Approach for the multi-stakeholder action agenda to end plastic pollution (Submitted by UNEP)

Introduction

1. By resolution 5/14, the United Nations Environment Assembly decided that the international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution would include provisions to initiate a multi-stakeholder action agenda, henceforth referred to as “action agenda”.

2. The annex to the present information document is a submission from UNEP, which outlines possible key elements of the multi-stakeholder action agenda to end plastic pollution as well as a set of questions for consideration at the multi-stakeholder forum that could provide further insight in initiating the multi-stakeholder action agenda.

3. The current document is presented without formal editing.
Approach for the multi-stakeholder action agenda to end plastic pollution (Submitted by UNEP)

I. Possible key elements of the multi-stakeholder action agenda to end plastic pollution

1. **An action agenda to shift the needle through collective impact.** A multi-stakeholder action agenda could provide a comprehensive framework for actions at global level, intended to (i) drive progress, harness and amplify existing momentum and scale towards solutions, that can increase the overall ambition to end plastic pollution and (ii) feed insight and recommendations to the intergovernmental negotiating committee.

2. There exist many governmental, intergovernmental, nongovernmental, and private sector initiatives, actions and solutions with varying aims and goals to address certain aspects of the issue of plastic pollution. To date, these initiatives, actions, and solutions have been mostly acting independently, and have had varying degrees of coordination amongst them.

3. The action agenda could set the framework under which those initiatives, actions and solutions can be **organized and guided to converge and shift the needle on plastic pollution with measurable collective impact.** The action agenda would also ensure a better understanding of the initiatives, actions and solutions which have enabled the development of successful business models; promoted public-private partnerships that deploy innovations on the scale needed to make a difference; guided research and innovation to create technologies and practices that reduce plastic pollution.

4. **Important linkages of the multi-stakeholder action agenda** need to be established with the work undertaken in the context of UNEA resolution 5/14 operative paragraphs 14 and 15, the work by international agencies, including in the context of the United Nations Environmental Management Group, other global partnerships such as the Global Partnership on Marine Litter, the One Planet Network, and relevant new information being generated, such as the upcoming UNEP publication on solutions to plastic pollution.

5. To the extent possible and where relevant, the delivery model of the action agenda could use **existing structures and coalitions** such as the Global Partnership on Marine Litter Action Tracks; the New Plastics Economy Global Commitment; the Basel Convention Plastic Waste Partnership; the Global Plastic Action Partnership; the High Ambition Coalition to End Plastic Pollution, the Business Coalition for a Global Plastics Treaty, the Alliance to End Plastic Waste; and possibly others.

6. **Engagement in the multi-stakeholder action agenda.** The action agenda may consider the engagement of all stakeholders and provide entry points for them to contribute to impact, show commitment, develop solutions, monitor progress and convey constraints and challenges. The action agenda should offer a platform for all stakeholders - including those that are not formally participating in the INC - to enhance their engagement and contribute towards measurable impact and high ambition. The action agenda could thus include non-state and sub-national actors such as cities, regions, informal and cooperative workers, indigenous peoples and local communities, business and industry, and civil society organizations in addition to non-governmental organizations (NGO’s), national governments, and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).

7. The action agenda could **identify challenges and bottlenecks** that these initiatives, actions, and solutions are confronted with, in their efforts to achieve higher scale and impact. Such challenges would be brought to the attention of the INC process, as the global instrument may potentially contain provisions which could address such challenges. In addition, as the INC process progresses, it would also provide continued guidance to the action agenda.

8. **Process for development and implementation of the multi-stakeholder action agenda.** The action agenda may evolve over time, as the ambition of stakeholders increases, and the INC process unfolds. It may enable stakeholders to reflect urgent and immediate actions, but also be flexible to accommodate over time new and more ambitious actions. The action agenda may be initiated during the INC process and continue beyond it.

9. The Multi-stakeholder Forum convened in conjunction with the first session of the INC, could serve as a platform to test the possible goal and scope and process of development of the action agenda with a broad range
of participating stakeholders. Elements of the action agenda could also already emerge from input to and guidance from the Multi-Stakeholder Forum held in conjunction with INC-1.

10. The first session of the INC could suggest a process for the development and implementation of the action agenda, which would ideally continue during the intersessional periods (in between INC sessions) and at following INC sessions, to ensure adequate progress towards collective impact. Future INC sessions could provide the opportunity to take stock of the development of the action agenda, with input from and guidance of the INC. Reporting of impact could take place annually at INC-3 and INC-5.

11. Measuring impact and tracking progress. A key part of the action agenda could be ensuring the collective impact all stakeholders make towards ending plastic pollution. Creating a common set of indicators associated with the action agenda could contribute to establish a baseline, against which it will be possible to measure the impact and progress of the actions. Metrics could evolve over time to identify the impact of actions and commitments of stakeholders along the life cycle of plastics, and could possibly be categorized by region and other relevant variables.

II. Questions for consideration at the multi-stakeholder forum that could provide further insight in initiating the multi-stakeholder action agenda

1. The Multi-stakeholder Forum convened in conjunction with the first session of the INC, will provide an opportunity to further explore the key elements of the multi-stakeholder action agenda during the 2nd set of roundtable discussions. The roundtable discussions will enable further insights on stakeholder’s view with regards to:
   a. What could be the proposed objective and scope of the action agenda?
   b. What existing efforts can it learn from and what related plastic pollution initiatives can it build upon?
   c. How could the action agenda be structured going forward so that it can inform the negotiations and drive policy decisions?

2. Other elements that might help define the action agenda could include considerations such as:
   a. How could the work of the action agenda formally connect to the INC process and its outcomes?
   b. What would be the preferred governance approach?
   c. How could progress be measured?
   d. How could the action agenda be resourced?
   e. Would it be useful to consider the opportunity to conduct intersessional work on the action agenda, to ensure adequate progress towards collective impact?
   f. Could the organization of additional Multi-stakeholder Forums in future INC sessions (UNEA resolution 5/14 operative paragraph 16 requests a forum at the first session of the INC only) provide a systematic platform to advance the development of the action agenda?