the projected production of plastic will only continue to add to pressure and resources on waste management systems.</li> <li>• <b>Moldova</b> highlighted national reporting on waste management as an implementation measure “that ongoing TA projects financed by UNEP and other donors will help countries with economy in transition to have an in-depth understanding of the current situation on put</li> </ul>
---	--	---

		<p>on the market plastics and existed plastics waste management practice that is of crucial importance to build up a coherent and complete picture for the baseline scenario on which further activities shall build on.” Submissions from the <b>Africa Group, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cook Islands, Egypt, the EU, Iran, Norway,</b> and others also support national reporting for strengthening waste management and reducing leakage. Some, like <b>Uruguay,</b> highlight the need for transparency in that process for a true circular economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>China, the EU, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Thailand,</b> and <b>Tunisia</b> emphasize strengthening <i>environmentally sound management</i> of waste as a critical objective for the treaty.</li> <li>● Many countries address the need for financial and technical assistance, including new technology, to strengthen waste management infrastructure. <b>Ghana’s</b> submission focuses on a financial mechanism to achieve sound global waste infrastructure.</li> <li>● <b>Australia, Ecuador, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Thailand,</b> and the <b>HAC,</b> among others, highlight the importance of the waste hierarchy in waste management.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(a) Options for enhancing waste management capacity and promoting innovation:</u></p>		
<p>(i) <b>Deploy and foster the development of technologies</b> for the collection, recycling and disposal of plastic waste.</p>	<p>AOSIS, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Cambodia, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Palau, Peru, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Sri Lanka, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the EU, and Sri Lanka</b> all call for <i>building or developing</i> infrastructure, not <i>investment</i>.</li> <li>● However, many countries are requesting technology transfer and financial assistance for the best available or new technologies. Additionally, in their INC-1 interventions, countries like <b>Ethiopia</b> and <b>Papua New Guinea</b> asked for the exchange of relevant technology to</li> </ul>

		<p>assist developing countries in addressing waste management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Cambodia</b> suggests the private sector “fosters innovation in product design, technology and production and mobilizing required finances/ investments for resource-efficient production and effective collection and treatment of plastic waste.” <b>Indonesia</b> believes the government and end-of-life facility industry should be responsible for making sure these technologies are environmentally sound.</li> <li>● <b>Armenia</b> calls for increased financing for technologies and incentives for those who reduce waste generation and introduce technologies for the production, collection, storage, and delivery of waste considered secondary raw materials. Similarly, <b>Saudi Arabia</b> wants a provision and financing for “advanced recycling technologies” for new materials, and <b>Tunisia</b> wants financial assistance to invest in waste-to-energy conversion technologies and “research to develop technologies to improve plastic recycling and waste management.”</li> <li>● <b>Palau</b> wants to “[f]und studies and development of recycling technologies that do not result in more pollutants or greenhouse gas emissions.”</li> <li>● <b>Egypt</b> calls for access to information on recycling technologies and suggests “technology transfer on preferential basis to affected industries and sectors in developing countries to allow for a just transition pathway to phase down plastics and relevant chemicals identified by the agreement” and “to enhance collection, recycling and final treatment of waste.”</li> </ul>
(ii) <b>Set a target</b> for reducing the generation of plastic waste that needs	Armenia, Colombia, HAC, Indonesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Philippines,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Switzerland</b> wants an obligation to phase out certain waste management practices that are not</li> </ul>

final disposal operations such as landfilling and incineration.	Qatar, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay	<p>environmentally sound and in conformity with guidance to be adopted by the COP that ensures transparency, reporting, and updates over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See also option 5(b)(ii), which would prohibit these disposal operations.</li> </ul>
(iii) Develop <b>guidance</b> for areas such as:		
a. <b>Encouragement of investment in waste management infrastructure;</b> (...)	Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Micronesia, Morocco, Norway*, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option likely ties in closely to option 5(a)(i) to deploy and foster the development of technologies, because many countries consider the need for financial assistance in building their waste management infrastructure. For example, <b>Azerbaijan</b> includes “[i]ncrease investment in plastic waste collection” as a core measure.</li> <li>Countries like <b>Micronesia</b> and <b>Morocco</b> suggest this investment in infrastructure as part of the dedicated multilateral fund.</li> <li><b>Saudi Arabia</b> wants investment through financial support, capacity building, and technology assistance in the whole value chain of waste collection, sorting, and conversion.</li> <li>The <b>United Kingdom</b> and <b>Norway</b> believe in voluntary financing “from the corporate sector and other stakeholders should contribute additional investment and support, including through innovative solutions.”</li> <li>The <b>Ghana</b> Global Plastic Pollution Fee speaks about the implementation of the GPPF building ESM waste infrastructure.</li> </ul>
(...) b. <b>Sampling, analysis, monitoring, reporting and verification</b> of plastic waste in the environment, to support	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Oman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>Oman</b> submission is the only submission to talk about sampling and analysis. They include a core obligation for: “[d]eveloping guidance addressing</li> </ul>

<p>policymakers in measuring the impact of implemented targets and policies; (...)</p>		<p>sampling, analysis and monitoring of plastic waste in the environment, including the marine environment.” This should be implemented by “ensur[ing countries have a] laboratory for sampling, analysis and monitoring of plastic waste that should be conducted by trained professionals and equipment capacity that should meet the required operating standards. Training and protocols should be in place to ensure that standards can be met, and that quality data and meaningful results can be obtained.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> want to undertake proper monitoring and reporting on plastic production, consumption and use, plastic waste management, and plastic pollution in the environment.</li> <li>● The majority of submissions include monitoring and reporting across the life cycle of plastic which would include plastic waste in the environment; however, because this is under means of implementation, those submissions are not considered here.</li> </ul>
<p>(...) c. <b>Specifications for containers, equipment and storage sites containing plastic waste.</b> (...)</p>	<p>Armenia, Oman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Oman’s</b> submission is the only submission to talk about the storage of plastic waste; it says an objective should be “[d]eveloping guidance addressing specifications for containers, equipment, bulk containers and storage sites containing plastic wastes.” <b>Oman</b> says this should be implemented by “enact[ing] specific legislation that describes specifications for containers, equipment, bulk containers and storage sites containing plastic wastes.” See the explanatory text in the box above for more details.</li> <li>● Many submissions speak more generally to the environmentally sound management of plastic waste, which could include support for guidance for stowage and containers. <b>Armenia</b> includes technical and financial</li> </ul>



		support for the collection and storage of plastic waste.
(iv) Promote research for innovation.	Africa Group, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia*, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, GRULAC, Indonesia, Libya, Moldova, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Singapore*, Thailand, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United States, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Saudi Arabia</b> includes an objective to “[e]ncourage research and innovation to reduce waste generation through the full cycle.” <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> also included it in the objectives section.</li> <li>● Numerous submissions considered research and development broadly and in means of implementation, not just within a core measure of waste management. For example, <b>Australia</b> says, “[t]he instrument should promote research and development to support the implementation of the instrument’s objectives in transitioning to a safe circular economy. Ongoing innovation in relation to environmentally sustainable plastic technologies, environmentally sound waste management and safe alternatives to plastic will be critical to achieving our goal of ending plastic pollution. Provisions that support strong stakeholder engagement, including with the research and development community, technical experts and innovators will facilitate this.”</li> <li>● <b>Moldova</b> “[e]ncourage research and innovation to reduce waste generation through the full cycle from the design of product phase, use, and recycling phase.”</li> <li>● Within its means of implementation, <b>Indonesia</b> and many countries include general promotion of research, especially for developing countries.</li> <li>● <b>Sri Lanka</b> includes a core measure to “promote research and take remedial measures to control micro and nano plastic leakage,” which can be an important aspect of waste management.</li> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> also includes a suggestion for “control measures to avoid green washing. This will also address</li> </ul>

		any rise in alternative products driven by industry innovation that are harmful to the environment.” This was not reflected in the Options Paper.
<u>(b) Options for regulating plastic waste:</u>		
(i) <b>Regulate the movement, and end of life management of plastic waste to reduce leakage from mismanaged waste.</b>	Africa Group, Australia, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Oman, Philippines, Saudi Arabia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Australia includes effective monitoring within this suggested option. Traceability and transparency are other mechanisms considered in most submissions’ means of implementation with monitoring. Therefore, while it is important to consider here, it may be most appropriate to consider it more widely than just one option here. For example, <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> includes “source identification, tracking movement from origin to final disposal, establishing a clear chain of custody for plastic waste (in order to prevent illegal dumping), improving data collection (e.g., by combining physical and digital systems such as barcoding, GPS tracking, electronic data exchange systems - specific mechanisms depend from the type of waste).”</li> <li>● <b>Bangladesh</b> has an objective to combat the transboundary movement of microplastics. <b>Oman</b> has a core objective as the control of transboundary movement and disposal.</li> <li>● The <b>Philippines</b> also says, “[t]ransboundary movement should be included in the Treaty” due to the addition of microplastics. Sri Lanka also hopes to “[c]ontrol transboundary movements of plastics through transportation modes and through sea currents.</li> <li>● A number of countries see that as through synergy with other related MEAs; however, China wants to reduce transboundary movement by “enhanc[ing] domestic recycling and proper disposal of plastic waste.”</li> </ul>

