

Statement by the Federated States of Micronesia on Agenda Item 4.3(d) at Plastics INC-1

1 December 2022

Chair,

We agree that cooperation and coordination between bodies that conduct research into and disseminate knowledge about plastic production, consumption, and pollution will be key to the effective implementation of the ILBI. The Secretariat, in document UNEP/PP/INC.1/10, has helpfully identified a wide number of existing international instruments and intergovernmental processes that could be relevant in this matter, including the BRS Conventions, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, the CBD, and the UNFCCC.

As announced by AOSIS and the Pacific SIDS earlier this session, we support the establishment of a scientific, economic, and technical body under the ILBI that will provide key advice and guidance to Parties to the ILBI upon the request of those Parties. In the view of the FSM, such a body could, upon the request of the Parties to the ILBI, synthesize key data, information, and knowledge produced by similar bodies under other instruments and processes to develop a comprehensive understanding of the plastic pollution crisis, which could then provide a basis for robust recommendations to the Parties of the ILBI in the implementation of the ILBI.

As also announced by AOSIS earlier this session, including this morning, the work of a scientific, economic, and technical body under the ILBI could provide a platform for the consideration and transmission, in a rights-based manner, of traditional knowledge, knowledge of Indigenous Peoples, and local knowledge systems of relevance to understanding the impacts of plastic pollution on health and the environment as well as how to address those impacts. This is in line with paragraph 4(d) of the UNEA resolution launching the INC process, in which we all agreed that when we deliberate on the ILBI in the INC, we consider, among other things, the best available science, traditional knowledge, knowledge of Indigenous Peoples, and local knowledge systems. In that respect, we echo the interventions before us of the EU and its Member States, Thailand, the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States, among others, that it is critical to have a clear and comprehensive understanding of traditional knowledge, knowledge of Indigenous Peoples, and local knowledge systems in order to inform actions under the ILBI, alongside the important contributions of science. The intervention from the observer from the Inuit Circumpolar Council earlier today provided a useful example of the complementarity between science and Indigenous knowledge in the context of the governance of the central Arctic Ocean through an international legally binding instrument. Key advisory bodies such as the IPBES and the IPCC already incorporate the relevant knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to complement their evaluations of science. We have precedents we can cite and build upon for our important work here.

Thank you.