

Statement at AHEG4 on Agenda item 4 (d) Analysis of the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities on Agenda 4

2020/11/10

Japan

<Overall comments >

1. The assessment findings in the effectiveness analysis include both items related to frameworks (A, C and D) and those on the contents of activities according to the plastic lifecycle (B, G and H). Although both are important, we need to avoid mixing up these two features when considering effectiveness of various response options.
2. It is of utmost importance to objectively understand each response option's characteristics, rather than seeing some options are definitely effective while others are not.

For example,

- ✧ National Action Plans (NAPs) can contribute to development and implementation of countermeasures consistent with country's circumstances. However, there is a need for international cooperation to avoid ending up these countries' arbitrary actions causing huge difference in the extent of countermeasures.
 - ✧ An international binding framework can help ensuring a certain level of formulation and implementation of substantial actions at all countries. However, For the international finding frameworks to be effective, some challenges should be properly addressed, including that 1) binding targets should be clarified, 2) it would take time to develop an international binding framework depending on the provisions, and 3) it would need to be flexible implementation of measures in taking into account each country's circumstances.
3. Among the categories of assessment Feasibility and Time frame are particularly important. In order to take urgent and steady actions on this issue, we should also bear in mind that the plastic issues are very complex, depending on each country's diverse circumstances.

<Comments on specific items>

A. Strengthening the existing international framework

The current evaluation of "Strengthening the existing international framework" in the working document only covers strengthening existing treaties, but it is important to analyze potential efforts that are not enacted in the treaties, such as the G20 Implementation Framework.. Strengthening existing international framework could include the increase of participating countries, international organizations and private sectors and expansion of its function.

F. National marine litter action plans

A number of national action plans are actively addressing significant pressures and barriers

across all actors within the plastic life cycle.

G. Strengthening solid waste management using regulatory and market-based instruments

As shown in the results of a global survey on estimating marine plastic pollution, the improper management of plastic wastes is a main source of losses and strengthening waste management by regulatory/economic methods is especially important. Effective regulatory/economic methods have to be in line with the country's diverse situation and system of waste management. Therefore, national marine litter action plans mentioned above should be able to accommodate the arrangement of measures based on the situation and system of waste management in each country.