<p>(ii) <b>Prohibit the following dangerous practices:</b> open burning, incineration, co-firing in coal-fired power plants and other waste-to-energy processes, co-processing in cement kilns, and chemical recycling.</p>	<p>Africa Group, Colombia, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, European Union, Kenya, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option is very similar to option 5(a)(ii); however, option 5(a)(ii) looks at targets for reducing the generation of plastic waste that needs final disposal operations. In comparison, this option aims to prohibit dangerous practices.</li> <li>• The <b>EU</b> submission includes the dangerous practices of incineration and landfill and a ban on open burning, while <b>Colombia's</b> submission focuses on open burning.</li> <li>• <b>Sierra Leone</b> calls for preventing the production and release of toxic emissions from plastics waste management; policies should prevent the following dangerous practices: open burning, incineration, co-firing in coal-fired power plants and waste-to-energy processes, co-processing in cement kilns, and chemical recycling.</li> </ul>
<p>(iii) <b>Establish guidance and tools for decision-making on waste recycling practices (...)</b></p>	<p>Ecuador, EU, HAC, Iran, Japan, Nepal, Norway, Monaco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>EU</b> urges developing tools to assess the entire life cycle of plastics and to inform COP decision-making.</li> <li>• At INC-1, <b>Ethiopia</b> raised the issue of a “lack of sophisticated technologies for plastic waste recycling, a lack of data management on recyclable and non-recyclable plastic materials, a lack of awareness and waste management are the core.” At INC-1, <b>China</b> and <b>Thailand</b> both spoke to technical guidelines for environmentally sound waste management.</li> <li>• Other countries at INC-1, like <b>Mongolia</b> and <b>Sri Lanka</b>, supported more knowledge of management and waste recycling. <b>Russia</b> asked for free and fair access to that knowledge with a scientific-based assessment of decisions.</li> <li>• <b>Nepal</b> suggests “[p]romotion of recycling industries through the formulation of policy” and “technical cooperation and coordination.”</li> <li>• <b>Saudi Arabia</b> wants States to “[a]gree on exchange of</li> </ul>

		<p>best practices in recycling between nations &amp; support knowledge transfer.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> wants to “improve plastic management and recycling through regulations according to needs and possibilities of every country; strength the efforts by Governments, non-governmental organization, international organization, industries in the sustainable approach of plastic management through national, regional and international action plans and initiatives.”</li> <li>● <b>Oman</b> wants to identify environmentally sound management of plastic wastes and “[develop] efficient strategies for achieving recycling and recovery of plastic waste, and sustain the current plastic producers to produce environmentally friendly plastic products which can be reused many times.”</li> <li>● <b>Qatar</b> wants to “[foster] a system that enables the recycling of plastic in an environmentally sound way through transfer and adoption of appropriate technological know-how.” <b>Thailand</b> would like to see “procedural measures to develop the appropriate technical guidelines or technology transfer such as product recycling, circulation, energy recovery technologies, etc. should also be set up.”</li> <li>● <b>Ecuador, the EU, the HAC, Norway, Monaco, and Uruguay</b> all speak to countries implementing their disposal of waste in an environmentally sound manner with consideration for the technical guidelines adopted by the Basel Convention.</li> </ul>
<p>(...) (to avoid lock-ins to solutions which harm human and environmental health).</p>	<p>Africa Group, Egypt, Kenya, Sierra Leone</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>Africa Group, Egypt, Kenya, and Sierra Leone</b> say the treaty should define ESM for plastic waste to guide future prohibitions, moratoriums, and investment criteria, for example, to avoid lock-ins to solutions which</li> </ul>

		harm human and environmental health.
(iv) Set <b>indicators and obligations</b> for waste collection, sorting and recycling of plastic waste, especially at the national level.	Africa Group, Argentina, Bahrain, China, Colombia, Cook Islands, Egypt, EU, Georgia, Japan, Moldova, Norway, Tunisia, Türkiye, United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While <b>China</b> expressed indicators at a domestic level, this does not accurately reflect other submissions like <b>Moldova</b> that “a common framework of indicators that will support monitoring and reporting at the national, regional and global levels.”</li> <li>Apart from <b>China</b>, all of the other submissions are found within suggested means of implementation on monitoring and reporting. Therefore, that may be the more appropriate setting for this option.</li> </ul>
(v) Require <b>producers</b> to prepare an <b>action plan to include individual waste reduction targets</b> .	Ecuador, Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the language directly from <b>Indonesia</b>, but <b>Ecuador</b> suggests, “Parties require producers to publish and update plans to reduce primary plastics use and reduce through circularity, and to report regularly on progress.”</li> </ul>
<u>(c) Options related to illegal dumping and disposal of plastic waste:</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While mentioned by the <b>Africa Group, Cambodia, China, the HAC, Switzerland, Monaco, Peru, and Uruguay</b>, these submissions do not offer particularly specific measures (except bans on dumping by <b>Cambodia</b>).</li> </ul>
(i) Implement measures to ensure the collection, sorting, management, and disposal of plastic waste in an environmentally sound and safe manner.	Africa Group, Armenia Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, HAC, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Libya, Monaco, Morocco, Norway, Oman, Palau, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Tunisia, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yemen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several submissions, like those from <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>, the <b>EU</b>, and <b>Oman</b>, suggest extended producer responsibility to ensure that producers finance the collection, treatment, and disposal of their products are handled in an environmentally sound way. See option 5(d).</li> <li>Many countries also consider these measures to include transparency through national reporting and implementation of these measures through national action plans.</li> <li>Many submissions believe this measure needs to go hand in hand with option 6, on fostering design for</li> </ul>

		<p>circularity. For example, <b>Tunisia</b> considers “the safe collection, management and disposal of plastic products at the end of use” one of three control measures to ensure circularity. The <b>EU</b> considers this measure together with the increase of secondary raw materials. <b>Micronesia</b> considers “In addition to reducing virgin plastic production and promoting a circular economy through means such as improved product design and use, policies and measures will also be needed to promote the environmentally sound management of plastic waste, in particular separate collection and recycling, prevention of leakage and restrictions on dumping, landfilling, etc.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Gabon</b> and <b>Guinea</b> suggest a ban on the export and import of single-use plastic waste, which may be considered not environmentally sound.</li> <li>● <b>Armenia</b> includes a core objective to be “the environmentally sound management and recycling of plastic waste,” and national action plans should “[increase] collection and recycling rates of plastic waste.”</li> <li>● The <b>HAC, Monaco, Norway,</b> and <b>Uruguay</b> all want Parties to take effective measures so that plastic waste is collected, sorted and, if necessary, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner, taking into account the waste hierarchy and considering technical guidelines and measures.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) Rely on the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal where appropriate.</p>	<p>Africa Group, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, Cook Islands, Egypt, EU, HAC, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Tanzania, Uruguay, United Kingdom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No submissions suggest the treaty “rely” on the Basel Convention. Rather submissions urge synergy to minimize pollution through plastic waste flows, consider technical guidelines, and complement work being done in Basel, Stockholm, Rotterdam, Minamata, Bamako, and other regional conventions.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further, some, like the <b>Cook Islands, Oman, and Saudi Arabia</b>, talk about Basel related to reporting mechanisms. For example, <b>New Zealand</b> “supports transparent reporting requirements and periodic assessment of the progress of implementation and effectiveness of the instrument. It is important that reporting requirements are not divorced from, but build on and add value to, what we already report on (for example, as a Party to the Basel Convention (including the regional Waigani Convention), the Stockholm Convention, the G20 Report on Actions Against Marine Plastic Litter, and reporting on the Ellen MacArthur Foundation Plastics Global Commitment).”</li> <li>• <b>Chile, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Indonesia, and Pakistan</b> are among several countries that called for cooperation with Basel and other relevant MEAs in INC-1 interventions.</li> </ul>
(iii) Establish surveillance systems and quotas for <b>exports of plastic waste</b> .	Ecuador, Gabon, Guinea, Oman, Palau, Rwanda, Thailand*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Palau</b> wants to “develop clear downstream measures to address collection, sorting and transfer, recycling, export of plastic waste for final disposal,” and <b>Rwanda</b> wants reporting on the plastic waste trade and export prohibitions for “plastic products not in conformity with criteria on the design and use of plastic products and transparency.”</li> <li>• <b>Guinea</b> and <b>Gabon</b> support the monitoring of plastic exports in their submissions and INC-1 interventions.</li> </ul>
(iv) <b>Prohibit or control transboundary movement of plastic waste</b> , except where this ensures circularity;	Australia, Bangladesh, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Oman, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Tanzania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ecuador’s</b> submission “[e]ach Party should be required to take effective measures to control (e.g., restrict or eliminate, depending on feasibility) the manufacture, export, and import of products and items that are not in line with the criteria listed in an annex and guidance adopted by the Conference of the Parties.” <b>China</b></li> </ul>

