

Dear Riccardo and other colleagues from the UNEP Secretariat,

Thank you once again for organizing yesterday's interactive technical briefing on developing the methodology to analyze the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities. As always, the dedicated efforts to finding alternative methods for advancing this work during the intersessional period by yourselves, the Acting AHEG Bureau Chair, and other members of the AHEG Bureau, are greatly appreciated. Following yesterday's discussion, we wanted to take this opportunity to share some feedback for your consideration going forward. We believe that, with some further revisions, the methodology will deliver findings that support a more robust and informed discussion amongst AHEG participants.

Canada supports the general need for additional clarity on the terminology used in the revised methodology, as well as for the inclusion of a table/matrix that summarizes the analysis' eventual findings. We wish to also echo the comments raised by some of our Member State counterparts, and stress the need for information on the assumptions that underpin the revised methodology, including the pilot studies, and with a particular emphasis on the assumptions relating to barriers, pressures, and the relationships/interplay between management strategies.

In addition, taking note of the approach to focus on "archetypes", we wish to express caution when determining which options are considered "archetypes" versus "control" measures, so as to not limit which options are ultimately included or excluded from the analysis. For example, recognizing its hypothetical/theoretical nature, the "new international framework" archetype used for the pilot study leverages examples from existing initiatives, but in the actual analysis, we would hope to see those initiatives be analyzed independently in order to have a more fulsome and encompassing understanding of the options and activities that already exist.

Lastly, Canada wishes to highlight the work of the Ocean Plastics Charter and the Global Plastic Action Partnership, as we believe it is important for them to be included as options to be analyzed. The Ocean Plastics Charter, now endorsed by 26 governments and almost 70 businesses and organizations, represents the only global framework to take a comprehensive lifecycle approach to addressing marine plastic pollution. The Global Plastic Action Partnership is a public-private collaboration platform that encourages and supports partnerships between civil society, national and subnational governments, and industry to tackle plastic pollution through inclusive national policy development. More information on both initiatives can be found within our stocktaking submission, and we would also be happy to discuss them further if/as needed.

While the Acting Chair mentioned that the list of examples of actual major response options to be analyzed included in the technical briefing summary document was not exhaustive, we would like to confirm that both the Ocean Plastics Charter and the Global Plastic Action Partnership will be analyzed, despite their absence from that list.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our feedback. Should you have any questions, or wish to seek clarity on any of the above, please do not hesitate to reach out.