

The AHEG 3 outcome document and final report include several references to the usefulness of such policies as extended producer responsibility and instruments that implement the polluter pays principles as a financing mechanism from a number of participants. These aspects have not been covered thoroughly in the summary of the Inventory of technical and financial resources and mechanisms, so far. Environmental costs have to be internalized as far as possible before being borne by public or private funds at the end-of-pipe. We consider taxes, levies and fees as appropriate financial instruments as well, as long as the collected finances are allocated for tackling plastic pollution afterwards.

It remains unclear which criteria was used to identify or classify options as medium and low cost. Regarding high cost options, the criteria should also take the avoided environmental damage into consideration. There has to be an interconnected analysis of financial and technological aspects to be able to assess effectiveness and feed in this analysis. Since one of the main barriers here is stated to be lack of financial resources, the necessity of a global agreement to support establishment of national and regional concepts and infrastructure is illustrated, e.g. national waste management plans or programmes on resources efficiency and SCP.

It should be elaborated on which stage of the value chain the highest cost in addressing plastic pollutions arises. The mere statement that almost half of the respondents consider the costliness as very or extremely high does not allow to draw any conclusions except that there is urgent need for financing.

The EU and its MS are of the opinion that the measures to tackle pollution become more costly the further down in the life-cycle they are taken. Preventive action in contrast seems to be the most cost-effective one. Most of the barriers mentioned in the summary report support this conclusion.

While it is recognized that there is no one-size-fits-all solution, depending on the starting point or current level of evolution in management of plastic and its waste, there is a set of rather standardized measures to tackle the most common problems and short-comings which can be tailored to the respective need of each country or region. A global agreement can support knowledge exchange and capacity building with a view to establish best practices and available technologies as a toolbox.