		<p>suggested to “reduce the transboundary movement of plastic waste” as a core obligation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Australia</b> suggested at INC-1 to stop the exports of “unprocessed plastic waste.”</li> <li>● <b>Bangladesh</b> suggested funding for downstream countries that could be included in this option: “[c]ombating plastic pollution including in the marine environment and the transboundary movement of micro-plastic. Introducing special fund for the downstream developing countries and countries in economic transition to manage cumulative plastic pollution due to transboundary movement.”</li> </ul>
(v) Develop a <b>streamlined permit process for transboundary movement of plastic waste</b> to countries where recycling facilities exist with sufficient capacity;	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No submission suggested this; however, <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> do want to introduce “a system of licensing and permits to control the production, import, export and use of plastic products.”</li> </ul>
(vi) Apply a <b>timetable for control measures on transboundary movements of plastic waste</b> , in particular for those from developed countries to developing countries.	<b>China</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>China</b> suggests this language.</li> </ul>
(d) Options for promoting EPR and enabling a market for recycling:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many countries see EPR as a means of implementation.</li> </ul>
(i) Adopt measures to <b>strengthen the demand for secondary plastics</b> and facilitate environmentally sound plastic scrap recycling, including by using public procurement to drive demand for plastic products containing higher recycled content standards, where feasible.	<b>EU, HAC, Monaco, United States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>HAC</b> and <b>Monaco</b> want <i>non-toxic</i> secondary plastics, which are not represented within the Options Paper.</li> </ul>



<p>(ii) Set <b>indicators</b> for the plastic waste recycling rate, especially at the domestic level.</p>	<p>Africa Group, Argentina, Bahrain, China, Colombia, Cook Islands, Egypt, EU, Georgia, Japan, Moldova, Norway, Tunisia, Türkiye, United States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While <b>China</b> expressed indicators at a domestic level, this does not accurately reflect other submissions like <b>Moldova</b> that “a common framework of indicators that will support monitoring and reporting at the national, regional and global levels.”</li> <li>• Apart from <b>China</b>, all of the other highlighted submissions are found within suggested means of implementation on monitoring and reporting. Therefore, that may be the more appropriate setting for this option.</li> </ul>
<p>(iii) <b>Establish EPR systems to incentivize recycling</b>, taking into account national circumstances. Options for such systems include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Action plan programmes</b> in which fees are charged to plastic manufacturers and plastic product producers;</li> <li>b. A <b>set of guidelines</b> for EPR systems.</li> </ol>	<p>Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, EU, Kenya, Moldova, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore *, Tunisia, United Kingdom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option inadequately reflects the desire by Member State submissions to utilize EPR schemes or systems more generally or as a means to increase circularity and not specifically to incentivize recycling. For example, the <b>United Kingdom</b> asks for consideration of “an obligation to ensure that producers pay the full net costs of managing plastic waste at end of life, for example through extended producer responsibility schemes.”</li> <li>• Further, the <b>Philippines</b> and <b>EU</b> are the only two submissions that explicitly call for EPR within a country’s national circumstances.</li> <li>• Some countries want consideration outside of national circumstances. For example, the <b>Palau</b> submission asks for “clear mechanisms for small islands to participate in EPR and Polluter Pay schemes.” <b>Sierra Leone</b> wants action programs and information sharing on EPR at a sub-region, regional, and global level.</li> </ul>
<p>(iv) Provide <b>financial support and tax exemptions</b> for recycling projects.</p>	<p>Bahrain, Egypt, Indonesia, Palau, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Tunisia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many submissions speak to the importance of financial incentives for recycling projects. For example, <b>Indonesia</b> wants “[f]airness of investment in the recycling sector in developing countries.”</li> <li>• <b>Saudi Arabia</b> suggests “[i]ncrease investment in the required infrastructure for plastic waste management</li> </ul>

		<p>and build an integrated waste management infrastructure that is linked to recycling[.] This involves identified investment opportunities in waste management across the entire value chain supported.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whereas <b>Palestine</b> would create “[f]inancial support and tax exemptions for green initiatives and recycling projects,” and <b>Sierra Leone</b> suggests “dedicating subsidies for recycling plastic waste or recycled content.”</li> <li>• <b>Egypt, Palau, and Tunisia</b> suggest financial assistance to invest in research and development of recycling technologies, which could also be considered in option 5(c)(iv).</li> <li>• <b>Bahrain</b> wants to provide financial assistance to developing countries to fulfill obligations and build robust infrastructure for recycling - see option 5(a)(i).</li> </ul>
(v) <b>Establish best available technologies</b> for recycling to ensure alignment with Paris agreement (or with principles for sustainable banking and investment).	No submissions include this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No countries make reference to the Paris Agreement, sustainable banking, or sustainable investment.</li> <li>• <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> does not reference the Paris Agreement but says countries should “[i]dentify best practice in last 10 years and create framework for waste management and plastic pollution.”</li> </ul>
(vi) Establish a <b>requirement that polymer producers invest</b> in the volume of recycling facilities needed to recycle all plastic they produce that could become plastic waste.	<b>Ghana</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Global Plastic Pollution Fee is a funding mechanism that would hold polymer producers accountable for the pollution costs of all their plastics, irrespective of the country where the plastics end their useful life and whether the plastics are ultimately destined for recycling or disposal.</li> </ul>

<p><b>6. Fostering design for circularity</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, AOSIS, Australia, Azerbaijan, <b>Bahrain</b>, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, <b>Cambodia</b>, <b>Canada</b>, China*, Colombia, <b>Cook Islands</b>, <b>EU</b>, <b>Ecuador</b>, Egypt, Gabon, Georgia, Guinea, <b>HAC</b>, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Mauritius, Micronesia, Moldova, <b>Monaco</b>, Morocco, New Zealand, <b>Nigeria</b>, <b>Norway</b>, Oman, Palau, <b>Peru</b>, Philippines, <b>Qatar</b>, Republic of Korea, <b>Rwanda</b>, <b>Saudi Arabia</b>, Sierra Leone, Singapore*, Sri Lanka, <b>Switzerland</b>, <b>Syria</b>, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Türkiye, <b>United Kingdom</b>, United States, <b>Uruguay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Based on the submissions, Member States likely will want to negotiate this option with option 5 and collaborate with options 1 and 2. Many submissions say to implement waste management systems effectively, products must be designed for non-toxic circularity, including reducing the volume of plastic.</li> <li>● For example, <b>Ecuador's</b> "Provisions to eliminate plastic pollution and reduce plastics through circularity" includes "product design" and "reduce and reuse" provisions. Further, although option 5(c)(iv) starts to look at export bans of waste <b>Ecuador's</b> submission puts forth a main objective under "product design" that "[e]ach Party should be required to take effective measures to control (e.g., restrict or eliminate, depending on feasibility) the manufacture, export, and import of products and items that are not in line with the criteria listed in an annex and guidance adopted by the Conference of the Parties." The <b>Cook Islands</b> also supports "ban[ning] the exportation and importation of plastic products from/to other countries that do not meet the eco-criteria." At a minimum, these core obligations should be negotiated in harmony; however, based on the submissions, it is likely most appropriate to include design circularity in the provisions of waste management.</li> <li>● Further, submissions identify that part of circularity is reducing the production of plastic (option 1). For example, <b>Japan's</b> submission says to "[e]nhance sustainable product design for the environment by production improvement such as volume reduction, simplification of packaging, ensuring long life of plastics, reuse of parts, use of mono materials, making it easier to break apart, sort out and transport for ease of</li> </ul>
---	---	--

