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The intervention of the Russian Federation in regard of Article 5

We strongly oppose setting any goals to reduce demand for feedstock and finished products. Such provisions shift the focus of negotiations away from the key problem – insufficient development of the waste management systems. It also goes far beyond the scope and objectives of the agreement, which is to end pollution from plastic waste.

As for subsection 5(b), we also oppose the idea of setting refill, reuse, and repair targets in Part II of Annex C. Countries significantly differ in terms of the level of development of waste management systems as well as production and recycling capacities. It is impossible to take such level of diversity into account and come up with any uniform targets suitable for every country. That is why we support the alternative paragraph OP2alt in section 5(b).

We believe we need to put brackets in paragraph 1 of 5(b) over “the reduction [in the use],] reuse, [recycling,] refill, repair, repurposing and refurbishment” in line 5 - since it can be considered as alternative approach to the next bracket [circularity approaches].

As for subsection 5(c), the Russian delegation highlights that in accordance with safety requirements, not every type of product can contain recycled plastic (a good example is syringes). In this regard, we do not support the idea of establishing uniform quantitative (percentage) goals for using secondary resources content. Prescribing specific requirements for the transition to recyclable materials in international agreement (especially in the form of specific percentage) is dangerous.

As for the streamlined text, we ask to put entire paragraph 3 of 5(c) in brackets. It is based on option 3 of the Revised Draft. But we cannot assume that all countries supported this Option for it to be included as agreed one (Russia does not support option 3 and consequently paragraph 3).

As for subsection 5(d), the Russian Federation supports Option 0 for the following reasons:

- The terminology and scope of this article is unclear..
- Article 5(d) discriminates plastics made from hydrocarbon raw materials for the benefit of alternative types of plastics, which may be not less harmful than “conventional” plastics.
- According to many studies, biodegradable plastics are among the major sources of microplastic pollution.
- Plastics made from alternative materials are generally less environmentally friendly when considering the full life cycle of finished products. They also shall be separately collected and recycled.