



## CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH

### Response to the Guiding Questions for the Second Informal In-Person Meeting of Heads of Delegation to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Plastic Pollution

27–30 September 2026 | Bangkok, Thailand

|                     |                                                                                                 |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Organization</b> | Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change Research (CHRCCR)                                    |
| <b>Status</b>       | Accredited non-governmental observer organization<br>In Special Consultative Status with ECOSOC |
| <b>Website</b>      | <a href="https://humanrightsandclimateresearch.org">humanrightsandclimateresearch.org</a>       |

#### Overall Approach.

CHRCCR supports an effective, equitable and implementable legally binding instrument that addresses plastic pollution across the full life cycle of plastics. The responses below focus on areas of convergence, bridging solutions and the allocation of matters between treaty text and subsequent Conference of the Parties (COP) decisions. The instrument should combine clear global obligations with nationally appropriate implementation, adequate means of implementation, human-rights safeguards, science-based decision-making and a just transition.

#### Cluster A:

- National plans
- Reporting
- Implementation and compliance
- Information exchange
- Effectiveness evaluation

#### 1. What purposes are National Plans expected to serve as a contribution to the achievement of the objectives of the instrument?

CHRCCR considers National Plans to be the principal mechanism for translating the commitments, global norms and legal obligations established under the instrument into effective implementation within national contexts. Their fundamental purpose should be to provide a coherent national roadmap through which Parties establish the policies, laws, regulations, institutional arrangements and practical measures necessary to give effect to the instrument and contribute collectively to its overall objective.

National Plans should therefore connect international obligations with domestic implementation and measurable outcomes. They should enable each Party, taking account of its national circumstances and capabilities, to identify national baselines, priorities, targets or milestones, implementation measures, responsible institutions, timelines, financing requirements, technology and capacity needs, and arrangements for monitoring and stakeholder participation. They should address relevant stages of the

full life cycle of plastics, including prevention and reduction of plastic pollution, product design, releases and leakages, environmentally sound waste management, existing and legacy pollution, remediation and just transition.

National Plans should also promote policy coherence by integrating treaty implementation into relevant national environmental, health, climate, biodiversity, industrial, trade and sustainable-development policies and regulatory frameworks. In this way, they should prevent implementation from operating in isolation and facilitate coordination among national and subnational authorities and relevant stakeholders.

Importantly, National Plans should provide a basis for implementation, accountability and progressive improvement. They should generate information for national reporting, enable assessment of implementation gaps and resource needs, facilitate international cooperation and support the effectiveness evaluation of the instrument. Periodic review and updating should allow Parties to strengthen their measures in response to implementation experience, scientific and technological developments and the findings of effectiveness evaluations.

The instrument should establish common minimum requirements for the preparation, implementation, review and updating of National Plans, while preserving sufficient flexibility for Parties to reflect different national circumstances, capacities and development needs. Detailed guidance on formats, indicators, methodologies and review cycles may subsequently be developed by the COP.

Accordingly, National Plans should function as the operational bridge between international commitments and domestic action, ensuring that obligations agreed at the global level are translated into coordinated, measurable and progressively strengthened national implementation and that national actions collectively contribute to achieving the objective of the instrument.

## **2. How could provisions on reporting, implementation and compliance, information exchange, and effectiveness evaluation support the overall implementation of the instrument, and what is the relationship between these articles?**

CHRECCR considers reporting, implementation and compliance, information exchange and effectiveness evaluation to be distinct but mutually reinforcing components of an integrated implementation and accountability framework. Their purpose should be to ensure that the obligations of the instrument are translated into action, implementation challenges are identified and addressed, progress is transparent and measurable, and the instrument remains capable of achieving its objective over time.

Reporting should provide the principal evidence base for assessing implementation. National reports should communicate the measures taken by Parties, progress achieved, implementation challenges, and financial, technological and capacity needs. Common core reporting requirements are necessary to promote transparency, comparability and assessment of collective progress, while reporting arrangements should avoid unnecessary burdens and take account of the capacities of developing countries.

Implementation and compliance should promote effective fulfilment of treaty obligations and assist Parties in identifying and overcoming legal, institutional, financial, technical and capacity-related barriers to implementation. The mechanism should be facilitative, transparent, non-adversarial and

non-punitive, while providing a credible process for considering implementation and compliance difficulties. Where non-compliance results substantially from capacity constraints, the mechanism should facilitate access to appropriate technical assistance, capacity-building, technology transfer and financial support.