		<p>recycling.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Saudi Arabia</b> and others consider options 2 and 5 in their circular provisions. <b>Saudi Arabia</b> says, “[t]his vision requires a major transformation from a liner to a circular model to reduce plastic waste, use non-toxic additives, and enhance products for recyclability to maximize their value and protect our environment.”</li> </ul>
<p>(a) <b>Establish circularity criteria and guidance for design and production of plastic products and packaging</b> to encourage, enhance and enable value recovery processes and systems; (...)</p>	<p>Africa Group, AOSIS, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Cook Islands, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Georgia, Guinea, HAC, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Moldova, Monaco, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Türkiye, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The majority of countries refer to sustainability or product design criteria rather than circularity criteria.</li> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> stress that circularity should be safe and not toxic.</li> <li>● Like a handful of submissions, <b>Uruguay</b> created an entire provision on design circularity that is not wholly reflected as an option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“<b>General obligation:</b> each Party should be required to take effective measures to ensure that plastic products already on to be put on the market are in line with the criteria listed in an annex and guidance adopted by the Conference of the Parties, with a view to either completely redesign, phase-out or prevent those products.</li> <li>“<b>Criteria:</b> the Treaty should set overarching criteria in an annex. Possible criteria include durability, reliability, reusability, reparability, absence of substances of concern, microplastic content and potential for its release, minimum recycled content, [the] possibility of remanufacturing and recycling as well as expected generation of waste. These criteria could be applied in respect of any product characteristics, such as, for example, composition, performance, shape, packaging, marking, and labelling.</li> <li>“<b>Transparency:</b> each Party should be required to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>ensure the availability of information on [the] chemical and material composition of plastic products along the value chain for manufacturers, importers, users, consumers, and recyclers through for example marking or labelling. The Secretariat should establish a central data exchange where this information can be made available.</p> <p><b>“Other general obligations:</b> each Party should be required to take effective measures to encourage the reuse of plastic products and to take effective measures so that plastic wastes are collected, sorted, and recycled in an environmentally sound manner.”</p>
<p>(...) high volume and problematic product categories could be prioritized, using a “start and strengthen” approach (criteria and guidance could be included in an annex to the instrument).</p>	<p>EU</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many countries support circularity criteria. Only the <b>EU</b> mentions the “start and strengthen approach.”</li> </ul>
<p>(b) Introduce a requirement for plastic products and packaging put on the market to <b>conform to circularity design criteria</b>.</p>	<p>Africa Group, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, HAC, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>HAC, Monaco, and Norway</b> all say that “[e]ach Party should be required to take effective measures to ensure that plastic products are produced, manufactured and put on the market are in line with the criteria listed in an annex.” <b>Ecuador</b> also agrees with the annex approach for criteria but wants to ensure this also includes imported and exported plastic products or items. While <b>Switzerland</b> agrees and wants to ensure it includes products and packaging.</li> <li>• The <b>Africa Group</b> wants “[h]armonized product design standards and requirements aimed at incentivizing reuse, durability, collection and/or recycling.” And also considers “[b]an or control of specific plastic products,</li> </ul>

		<p>including single-use plastics, where alternatives are available, accessible and affordable with corresponding annexes.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Certain suggested criteria to be included in the annex pulled from submissions are: chemical composition, durability, reliability, reusability, refillability, reparability, absence of substances of concern, microplastic content and potential for its release, minimum/incorporation of recycled content, the possibility/suitability of remanufacturing and recycling, expected generation of waste and safety. (The <b>Africa Group, Ecuador, Egypt, the EU, the HAC, Micronesia, Monaco, Norway, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay</b>).</li> <li>● Submissions suggest these criteria could be applied to increase transparency with respect to any product characteristics: composition, performance, shape, packaging, marking, and labeling. (<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ecuador, Egypt, the EU, the HAC, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Oman, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, and Uruguay</b>).</li> <li>● <b>Ecuador</b> further says, “The criteria could also seek to promote material and chemical simplification (e.g., to improve recyclability and ensure a non-toxic secondary market), and products (e.g., to minimize the release of microplastics), reduce overpackaging; and standardize formats for reusable containers (e.g., to promote reuse and refill schemes).”</li> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> suggest, “eco-criteria should be listed for plastic products that consists of both general eco-criteria (e.g., durability) and product- or sectoral-specific eco-criteria (e.g., agri-plastics in agriculture or fishing gear).”</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Colombia</b> and the <b>United States</b> suggest ecolabeling standards.</li> </ul>
<p>(c) Establish <b>national requirements for design criteria</b> based on a <b>global harmonized system</b> and <b>methodologies</b> to promote circularity of plastics.</p>	<p>AOSIS, Australia, Cook Islands, Egypt, United Kingdom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The second part of this option comes directly from the <b>AOSIS</b> submission, which recommends the creation of globally harmonized design criteria. However, it does not include the language of national requirements. No submission includes language about national requirements.</li> <li>● <b>Australia</b> calls for “Global standards and definitions to support the circular trade in plastics, reduce the costs of doing business and increase recycling rates. Global standards and definitions will be needed to define problematic single-use plastics, standards to ensure products are truly recyclable, and definitions and standards to counter vague and prolific greenwashing claims.”</li> </ul>
<p>(d) <b>Establish labelling measures</b> for plastic products and packaging in light of the criteria and guidance to allow informed choices by consumers.</p>	<p>African Group, Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore *, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many countries support harmonized labeling requirements. Submissions from the <b>EU, Morocco, the Philippines, Switzerland, and the United States</b> specifically mention labeling to inform consumers.</li> <li>● <b>Ecuador, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland, and Uruguay’s</b> suggested provision should be considered between this option and option 2. They propose a requirement “to ensure the availability of information on the chemical and material composition of plastic products along the value chain for manufacturers, importers, users, consumers, and recyclers through for example (marking or) labelling.”</li> <li>● The <b>Africa Group</b> and <b>Nigeria</b> call for labeling and information disclosure requirements on the composition of chemicals in plastic products at the design level, but that could extend to the consumer.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AOSIS</b> made an intervention at INC-1 in support of globally harmonized labeling standards.</li> </ul>
(e) Set a target for minimum recycled content of plastic products on the market.	Bahrain, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, EU, HAC, Monaco, Moldova, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Syria, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>United Kingdom</b> suggests minimum recycled content incentives, and the <b>United States</b> suggests measures “including by using public procurement to drive demand for plastic products containing higher recycled content levels, where feasible.”</li> </ul>
(f) Establishing a central data exchange registry where the secretariat can make related information available.	Cook Islands, Ecuador, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Rwanda, Switzerland, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>Cook Islands</b> supports a registry of product design.</li> <li>• All other countries say, “the Secretariat should establish a central data exchange where this information can be made available” in a product design and manufacturing provision.</li> </ul>



<p><b>7. Encouraging reduce, reuse and repair of plastic products and packaging</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina*, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, China*, China, Colombia, EU, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Guinea, HAC, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Libya, Micronesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore*, <b>Sri Lanka</b>, <b>Switzerland</b>, Tanzania*, Tunisia, <b>Türkiye</b>, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The ideas of reduce, reuse and repair appear in many submissions in various ways, but mostly attached to product design and increasing non-toxic circularity. <b>Australia</b> considers these in measures for “design standards/ criteria to ensure products (including their chemical composition) are designed for safe recyclability, reuse and repair,” and <b>Ecuador</b> says, “Parties should set targets for increased durability, environmentally safe and sound reuse, and repair of plastic products as well as product and service delivery systems that reduce the use of plastics.” <b>Tunisia</b> includes it within product design.</li> <li>● Submissions also vary where to include this concept. It is seen as a core obligation by <b>Switzerland</b>, as an objective for circularity by <b>Saudi Arabia</b> and <b>Mauritius</b>, or as a voluntary theme to promote by <b>Tanzania</b> and <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>.</li> <li>● Notably, the concept of reuse is usually not limited in submissions to plastic products and packaging but is most commonly considered widely for all plastics.</li> <li>● Countries also use varying language; for example, <b>New Zealand</b> expands this view to “avoid, reduce, reuse and repurpose,” while <b>Japan</b> also includes “renewable measures,” <b>Burkina Faso</b> says “recovery, reuse, regeneration and recycling,” and <b>Libya</b> says “Refuse, Reduce, and Reuse.” <b>Canada</b> suggests control measures that “support reduction and value recovery processes and systems for reuse, refill, repair, remanufacture, refurbishment or recycling.”</li> <li>● Further, <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>, <b>Burkina Faso</b>, <b>Egypt</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, and <b>Uganda</b> all include investment in research and innovation for reuse in their submissions.</li> <li>● <b>Türkiye</b> suggests “[t]he instrument would aim to provide</li> </ul>
---	---	---

