

AHEG 2nd Virtual Prep meeting October 20-22 2020

Norwegian comments to the Agenda item 3; Consideration of paragraph 7 d) of the United Nations Environment Assembly resolution 4/6 entitled marine plastic litter and microplastics: Analysis of the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities

1. We also would like to thank Karen for the presentation as well as the Secretariat for their efforts in putting together this document. Gathering information on the various efforts undertaken and assessing their contribution to the overall goal is a highly complicated and challenging exercise that requires a lot of time and effort, which the document clearly illustrates.
2. Like others we would also make some general comments on the process as well on the content. We do find the process for developing this summary of the effectiveness analysis somewhat difficult to understand. The pilot studies presented to Member States in August seem to apply indicators differently than in the summary. For example, the indicator *Maturity* is described as *not applicable* to the potential response option of a new international framework in the pilot study. On page 44 it says "As the international framework is still at a proposal phase, this indicator is not applicable". However, in the summary of the effectiveness analysis the *Maturity* indicator is rated as *low* for the same reason.
3. Moreover, we can not find assessments of the indicators *Feasibility* and *Time Frame* for a new international framework in the pilot studies. However, both of these are rated in the summary. If given the chance, we would have not supported applying these criteria to analyse effectiveness of a new international framework.
4. The assessment of the maturity, feasibility and time frame of such a response option will significantly depend on the type of obligations proposed, and the will of political leaders to meet them. Therefore, these indicators are not applicable to an analysis of the effectiveness of a new international framework that has yet to be defined.
5. Given that this document is merely meant to inform the discussion by government experts in the AHEG on the recommendations for further work, we do not see the need to bring any further objections to content of this summary document. We will however reiterate the continued need for more knowledge of the effectiveness of response options at all levels.
6. The results of the analysis give an *indication* of effectiveness, based on a qualitative assessment. On the other hand, it is currently not possible to assess to what degree the different response options contributes to *actually* reduce the volume of plastic waste that ends up in the marine environment. Put simply, we do not have the necessary data and information available, and hence such an analysis will not be complete, especially so for potential response options.
7. The document clearly demonstrates that there is a need to develop a monitoring and reporting framework that will enable harmonized data collection to assess the progress towards the goal of reducing the amount of marine litter entering our oceans. The AHEG

should therefore focus its efforts in the remaining time on discussing response options, focusing on how we can ensure that these functions are taken care of.

8. We appreciate that the effectiveness analysis gives an overview of key aspects of different response options, and as such the analysis should now be finalized. On the other hand, we stress that this document will not be able to replace a substantial discussion by the AHEG on potential response options, which to our understanding is planned under agenda item 5.