

Norwegian statement AHEG 2nd Virtual Prep Meeting 22 October Item 5 continued – elements in a new agreement

Yesterday we started a very engaging discussion on considerations of the different submissions in a comprehensive manner. To us, it is clear that the AHEG has identified a new global agreement as an international response option as per our mandate from UNEA 3/7 10 (d) (ii) and that there is significant support of a new global agreement to be considered as a potential option for continued work by the UNEA as per UNEA 3/ para 10 (d) (v).

We have been encouraged to elaborate on our submission on global response options.

Norway believes that a new global agreement would be beneficial for governments, but also for private sector as it would provide predictability and stability. We don't foresee a very strict and detailed agreement, but rather an agreement that provides a permanent framework to work within and that can progress over time.

Many of the submissions point to the need for a **common long-term vision and objective**. As of now, the UNEA-3 zero vision to eliminate all discharge of plastic litter into the ocean is one such global goal. The Osaka Blue Vision put a date to end this by 2050. The SDG target 14.1 have committed us to significantly reduce discharge of marine litter by 2025. The G7 Ocean Plastic Charter have a number of targets and measures with the date 2030 and 2040. A new global agreement would need an ambitious goal that we all can work towards.

The Nordic Report introduced yesterday suggests that **National Plastics Management Plans** could form the core commitment of a new global agreement. The report also includes a toolbox for how such plans could be designed to be effective. Guided by the global vision and objective, countries could then develop their national strategies and plans. Having such a commitment in an agreement could also bring the topic to the top of the political agenda, ensure regularity in revision and report also on a national level.

Yet, there is no one size fits all solution to this problem and we believe that countries should be allowed flexibility in how these plans are developed to fit their national and local circumstances. The agreement could include a mechanism to support countries in developing these action plans, facilitate learning and cooperation across countries and regions. Such plans would cover both land and sea-based sources and consider plastics management across the entire life-cycle.

We think this is a very interesting proposal to be further explored, and we heard from our colleague from the Philippines yesterday support for such national implementation mechanisms.

Recalling our own submission from February, you will see that raised a number of questions related to how to get in place **more sustainable plastic products**. This will in turn also ease the pressure on already overburdened waste management systems. Possible options range from product design, durability, reparability, recyclability and multiple use-plastic versus single-use, etc. This could also boost the market for secondary plastics.

The Nordic Report introduces the suggestion of sustainability criteria that we also find very interesting. We would like to hear from other delegations on how they see this proposal.

International sustainability criteria could be developed to provide governments with a toolbox to achieve the strategic goals of an agreement. The new agreement could formulate obligations or guidance for States to promote industry compliance with the performance measures set out in the sustainability criteria.

This can be achieved through the development of National Plastics Sustainability Standards that give effect to the international sustainability criteria. These may be further elaborated in National Plastics Management Plans (NPMPs).

At the same time, the convergence of industry standards at the international level, harmonised by international sustainability criteria, could help create a level playing field for industry and governments and incentivise the design of products that generate less waste or waste that is more likely to be collected and recycled. This would ultimately reduce the burden of waste management on municipalities and taxpayers.

Finally, a global agreement will provide us with a number of other common global functions:

- 1) **Monitoring and Assessment**
- 2) **Reporting**
- 3) **Financing and capacity building**
- 4) **Strengthening the science-policy interface**, on which we can further elaborate on later, if time allows.
- 5) **Education and awareness rising, behavioural change**

To us, it is clear that the AHEG has identified a new global agreement as an international response option as per our mandate from UNEA 3/7 10 (d) (ii) and that there is a growing support a new global agreement to be considered as a potential option for continued work by the UNEA as per UNEA 3/ para 10 (d) (v)

Thank you