		an entirely new vision for the plastics economy, that will encompass design and production of plastics respecting reuse, repair and recycling needs as well as development of more sustainable and durable materials.”
<u>(a) Options for targets:</u>		
(a) Setting targets for the reuse and repair of plastic products	Ecuador, EU, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Palau, Philippines, Rwanda, Switzerland, Türkiye, United States*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>Philippines</b> suggests control measures for plastic product circulation, including identifying substitute materials “that could aid in the establishment of targets for reduction and/or substitution.”</li> <li>• <b>Palau</b> wants to “develop clear global rules with defined targets, responsibilities, penalties, and actions,” and the explanatory text speaks to the importance of minimizing plastic waste. <b>Türkiye</b> also calls for “global common targets (e.g. circularity of plastics).”</li> <li>• The <b>EU</b> wants to make sure general provisions on product design ensure circularity and targets to support such provisions.</li> <li>• <b>Ecuador</b> and <b>Switzerland</b> mention the repair of plastic products.</li> <li>• The <b>United States</b> mentions this as an element within the National Action Plans.</li> </ul>
<u>(a) Options for regulating and encouraging reduction and reuse of plastics:</u>		
(i) Requesting the governing body to <b>develop and adopt general and sectoral guidelines for reuse.</b>	Ecuador, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is language from the <b>HAC, Monaco, and Norway</b> submissions: “The Conference of Parties should be required to develop and adopt general and sectoral guidelines for reuse.”</li> <li>• <b>Ecuador</b> also agrees the COP “should be required to develop and adopt general and sectoral guidance for durability and environmentally safe and sound reuse and repair.”</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Switzerland</b> suggests COP guidance for “meeting the reduction, reuse and repair obligations, including in relevant sectors.”</li> </ul>
(ii) <b>Encouraging reduction and reuse</b> of plastic products, such as containers and bottles, <b>including through service delivery systems.</b>	Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, China, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Indonesia, Japan, Micronesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This is one example of how to enhance the life cycle of products and packaging based on a more broad obligation of <b>Switzerland</b> to reduce, reuse and repair.</li> <li>● The <b>United Kingdom</b> wants this option to promote “systems” to encourage reuse, while the <b>United States</b> wants measures to enhance the circularity of plastic, including through reuse.</li> </ul>
(iii) Recommending that Parties promote reuse through collection of used plastics <b>by production sector.</b>	Japan, Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Japan</b> calls to “[c]ollect and recycle used plastics by production sectors (promotion of reuse, improvement of recycling rate of plastics).” While <b>Uganda</b> envisions working “with private sector to create value out of plastic waste (reuse and recycle models).”</li> </ul>
(iv) Applying <b>harmonized product design standards, certifications and requirements</b> , including for certain plastic products and packaging.	Africa Group, Australia, Cambodia, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Gabon, Guinea, HAC, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore *, Switzerland, Tunisia, Türkiye, United Kingdom, United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>Philippines</b> want “[p]roduct design requirements standards aimed towards reuse and recycling” and “industry certification for global standard requirements.”</li> <li>● <b>Tunisia</b> sees harmonized design standards as means of implementation; likewise, the <b>United States</b> believes product design and transparent labeling of plastic products to inform consumer choices and facilitate reuse and recycling should be utilized within national action plans.</li> <li>● <b>Türkiye</b> describes a global plastics strategy that “shall result in more sustainable plastics industry where the product design and production shall enable higher recycling rates also respect the needs of reuse, the rights to repair.”</li> <li>● The <b>United Kingdom</b> bundles this option with upstream measures on polymers and products.</li> </ul>

<p>(v) <b>Encourage reduction and reuse</b> of plastic products, including fees, tariffs or tax incentives, EPR schemes and product take-back, right-to-repair requirements and remove trade barriers.</p>	<p>Armenia, Cambodia, Canada, China *, Colombia, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Indonesia, Micronesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Tanzania*, Tunisia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Switzerland</b> mentions some of these financial mechanisms, but in relation to waste management (collection, sorting and recycling).</li> <li>● <b>Tanzania</b> provides “provisions to support countries in terms of financial and technical to implement existing initiatives undertaken including promoting 3Rs (Reuse, Recover, Recycle) concept and extended producers’ responsibilities.”</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<p><b>8. Promoting the use of safe, sustainable alternatives and substitutes</b></p>	<p>Africa Group*, Africa Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, <b>Burkina Faso</b>, <b>Cambodia</b>*, Cambodia, Canada, China*, China, <b>Colombia</b>, Cook Islands, EU, Ecuador, Egypt*, Egypt, GRULAC, Georgia, HAC, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Micronesia, Moldova, Monaco, Morocco*, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palestine*, Peru, <b>Philippines</b>, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone*, Singapore*, <b>Sri Lanka</b>, Switzerland, Tanzania, <b>Tunisia</b>*, Uganda United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yemen</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Many countries are calling for the establishment of alternatives for specific types of plastic or products. Sri Lanka calls for “environmentally friendly alternatives” generally, while the <b>Philippines</b> calls for “environment-friendly packaging materials.”</li> <li>● The <b>Philippines</b> also joins countries like <b>Cambodia</b>, <b>Indonesia</b>, <b>Nepal</b>, and <b>Nigeria</b> which are all promoting sustainable alternatives. More specifically, <b>Burkina Faso</b> wants to “promote the availability and use of sustainable production and consumption patterns as alternatives to plastics through the circular economy.” <b>Yemen</b> believes this should be mobilized through guiding businesses toward these environmentally friendly alternatives.</li> <li>● <b>Bangladesh</b> is calling for “global consensus on [the] production of alternatives,” while <b>Morocco</b> calls for research and development of new technologies and materials to develop alternative products. And <b>Tunisia</b> wants to “build capacity in the use of sustainables.”</li> <li>● <b>Tanzania</b> suggests the promotion of “biodegradable technologies for [the] production of plastics packaging for medical devices, industrial products, construction industry, agricultural sector, food processing or sanitary and waste management,” and <b>Uruguay</b> is also interested in “biodegradable alternatives.”</li> <li>● <b>Colombia</b> wants to “finance and promote sustainable alternatives through economic incentives that include funds for research, development, technological development, innovation, use, transition and transfer of technologies and systems that stimulate the reduction of consumption of plastic products.” <b>Burkina Faso</b> also wants to “promote the availability and use of sustainable modes of production and consumption as alternatives to plastics through the circular economy.”</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>EU</b> wants substitutions of “[u]nnecessary, avoidable, and problematic plastics, substances and additives.”</li> <li>• The <b>Africa Group, AOSIS, Australia, PSIDS, Qatar, Thailand,</b> and <b>Uruguay</b> all made interventions at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(a) Options for enhancing research and development:</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section does not adequately reflect possible control measures as found within submissions.</li> <li>• While most countries see this option for research and development within the means of implementation, many countries like <b>Argentina, China, Japan, Libya, Mauritius, Micronesia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Switzerland,</b> and <b>Thailand</b> made general suggestions about promoting research for alternatives, which is not reflected as a control measure in this section.</li> <li>• Many other countries speak to researching, inter alia, “substitutes” (<b>Azerbaijan</b>), “safer or alternative replacements” (<b>Thailand</b>), or “solutions for alternatives” (<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> and <b>Bangladesh</b>).</li> <li>• <b>AOSIS</b> and <b>Costa Rica</b> made oral interventions at INC-1 on the matter.</li> <li>• <b>Libya’s</b> suggestion of “encouraging initiatives to find alternatives” and “[r]einforcement of research studies on green innovations, impacts of marine litter and plastics (macro, micro and nano plastics) on marine environment and risks on marine life and human health” is also not represented in this option.</li> </ul>
<p>(i) <b>Provide platforms</b> for sharing information on the development of safe, sustainable alternatives and substitutes.</p>	<p>Africa Group, Australia, AOSIS, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cook Islands, Egypt, Georgia, United States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Australia’s</b> submission includes a “mechanism for scientific and socio-economic information and analysis to inform decision-making will be vital [...] to support research on safe plastic alternatives.”</li> <li>• The <b>United States</b> also wants to “promote the</li> </ul>

