

DRAFT SUMMARY – TUESDAY Governance, Room XVI

AM SESSION

Elements to consider:

- Need to take immediate action and move beyond status quo.
- We lack a structured response. Clear need for coordination and priority setting at global level: to steer the process and promote prevention pillar.
- Platform suggested
- There is a basis for a vision through the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and UNEA3.
- Start with building up voluntary. Opportunity to build on Global Partnership on Marine Litter and strengthen it or modify it
- Deeper analysis of option 2, beyond what is in the paper today.
- Take into account national, regional and local realities.
- Need resources to take action. Donor database – way to access funding, draw lessons on efficiency of funding.
- Transparency is an issue. Limited capacity for many related to additives and recycling.
- Need for National targets.
- Upstream is important. Upstream measures and dialogue with other actors. Also to address consumption and production.
- Need to ensure that private sector, community and NGOs are engaged.
- Important role of private sector in taking responsibility. Provide finance.
- Get everyone on board, opportunities through UNEA, regional seas, Basel etc.
- Do not interfere with existing frameworks.
- Provide roadmaps - System level changes required. For food for example.
- Review system. Ensure we are moving forward. Set up an architecture where we help each other move forward.
- Need to define elements to progress on the options.
- Consider legal binding agreements for governance
- Strengthen existing platform and what in future might be crafted by legally binding agreement
- Take steps to get global consensus on prioritizing actions that make most impact
- Call for a global dedicated meeting place
- Roles and responsibilities of actors further identified. Local government and city mayors included.

- Strengthening regional level to involve member countries and implement action at national level

PM SESSION

Presentation of four proposal (see documentation on portal) and ensuing discussion:

- Sweden: proposal builds in UNEP assessment – 3 pillars
- CIEL: Thought-starter design - architecture based on 4 pillars.
- Norway: Paper is not a proposal on architecture – but to help to be more specific
- WWF: not unlike the other suggestions/ ideas – address gaps

Certain commonalities continue to come back:

- o Need to enhance coordination
- o Need to work on prevention dimension, which means upstream
- o Work with instruments that already exist

Coordination to intertwine all these instruments – reflect binding and non-binding agreements more clearly

Further elements to consider:

- Start off with regional strategies. Easier to get countries to agree if they have same economic policies. Not all countries at same level. Start with something simpler.
- Negotiating a treaty might be long and expensive. Annual estimated costs of impact of marine litter however is also US\$13bn per year and rising quickly.
- Need to be coordinated – do we or do we not need a negotiated agreement to get that coordination?
- Discussion may develop toward a more robust architecture. But need more research on this issue and focus on priorities
- Develop existing mechanism further. Working horizontally. Endeavour new funding mechanisms
- General agreement that urgent work will need to be done in the meantime as soon as possible. Building from work done by UN experts over a long time – not just thought up.
- Platform suggested. GPML could be the one? Tomorrow GPML presentation.
- UN Environment is concluding GEO6 report. What are findings of this global outlook report on this particular subject? Decisions from UNEA can help deal with the issues. Also relevant in this regard is the Implementation Plan in Pollution.
- Look at the short term, mid-term and long-term
- Need global, regional national level action plans
- How could the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) play a role in this coordination effort? Also many other platforms: G7 charter, G20 action plan, Ellen MacArthur foundation; Basel convention etc.– what are regional agreements doing, their scopes, limitations? Are there still gaps? Where are they? New elements to address these in structure. UN Environment/ UNEA well placed to address

- Secretariat is requested to do a mapping that looks at what we have in light of the previous point. American Chemistry Council will help coordinate overview many private sector efforts underway.
- Important to engage cities who often have a primary responsibility for dealing with waste
- Given current mandate of GPML it would be possible to address all the lifecycle aspects. Broad enough in approach? Including recycled material of good quality. GPML only may not be sufficient.
- message – what can be done?
- Suggestions for short term action:
 - o Do national assessments of solid waste management and sources
 - o Global data base for monitoring
 - o Short term solutions already listed under UNEA resolutions and UNEA3 assessment
 - o Voluntary commitments at national level
 - o Recyclability of fishing gear
 - o Study on link plastics and malaria and cholera
 - o Ensure jobs offered by business are sustainable
- All of these suggested actions and more were already listed in UNEA2 and 3 resolutions and a lot of analysis requests were already available in the UNEA2 and 3 UNEP assessments.
- Premature to consider a binding agreement until we know what the priorities are