Information exchange should support implementation by enabling Parties to share scientific and technical knowledge, regulatory experience, technologies, safer alternatives, good practices, lessons learned and information on available financial and technical assistance. It should therefore operate both as an independent cooperation mechanism and as a cross-cutting function connecting national implementation, reporting, capacity-building and effectiveness evaluation.

Effectiveness evaluation should assess whether implementation of the instrument is collectively producing the environmental, health and socioeconomic outcomes necessary to achieve its objective. It should draw upon national reports, information generated through implementation and compliance processes, scientific and environmental monitoring, and other relevant technical, financial and socioeconomic information. Its purpose should extend beyond reviewing whether individual Parties have undertaken particular measures to determining whether the instrument itself is working and where collective action may need to be strengthened.

These provisions should therefore operate as a continuous implementation and improvement cycle: National Plans translate treaty obligations into national action; implementation gives effect to those plans and obligations; reporting provides evidence of measures, progress and gaps; information exchange supports implementation and cooperation; the implementation and compliance mechanism identifies and assists in addressing implementation difficulties; and effectiveness evaluation assesses whether these combined efforts are achieving the objective of the instrument and informs future action.

The relationship between the articles should be expressly recognized while preserving their distinct functions. Reporting should not duplicate effectiveness evaluation, and effectiveness evaluation should not become an individual compliance procedure. Rather, information generated under each article should appropriately inform the others. This will create a coherent system of implementation, transparency, assistance, accountability, learning and progressive improvement.

CHRECCR therefore recommends that the core obligations, institutional relationships and functions of these mechanisms be established in the instrument itself, while detailed reporting formats, indicators, methodologies, review procedures, information-exchange arrangements and other technical guidance may be developed and periodically updated by the COP. This approach would provide legal certainty while allowing the implementation architecture to evolve in response to experience, scientific knowledge and the changing needs of Parties.

These provisions should operate as one implementation cycle: National Plans set intended action; reporting records measures and results; information exchange supports implementation and learning; the implementation and compliance mechanism assists Parties in addressing difficulties; and effectiveness evaluation assesses collective progress and informs future strengthening. Reporting should use common core information while avoiding unnecessary burdens, especially for developing countries. The compliance mechanism should be facilitative, transparent and non-adversarial, with attention to systemic implementation barriers. The treaty should establish these core functions and linkages; reporting formats, indicators, review procedures and technical methodologies can be developed or updated by the COP.

### 3. What will be the role of information exchange in the overall implementation of the instrument and how can it contribute to its effectiveness?

As stated above, Information exchange should support implementation by enabling Parties to share scientific and technical knowledge, regulatory experience, technologies, safer alternatives, good practices, lessons learned and information on available financial and technical assistance. It should therefore operate both as an independent cooperation mechanism and as a cross-cutting function connecting national implementation, reporting, capacity-building and effectiveness evaluation.

In summary, Information exchange should be a cross-cutting implementation function supporting product measures, design, waste management, remediation, finance, technology transfer, reporting and effectiveness evaluation. The treaty should require cooperation and exchange of accessible information on safer alternatives, chemicals of concern, product composition and design, technologies, monitoring methods, financing opportunities, good practices and relevant scientific, traditional and local knowledge. A global clearing-house mechanism should be operationalized by the COP and linked, where appropriate, to existing regional and international platforms. Protection of confidential business information should not prevent disclosure of information necessary to protect human health or the environment.

#### CLUSTER B

##### Cluster B:

- Releases and leakages
- Existing and legacy plastic pollution
- Plastic waste management
- Plastic products design
- Plastic products

#### 1. What considerations should guide decisions on determining which plastic products will require possible global measures, actions or cooperation?

CHRCR considers that decisions on plastic products requiring global measures, actions or cooperation should be guided by transparent, science-based, life-cycle and risk-based criteria, consistent with the comprehensive approach mandated under UNEA Resolution 5/14. Assessment should extend beyond the waste stage to consider impacts associated with production, product design, use, reuse, recycling and environmentally sound end-of-life management.

Priority for global measures should be given to plastic products that are unnecessary or avoidable; problematic or short-lived; highly likely to be released or leaked into the environment; persistent or difficult to recover; not capable of safe reuse, repair or environmentally sound recycling; contain or are associated with chemicals or polymers of concern; contribute significantly to microplastic or other plastic pollution; or present significant risks to human health, biodiversity, ecosystems or the climate. The scale and prevalence of a product in terrestrial, freshwater and marine pollution should also be considered.

Decisions should further assess whether the product performs an **essential or necessary function** and whether safer, technically feasible, accessible and affordable alternatives or systems are available. Alternatives should themselves be assessed across their life cycle to avoid regrettable

substitution or shifting environmental, health and climate impacts from one product, material, technology, population or environmental medium to another.