		<p>cooperation and coordination of research of lifecycle analysis of alternatives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another suggested way to share information is through monitoring and reporting related to alternatives and substitutes. The <b>Africa Group</b>, <b>Colombia</b>, the <b>Cook Islands</b>, <b>Egypt</b>, and <b>Georgia</b> all support this in their submissions.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) <b>Establish market tools (or fiscal policy incentives) for enhancing research and development</b> of alternative products and technologies.</p>	<p>Australia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Colombia, Ecuador, EU, GRULAC, Peru, Philippines, Tunisia, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Colombia</b> believes a “[financial] mechanism may finance [the] transition to substitutes and transfer of technologies that allow the development of these substitutes.” Similarly, <b>GRULAC</b> calls for “a robust integrated mechanism that ensures the provision and mobilization of new, additional and predictable flows of financial resources to support relevant research, development, and innovation (R&amp;D&amp;I) projects.”</li> <li>• <b>Brazil</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(b) Options for reviewing and enabling the use of safe, sustainable alternatives and substitutes:</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section does not include a control measure option for training related to the use of substitute materials (<b>Tunisia</b>, <b>Mauritius</b>, and the <b>Republic of Korea</b>).</li> </ul>
<p>(i) <b>Establish a certification scheme for plastic products.</b></p>	<p>Africa Group*, Canada, Egypt*, Morocco*, Philippines, Sierra Leone*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As discussed in option 6, many countries support design criteria, transparency, and labeling for increased circularity. However, no submissions asked for a certification scheme within an option for “safe, sustainable alternatives and substitutes,” thus it remains unclear whether this is the appropriate place for this option. For example, within a provision on plastic circularity, the <b>Philippines</b> mention “Industry certification for global standard requirements.” Similarly, <b>Canada</b> proposes “standards or certifications” within a general obligation to increase circularity.</li> <li>• The <b>Africa Group</b>, <b>Morocco</b>, <b>Sierra Leone</b>, and <b>Egypt</b></li> </ul>

		include a certification scheme as a voluntary option for pro-environment behavior in societies through non-price and non-regulatory means.
<p>(ii) <b>Task a technical review committee</b> (comparable to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer) with <b>assessing criteria</b> for the sustainable production and use of plastics and the availability of safe alternatives and substitutes, set out the criteria in annexes to the instrument, and recommend possible adjustments to such annexes or amendments to the instrument (including new annexes).</p>	<p>Armenia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, HAC, Kuwait, Monaco, Norway, Oman, Philippines, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>EU</b> suggests this measure within implementation measures for subsidiary bodies. <b>Uruguay</b> recognizes the need for intersessional expert working groups to create a “list of alternatives or substitutes to plastics that should not be promoted due to their impact on human health or the environment.” Additionally, for “criteria for identifying environmentally sound substitutes to be provided.”</li> <li>• <b>AOSIS</b> says provisions “must provide clarity on the terms sustainable alternatives and substitutes,” and the <b>Republic of Korea</b> wants “consistent signaling towards cleaner alternatives.”</li> <li>• <b>AOSIS</b>, the <b>Republic of Korea</b>, and <b>Saudi Arabia</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> <li>• The <b>Philippines</b> support this option in differing language of “[i]dentification of ideal substitute materials to plastic” and “[l]ife cycle assessment of these plastic substitutes.” Likewise, the <b>United Kingdom</b> supports a comprehensive review of use scenarios across the full life cycle.</li> <li>• The <b>HAC</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, and <b>Ecuador</b> all support “criteria for identifying environmentally sound substitutes to be provided.”</li> <li>• <b>Cambodia</b>, <b>China</b>, <b>Colombia</b>, and <b>Saudi Arabia</b> all appear to support standardizing conditions for the quality and use of alternatives or substitutes based on science. Further, <b>Armenia</b> and <b>Oman</b> support “[s]cientific and technical cooperation component for identification of reliable alternatives.”</li> </ul>



<p>(iii) Develop <b>clear mechanisms for funding, technical support and transfer of technology</b> for the development of natural alternatives to plastics, in particular in small island developing States.</p>	<p>AOSIS, China, Georgia, Japan, Morocco</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>AOSIS</b> calls for “technology development and transfer.”</li> <li>● <b>Georgia, Japan, Morocco, and Peru</b> all support research and development for technologies to develop alternative products without specifying small island developing States.</li> <li>● <b>Cuba</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 calling for the “development of technologies for the search for alternatives.”</li> </ul>
<p>(iv) Use <b>economic instruments</b>, such as fees, tariffs, taxes, subsidies, and tradable permit systems, to incentivize a reduction of plastic use and the adoption of sustainable alternatives.</p>	<p>AOSIS, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Colombia, Georgia, Libya, Malaysia, Micronesia, Morocco, Nepal, Palestine *, Tunisia, Uganda</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Colombia</b> also suggests “[f]inancing of prefeasibility studies/pilots and programs focused on market development (building demand for substitute products).”</li> <li>● <b>Cambodia</b> wants “Fiscal and economic measures to promote <i>environmentally friendly</i> alternatives.”</li> <li>● <b>Micronesia</b> calls for “national programmes including incremental costs of compliance, such as transition to substitutes.”</li> <li>● <b>Palestine</b> stresses tariffs on single-use plastics and other kinds of plastics.</li> </ul>

<p><b>9. Eliminating the release and emission of plastics to water, soil, air</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Colombia, <b>Cook Islands</b>, EU, <b>Ecuador</b>, Egypt, Gabon, <b>HAC</b>, Kenya, <b>Monaco</b>, New Zealand, <b>Norway</b>, Oman, Palau, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, <b>Switzerland</b>, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States, <b>Uruguay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>Cook Islands</b>, <b>Ecuador</b>, the <b>HAC</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, <b>Norway</b>, <b>Switzerland</b>, and <b>Uruguay</b>, and all include a core obligation on eliminating the release of plastics (including microplastics) to the air, water and soil or land, or some similar language. These include suggested text about general obligations, processes, transparency and reporting, international cooperation, and intersessional working groups that are not all reflected in the Options Paper but should be considered for negotiations.</li> <li>• <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> want “monitoring of all plastic production, consumption and use, plastic waste management, plastic pollution in the environment” to identify and target and minimize plastics that end up in the environment.</li> <li>• <b>Canada</b> includes an obligation to prevent, reduce or remove. This says that “[e]ach Party should be required to implement and report on national measures that prevent, reduce, and remove in an environmentally sound manner where appropriate plastic pollution from land and aquatic-based sources, including microplastics and abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear.”</li> <li>• The <b>United States</b>, in its submission and at INC-1, supported recognizing the need to end plastic pollution, including through efforts aimed at eliminating the release of plastic into the environment by 2040.</li> </ul>
<p>(a) Reduce and, where feasible, eliminate <b>releases of plastics to water, soil and air</b> (general and sectoral measures could be listed in an annex to the instrument, including wastewater, industrial facilities,</p>	<p><b>Argentina</b>, <b>Canada</b>, <b>Cook Islands</b>, <b>Ecuador</b>, <b>HAC</b>, <b>Kenya</b>, <b>Monaco</b>, <b>Norway</b>, <b>Palau</b>, <b>Palestine</b>, <b>Switzerland</b>, <b>Uruguay</b>, <b>Thailand</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the highlighted submissions, the list could include stormwater drainage systems, wastewater and sewage, industrial facilities, aquaculture, agriculture, fishing, (Microplastics missing but included under the microplastic category), transport and handling of pellets, unintentional Microplastics releases (roads, textiles,</li> </ul>

aquaculture, agriculture and the fishing industry, and transport).		other).
(b) Develop and use <b>the best available technology and best environmental practices</b> , including environmental and emission/effluent standards, to minimize and eliminate pollution from all stages of the plastic life cycle.	China, Ecuador, HAC, Monaco, Norway, Oman, Rwanda, Thailand, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Thailand</b> speaks to control measures during the entire life cycle of plastics and has an additional section based on unintentional plastic pollution, “Focusing on the best available technology (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP) used to minimise and eliminate pollution. These include the environmental and emission/effluent standards from all stages of plastic.”</li> <li>● The text neglects to include the obligation to use the best available techniques (BAT) to minimize the health impacts as suggested by <b>Rwanda</b>.</li> </ul>
(c) Prohibit dangerous practices to <b>prevent the production and releases of toxic emissions</b> from plastic waste management.	Africa Group, Colombia, Cook Islands, Egypt, Kenya, Rwanda, Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Kenya</b> wants to promote environmentally sound management in line with resource efficiency and succinctly lists the following “dangerous practices: open burning, incineration, cofiring in coal-fired power plants and waste-to-energy processes, co-processing in cement kilns, chemical recycling, and landfilling.”</li> <li>● Alternatively, countries like <b>Tunisia</b> and <b>Mongolia</b> are actively trying to develop waste-to-energy processes.</li> </ul>
(d) Take effective measures to <b>prevent and reduce loss of fishing gear containing plastic</b> and leverage existing efforts, including those of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and the International Maritime Organization	Africa Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Gabon, Guinea, HAC, Kenya, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Partial inclusion of <b>Norway’s</b> general obligation to reduce fishing gear, however, cuts off other measures for EPR schemes, adequate port reception facilities, and identification of hotspots for ALDFG.</li> <li>● Several submissions reiterated special obligations through EPR and return schemes. While fishing gear will be regulated separately, it is important to coordinate with those countries that mentioned regulation of fisheries plastic - highlighted in blue.</li> </ul>

