

# Definition Article2 Suggestions:

---

# Where is the historical route of the Resolution 5/14 ?

---

In 2021, the UNEP released a report titled From Pollution to Solution: A Global Assessment of Marine Litter and Plastic Pollution. It was a good read then and still is now .It clearly defined global threat in need of a legally binding response: marine litter and plastic pollution.

The report laid out a compelling case for a treaty, covering everything from biological and ecological impacts to risks, economic costs, and even the indirect role of plastic debris in climate change. It helped build the foundation for what many expected — or at least hoped — would become a focused, targeted, and effective international agreement.

After UNEA 5/14 ,It was decided to sideline the word ‘marine’, radically expanding the size of the problem the treaty was meant to solve. Plastic pollution was no longer about the ocean — it was about land and air as well. And with that change, the treaty’s scope ballooned. More importantly, it altered the expected treaty’s legal character and nature. By removing the word ‘marine’ without replacing it with another clear determinant of transboundary relevance, the issue shifted to being mainly an international problem without considering its merits and various applications at domestic level.

# Why a Clear and exact definition part is important?

---

In the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT) states that treaty terms shall be interpreted within their “ordinary meaning”. But the ordinary meaning of pollution is “the presence in or introduction into the environment of a substance which has harmful or poisonous effects” (if you can call the Oxford Dictionary ordinary). With this definition , CO2 emissions from the production of plastic, from the transport of pellets on ships, or from the incineration of plastic waste, should not count as ‘plastic pollution’. It should count as CO2 emissions — for which there is international MEAs in place to deal with. And the regulation of the chemical content in baby bottles made of plastic is not a plastic pollution issue, but It is a human health issue. It should clearly be dealt with, but not by this treaty. For decades, this was obvious. Since 2022, it is not!

# Which definitions are vital for current framework?

---

**Plastic Pollution** : It is important to clearly define this term and keep the focus on meaning of the “ plastic pollution” definition on “mis-managed plastic wastes” and any other issues such as human health issue, chemical content in plastic and CO2 emissions from Plastic Value chain are followed in other related MEA and there is no need to expand the scope of the current instrument to other subjects in a manner to duplicate them in the current treaty.

**Life Cycle** : When plastic pollution is clearly defined then it is possible to focus the life cycle term from the creation of plastic pollution which is the plastic products stages and any upstream stage above it is excluded.

**Microplastic**: It is important to keep the Size scope of this term below 1000 µm and this definition is possible to advise based on ISO 24187 : 2023 part 3.2 page 1

“Any Solid Plastic Particle insoluble in water with dimension between 1µm to 1000µm(1 mm)”

# Suggested Definitions:

---

**Plastic pollution** : Pollution of the environment caused by plastic product waste mis-management.

**Plastic product** : Any finished article made of plastics.

**Plastic waste** : Means wastes from plastic products, which are disposed of or are intended to be disposed of or are required to be disposed of by the provisions of national law.

**Life cycle** : Consecutive and interlinked stages of plastic product's life starting from its design to final disposal of its waste and do not include the raw material production .

**Microplastic**: Any Solid plastic particle in water with dimension between 1  $\mu\text{m}$  to 1000  $\mu\text{m}$ (=1 mm). ISO 24187 : 2023-part 3.2 page 1