Comment from Japan on "Background note: Intersessional Consultation Webinar 17 February 2020"

Feb 19, 2020

While the revised methodology provided via "Background note: Intersessional Consultation Webinar 17 February 2020" might enables a holistic overview of response options, it does not seem to fully enable to assess the effectiveness.

In this regard, to establish a methodology that visualizes the level of contribution, at least the extent of activities, we propose to exemplify some typical indicators that are already used in several countries, regions, groups, etc, can be applied to other actors.

These correspond to the "output indicators" which is written in section 7.1 of the background note.

Although situations differ from countries to countries, the evaluation is a primer responsibility of each member states and they may have to choose the most appropriate indicators by themselves.

In addition, even when it is difficult to specify exact contribution to actual outcome of each response measures, member states should be able to illustrate the extent of their activities substantially.

Here, examples of such indicators are;
(1) the amount of waste generated, reused, collected, recycled, and properly disposed of;
(2) the amount of marine litter cleaned up;
(3) the scale of use of innovative technologies and materials including R&D investment;
(4) the scale and/or effect of assistance for countries that need technical capacity development including the increased amount of waste properly disposed of

By providing examples of achievements of measures by countries, other actors can learn measures as "best practices." This will enable to further promote discussions for potential response options.

UNEP/EA.4/L.7
"Marine plastic litter and microplastics" para 7 (d) "Analyse the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities on marine litter and microplastics at all levels to determine the contribution in solving the global problem,"