<p><b>10. Addressing existing plastic pollution</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, <b>Canada</b>, Cook Islands, <b>EU</b>, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon*, Ghana, <b>Guinea</b>, HAC, <b>Iceland</b>, Iran, Japan, Libya, <b>Micronesia</b>, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Peru*, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Tonga, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yemen</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>EU</b> considers this a core obligation. As does <b>Micronesia</b>; however, its submission uses language of “remediation” and “legacy waste.” <b>Canada</b> includes broader language to “Mitigate and Remediate Plastic Pollution” as a core obligation and, within that, calls for measures to remove fishing gear and microplastic pollution.</li> <li>• Some submissions do not consider addressing legacy or existing pollution as a core obligation but do promote measures to “address” and “collect” plastics in the ocean. For example, <b>Egypt, Japan, and Palau</b>, and <b>Cameroon’s</b> INC-1 intervention.</li> <li>• Submissions from <b>AOSIS, the Cook Islands, Ecuador, the HAC, Micronesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, and Switzerland</b> call for guidance on best available practices for environmentally sound remediation.</li> <li>• <b>AOSIS, Cook Islands, Ghana, Sierra Leone, and Rwanda</b> all ask for financing options specifically for remediation through legacy funds. This is not reflected in this option section.</li> <li>• <b>Uruguay</b> also requests an intersessional working group on marine pollution and legacy pollution.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(a) Options for addressing existing plastic pollution:</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear why this section is separate from eliminating the release and emission to the environment. Submissions often consider remediation with releases.</li> </ul>
<p>(i) Take measures to remediate plastic pollution in the environment, including in the marine environment and <b>areas beyond national jurisdiction</b>, taking into account the draft agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and</p>	<p><b>Africa Group, AOSIS, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Gabon, Guinea, HAC, Micronesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Philippines, Uruguay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Options Paper brings in other instruments that concern areas beyond national jurisdiction; however, it is important to note that no submissions nor interventions from INC-1 include language about UNCLOS or the BBNJ treaties.</li> <li>• Many submissions, from the <b>Cook Islands, Egypt, the EU, the HAC, and Sierra Leone</b> speak to remediation of</li> </ul>

<p>sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction.</p>		<p>legacy plastic pollution more generally as core objectives and sometimes with waste management in option 5 or eliminating releases in option 9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When suggesting provisions to identify land and aquatic-based sources of plastic pollution, including microplastics, <b>Canada</b> does say “in complementarity with existing instruments.”</li> <li>• <b>Bangladesh</b> supports “[a]ssessing transboundary movement of plastics especially microplastic.”</li> <li>• <b>Canada, Gabon, GRULAC, the EU, Mexico, Micronesia, New Zealand, PSIDS, Rwanda,</b> and others in submissions and INC-1 interventions recognize the need to address “existing” plastic pollution and support the first clause; however, without the spatial component added through the end.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) <b>Cooperate to develop strategies to identify, prioritize and address areas of legacy waste.</b></p>	<p><b>Africa Group, Australia, Cook Islands, Ecuador, Egypt, HAC, Iran, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland, Uruguay, Yemen</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option only promotes half of <b>Norway’s</b> suggested provision “Parties should cooperate to develop strategies to identify, prioritise and address areas of legacy waste in an environmentally sound manner, and encourage partnerships with stakeholders in support of these strategies.”</li> <li>• The <b>Africa Group</b> suggested “actions to tackle plastic pollution including cooperation to control plastic pollution.”</li> <li>• <b>Australia, Egypt, Iran, and Yemen</b> all call for cooperation on existing plastic pollution.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(b) Options for sector/context-specific measures:</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite a large list of submissions speaking to this matter, options 10(b)(ii), 10(b)(iii)(a), and (b) are copied and pasted from the <b>EU</b> explanatory text related to addressing existing plastic pollution.</li> </ul>

<p>(i) <b>Eliminate ghost gear pollution in the environment</b>, particularly the marine environment, in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Maritime Organization.</p>	<p>African Group, AOSIS, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Gabon*, Guinea*, Monaco, Norway, Palau, Peru*, United Kingdom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> only calls for “identifying the amount of lost fishing gears,” while <b>Palau</b> suggests “marking and tracking fishing gears to incentivise retrieval of lost gears.”</li> <li>● <b>AOSIS</b> and the <b>United Kingdom</b> call for the elimination of ghost/fishing gear; however, do not limit that governance by mentioning collaboration with FAO/IMO.</li> <li>● <b>AOSIS</b> also made an oral intervention at INC-1.</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) Conduct <b>remediation activities in specific contexts</b> such as accumulation sites on coasts, rivers and estuaries, urban mining and unregulated landfills, as feasible and justified from a socioeconomic perspective. Priority could be given to plastic pollution hotspots and measures that could have a positive local or regional impact on human health or the environment and to minimizing negative effects to ecosystems.</p>	<p>AOSIS, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Cook Islands, Ecuador, EU, Gabon, Guinea, HAC, Micronesia, Monaco, New Zealand, Nepal, Norway, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Tunisia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No submission speaks to socioeconomic perspectives related to remediation activities except the <b>EU</b>.</li> <li>● See comments related to hot spots in option 10(b)(iii)(a) below.</li> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> also wants to “[m]inimise emissions and releases to the environment across the full life cycle, including those related to climate change, and promote remediation where safe to do so for the environment and human health.”</li> <li>● The <b>Cook Islands</b> and <b>Micronesia</b> made oral interventions at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
<p>(iii) <b>Develop criteria</b> and guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices, including to ensure that clean-up activities respect biodiversity. Options include: (...)</p>	<p>China, Iceland, EU, HAC, Norway, Thailand</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The <b>HAC</b> suggests “[t]he Conference of Parties should be required to adopt criteria and guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices for environmentally sound remediation of legacy waste.”</li> <li>● <b>Norway</b> also suggests the COP adopt guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices but rather “to reduce release of plastics to water, land and air from the source categories listed in an annex” [related to annexes for a sectoral approach found in option 9].</li> </ul>
<p>(...) a. Identifying indicators for hot spots where quantities and types of litter</p>	<p>Bosnia and Herzegovina, EU, Libya, Nepal, Norway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Hot spots can include mountains; for example, <b>Nepal</b> calls for hotspots on their mountains where there is an</li> </ul>

endanger marine or other species or habitats (...)		<p>increased risk of pollution due to tourism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Norway</b> calls for the identification of hotspots of abandoned, lost, and otherwise discarded fishing gear.</li> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> and <b>Tunisia</b> call for reporting to build a database that can inform hotspots.</li> </ul>
<p>(...) b. Encouraging the adoption of targeted removal measures in national action plans (NAPs) on a voluntary basis (e.g., clean-up activities and awareness-raising initiatives).</p>	<p>Canada, EU, New Zealand</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This option is presented based solely on domestic ambition or on a voluntary basis. Not reflected are the <b>Cook Islands</b> and <b>Ghana's</b> request for financing measures related to remediation and clean-up initiatives.</li> <li>● Further, <b>New Zealand</b> suggests “coordinated global, national and local efforts to address damage caused by ongoing plastic pollution, including clean-up and remediation activities.”</li> </ul>

<p><b>11. Facilitating a just transition, including an inclusive transition of the informal waste sector</b></p>	<p>Africa Group, Argentina, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Libya, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Argentina, Cambodia, Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria and Sierra Leone</b> support a just transition as part of the general objective.</li> <li>● Submissions use “just transition” quite broadly; for example, <b>Cambodia</b> includes green job creation, and <b>Egypt</b> calls for financial and technology transfer to developing countries.</li> <li>● <b>Malaysia’s</b> submission asks for a just transition in the context of reporting, while <b>Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka</b> want a just transition for plastics and certain chemicals industries.</li> <li>● <b>Nigeria</b> and the <b>United Kingdom</b> offered more elaborated responses on the link between just transition and the informal sector. And <b>Canada</b> expanded on the relationship between just transition, human rights, and Indigenous Peoples.</li> <li>● <b>Chile, Ecuador, and Uruguay</b> made oral interventions at INC-1 on a just transition.</li> </ul>
<p>(a) Establish a <b>mechanism to ensure a fair, equitable and inclusive transition for the industry and affected workers, informal waste workers and affected communities</b>, particularly in developing countries;</p>	<p>Africa Group, Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia, Libya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tunisia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Libya</b> does not mention that the mechanisms for just transition should cover the industry or affected workers but only for “informal waste workers and impacted communities, particularly in developing countries.”</li> <li>● <b>Egypt</b> wants a means of implementation measure to “ensure just transition pathways for developing countries, which own plastic and relevant chemicals industries, such pathways should also consider the social and economic aspects related to the implementation of the instrument.”</li> <li>● Several submissions include just transitions in objectives. For example, the <b>Africa Group and Egypt</b> call for “[e]nsuring a just and inclusive transition for informal waste workers and affected communities, especially in developing countries,” and <b>Nigeria</b> includes a “just</li> </ul>



