

## **Norwegian comments to the Draft Outline of Summary of potential response options for continued work for consideration of the United Nations Environment Assembly**

### **Key messages:**

Identifying potential response options for future work to combat marine litter and microplastics under UNEA constitute the core of the work to be undertaken by the AHEG, as specified in the mandate given to the group. Norway believe that the AHEG needs to dedicate the majority of its time to these discussions.

We appreciate the efforts done by the Secretariat in trying to bring together the different submission received. We recognize the attempt to identify some of the key words that appear in the various submissions and grouping these together. However, these vary very much in form and format.

As such, we do not believe this outline for the proposed summary its current form is useful to the discussions that need to take place. The summary as it stands now in Section 1 is very literal and lack substantive analysis to be useful for the discussion that need to take place in the AHEG.

Section 2 provides an attempt to identify commonalities and areas of emerging consensus in the submissions. However it seems to give more attention to those submissions with a larger number of pages included than the substantial content of the submissions. In order to serve the purpose of this exercise, we need an additional and deeper analysis is needed to bring forward the discussions of the AHEG. We need to look beyond the individual submissions and make progress in discussions on the substantive areas and elements in the respective submission.

Grouping these into different topics for consideration and areas could help shape the discussions of the AHEG and identify areas for further work where there is emerging consensus. It is our understanding that the Chair of the AHEG will develop a non-paper based on the received submissions and we encourage her to take into consideration the above-mentioned concerns when developing the non-paper and not limit the analysis on the summary that we do not consider constructive for our work going forward.

### **On the Norwegian submission:**

Respecting the tight deadlines for the preparation of the AHEG4, the Norwegian submission was sent in early February and in a format that aims at raising some of the issues we would like the AHEG4 to discuss.

In order to stimulate discussion we have identified some challenges that we must addressed, that might be described in other wording. We have also followed the instructions given to build on our previous submissions to AHEG 1 and 2, which is why some of the elements and principles that we have stated previously in our position are not repeated in this submission. It could therefore be worthwhile to consider *all* of the submissions before the AHEG in such an analysis, and not limit this exercise to those received before AHEG4.

Against this backdrop we do not see that table 1 does not clearly reflect the substantial content of our submission.

For one, the table does not check off on life-cycle approach and multi-stakeholder engagement including with industry and private sector while this constitute an important element of our item 3 " how to share responsibility fairly" as well as in "1 and 2 on enhanced minimization" and "more sustainable products"

Secondly, the table does not check the Norwegian submission on "science-based action". Meanwhile item 5 " building a global science and knowledge base" and the accompanying annex on this item in our submission clearly underlines the importance of building a stronger basis for science and evidence-based action.

Thirdly, the Norwegian submission checks on the "legally binding approach" in the table. In the submission the relevant formulation is "This includes the consideration of a new dedicated global agreement", but there is no prejudgement on the nature of the agreement.

The table 2 on key words explained does not provide additional value, as a number of the central principles and key words only reflect the one given submission.

Table 3 identifies what the expectations are for the AHEG discussions and could be separated from the substantive analysis of the response options. These are the "how" of the discussions, not the "what" of the substantial constituents of future response options.

### **Nordic Report commissioned by the Council of Environment and Climate Ministers submission:**

The submission was sent in February in the early stages of writing the report. A presentation of what constitutes the elements in the report will be done to supplement the written submission, addressing a number of the key-words identified in the summary in Section 1.

Due to a delay in the production of the report and the SDG 14 conference in Lisbon being postponed to 2021, the report will most likely be finalized over summer.