		<p>transition for waste pickers and frontline communities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Malaysia</b> says, “[d]ue to data being the key component in reporting, it is strongly suggested for this instrument to consider this gap and challenge to ensure fair and just transition in formulating provisions on national reporting taking into account countries’ capabilities.</li> <li>● <b>PSIDS</b> made an oral intervention at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
<p>(b) Establish a <b>requirement</b> for private waste management companies to <b>collect plastic waste from informal waste picker cooperatives or associations, where relevant, and establish gradual schemes for their formalization</b>. As these cooperatives or associations formalise, the requirement for companies to collect from waste picker cooperatives or associations should be geared toward the formal ones</p>	<p><b>AOSIS, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Kenya, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Uruguay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No submissions suggested this language or spoke to any private sector requirements related to the informal sector. Nor did any submission speak about waste picker cooperatives.</li> <li>● Rather, a few submissions spoke about all stakeholders being involved in the process. For example, <b>AOSIS</b> wants to promote, encourage and incorporate action “by all stakeholders to address plastic pollution, including the private sector, informal plastics waste sector, waste pickers.”</li> <li>● Other submissions, like <b>Ecuador</b>, spoke to the involvement of the informal sector in promoting workers’ rights and the principle of just transition. While <b>Peru</b> says, “[i]t will be essential to recognise and define the role of waste pickers, and to incorporate them as key actors in the framework of the actions and strategies needed to address plastic pollution in the environment.”</li> <li>● <b>Egypt, the EU, Kenya, Nigeria, the Philippines, and Uruguay</b> also all speak to the role of waste pickers and the importance of promoting capacity building and their transition to formality, green jobs, and new roles.</li> </ul>
<p>(c) Improve working conditions for workers, including waste pickers, including by providing <b>legal recognition and support</b> for informal waste pickers,</p>	<p><b>Colombia, Ecuador, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Uruguay</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● While not offering direct legal recognition, the highlighted states stress “support” for waste pickers amid a just transition.</li> <li>● <b>Colombia, GRULAC, and South Africa</b> made oral</li> </ul>

such as <b>access to health care, education and social security benefits</b> .		interventions at INC-1 on the matter.
(d) Integrate the <b>informal waste sector</b> into the plastics value chain and promote a circular economy through a “just transition programme”.	Argentina, Canada, Ecuador, United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Kenya and South Africa</b> made oral interventions at INC-1 on integrating the informal waste sector through a just transition programme.</li> </ul>
(e) Establish a requirement to use <b>fees derived from EPR schemes to fund</b> an upgrade of infrastructure and technical and management skills for informal waste pickers to function as waste collection and sorting companies.	No submissions include this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In its “Obligation to reuse, collect, sort, and recycle. Increase the use of secondary raw materials in plastics and for environmentally sound management of all plastic waste,” the <b>EU</b> suggests two measures. First, each Party be required to set up separate collection schemes with options for integration of the informal waste sector and second, the “[m]andatory establishment of financing systems for separate plastic collection and waste management, e.g., through fees or EPR.” However, these were two separate suggestions, and this option appears to conflate the two.</li> <li>● While many countries, like <b>AOSIS, GRULAC, Kenya, the Philippines, and Sierra Leone</b>, mention utilizing EPR funds for the implementation and enforcement of the treaty, none of them specifically speak to a just transition. For more on EPR, see the options in 5(d).</li> </ul>

<p><b>12. Protecting human health from adverse impacts of plastic pollution</b></p>	<p>AOSIS, <b>Australia</b>, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh*, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Cook Islands, EU, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Kenya, Libya, Malaysia, Micronesia, <b>Moldova</b>, Monaco, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, <b>Oman</b>, Palau, Peru, Russia, <b>Rwanda</b>, <b>Singapore</b>, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Overall, the protection of human health was not solely mentioned in relation to risk assessment or cooperation but appeared more as a cross-cutting issue.</li> <li>● Specifically related to options 2, 5 and 6 on non-toxic circularity, <b>Moldova</b> mentions its obligation “enable a circular economy for plastics that protects the environment and human health.” While <b>Rwanda</b> mentions “plastic pollution in all environments” and the need to “achieve a non-toxic circular economy for plastics protective of health, livelihoods and the environment,” <b>Oman</b> mentions its obligation “enable a circular economy for plastics that protects the environment and human health while achieving environmentally sound management and recycling of plastic waste.”</li> <li>● <b>Singapore</b> more generally says to include “control measures that protect human health and the environment from the impact of plastic pollution.”</li> <li>● Nearly all submissions, for example, <b>AOSIS, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Kenya, Malaysia, New Zealand, Peru, Syria, Thailand, and Uruguay</b>, recognize the adverse impacts of plastic pollution on human health. In line with option 1, these countries recognize the need to reduce and eventually eliminate plastic pollution to protect human health.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(a) Options for assessing and evaluating risks:</u></p>		
<p><b>(i) Evaluate risks caused by plastic and plastic pollution for human health.</b></p>	<p><b>Bangladesh*</b>, <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>, <b>Japan</b>, <b>Russia</b>, <b>Tunisia</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Tunisia</b> refers to the “[r]einforcement of research studies on green innovations, impacts of marine litter and plastics (macro, micro and nano plastics) on marine environment and risks on marine life and human health.”</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> includes “[h]uman and ecosystem risk assessment” as a monitoring implementation element.</li> <li>● <b>Bangladesh</b> includes “[s]trengthening institutional capacities to enhance environment risk assessment processes arising from plastic pollution” as a voluntary measure.</li> <li>● <b>Japan</b> mentions that due consideration should be given to “[i]nsufficiency of established scientific data on concrete negative impacts and risk of plastic pollution on human health and the environment, and of appropriate methodologies for monitoring.”</li> </ul>
<p>(ii) Conduct further research on the <b>adverse effects of plastic and plastic pollution on human health.</b></p>	<p>Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Libya, Morocco, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>China</b> suggested enhanced “[s]ources, releases and the impact on human health and the environment of plastics and microplastics” and recognizes the “[i]mpact of transboundary movements of plastic waste on human health and the environment.”</li> <li>● The <b>United States</b> refers to “potential adverse human health outcomes.” <b>Cambodia</b> does not include adverse; it does mention the need for further research and “Scientific evidence on the impacts of microplastics on our environment and human health.” Still, some, including <b>Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Libya, Morocco, and Sri Lanka</b>, use the word “impact” rather than “effects.”</li> <li>● <b>Australia, Sri Lanka, Libya, and Tunisia</b> also explicitly refer to microplastics and nanoplastics.</li> <li>● <b>Australia</b> also mentions a mechanism for scientific and socio-economic information and analysis that “should incorporate the best available science and traditional knowledge to: Fill knowledge gaps regarding the environmental and human health impacts of chemicals of concern and microplastics.” And <b>Morocco</b> asks to</li> </ul>

		<p>“[e]stablish a comprehensive monitoring and assessment system with equitable access to countries that produces reliable information allowing to make science-based decisions, including volumes, types of plastic, and health impacts.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Burkina Faso</b> includes the “long-term effects” of plastics on human and animal health.</li> <li>● The <b>United Kingdom</b> also wants to include the “assessment of the environmental, economic, social and health impacts” of alternatives.</li> </ul>
<p><u>(b) Options for cooperation:</u></p>		
<p>(i) <b>Promote cooperation, collaboration and exchange of information</b> with the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organization and other intergovernmental organizations.</p>	<p>Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, EU, Switzerland, United Kingdom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A note in the text of the document says “Gap identified by the secretariat. This language is modeled after that of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.”</li> <li>● The <b>United Kingdom</b> says, “[w]hile evidence on the harm to human health caused by plastic and plastic pollution is emerging, it is essential that the ETB, working closely with the WHO, makes a concerted effort to understand and resolve evidence gaps in the effects of plastic pollution on human health, so that the committee can take informed action to mitigate these risks.”</li> <li>● <b>Ecuador</b> calls for “experience of Basel, Stockholm, Montreal. We must also work with the key expertise that exists throughout the United Nations system, WHO and FAO, as well as in other organizations such as the WTO, WCO, and UNCTAD” and <b>Uruguay</b> agrees “especially the WHO, the ILO and the special rapporteurs on human rights, to make written submissions to the Secretariat, prior to the second session of this Committee, regarding the effects on the environment and human health,</li> </ul>

		<p>derived from plastics and the dangerous additives used.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Panama, Mexico, and Uruguay</b> made oral interventions at INC-1 on the matter.</li> </ul>
(ii) Improve the <b>One Health</b> approach.	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b> suggested it as an implementation measure and not as a control measure or voluntary approach. They specify that a One Health approach includes the perspective of the impacts of microplastics on animal, human and environmental health.</li> </ul>