A further consideration should be the transboundary dimension of the product and its impacts. Global measures are particularly warranted where production, international trade, consumption, waste movements or environmental releases create impacts that cannot be effectively addressed through national measures alone. Particular attention should be given to preventing developing countries, including African countries, from becoming destinations for problematic or obsolete plastic products, hazardous plastic waste, polluting recycling activities or technologies that would not meet appropriate environmental and health standards elsewhere. Measures under the instrument should complement relevant international obligations governing chemicals and wastes.

The assessment should also incorporate human-rights, environmental-justice and socioeconomic considerations, including disproportionate impacts on children, women, workers and waste pickers, coastal populations and communities located near petrochemical facilities, dumpsites, recycling facilities and waste-burning sites. The implications of proposed global measures for livelihoods, employment and development should be addressed through just-transition measures rather than used to postpone action against products demonstrated to cause significant harm.

CHRECCR therefore supports a common global criteria-and-review framework rather than reliance exclusively on differing national product classifications. The instrument should establish the core criteria and legal basis for determining products requiring global action, while annexes or COP decisions could identify and periodically update specific products, product groups and associated control measures in light of evolving scientific evidence, technological developments and effectiveness evaluations.

Depending on the characteristics and risks identified, global responses should be proportionate and differentiated, ranging from product-design and information requirements, restrictions and extended producer-responsibility measures to progressive phase-down or phase-out of products that are unnecessary, avoidable or demonstrably problematic and for which safer and feasible alternatives exist. International cooperation, finance, technology transfer and capacity-building should accompany such measures, particularly for developing countries.

The treaty should establish transparent, science-based criteria for identifying products requiring global measures. Criteria should include likelihood of release or leakage; persistence; risks to human health and the environment; hazardous chemical content; contribution to microplastic pollution; difficulty of reuse, repair or environmentally sound recycling; disruption of circularity; prevalence in pollution; and transboundary impacts. Decisions should also consider necessity, essential uses, availability and affordability of safer alternatives, technical feasibility and socioeconomic impacts. Global action is particularly justified where transboundary production, trade or pollution limits the effectiveness of national action alone. The treaty should contain the criteria and authority for action; product lists, technical guidance and periodic updates may be addressed through annexes or COP decisions.

This approach would enable the instrument to establish common global protection against products presenting significant or transboundary risks while retaining sufficient flexibility to respond to essential uses, national circumstances, emerging scientific evidence and the availability of safer alternatives.

**2. What type of enabling factors should be considered to address existing and legacy plastic pollution, including the process to identify and evaluate the locations or accumulation zones and subsequent remediation efforts?**

CHRCCR considers that addressing existing and legacy plastic pollution requires an integrated framework for identification, assessment, prioritisation, remediation, financing, monitoring and accountability. Because accumulated plastic pollution is the result of historical as well as continuing production, consumption, trade, waste-management failures and transboundary movements, responsibility for remediation should not fall disproportionately on affected communities or developing countries with limited financial and technical capacity.

The first enabling requirement is an adequate knowledge and evidence base. Parties should develop harmonised methodologies for identifying, mapping and monitoring plastic-pollution hotspots and accumulation zones, supported by national inventories, environmental monitoring, geospatial and other appropriate technologies, scientific research, community knowledge and accessible data systems. International cooperation should strengthen the scientific and monitoring capacity of developing countries and address significant information gaps concerning terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine pollution.

Identification should be followed by a risk-based assessment and prioritisation process. Relevant criteria should include the quantity, concentration, persistence and characteristics of accumulated plastics; presence of hazardous chemicals and microplastics; risks to human health, biodiversity and ecosystem functions; potential for further releases and transboundary movement; impacts on water, food security, fisheries and livelihoods; and the vulnerability of affected populations and ecosystems. Particular attention should be given to communities located near dumpsites, waste-burning and recycling facilities, waterways and coastal accumulation zones, as well as children, women, workers, waste pickers and other groups experiencing disproportionate exposure.

Remediation should be based on the prevention, precautionary and polluter-pays principles and should apply environmentally sound standards. Proposed remediation technologies should be independently assessed for their environmental, health, climate, social and economic impacts. Removal of plastic pollution should not result in secondary pollution or simply transfer risks between land, water and air, between communities, or from one country to another.

A further enabling factor is the availability of adequate, predictable and accessible means of implementation. Dedicated finance, technical assistance, capacity-building and technology transfer should support identification, assessment, remediation and long-term monitoring, particularly in developing countries. Consistent with the polluter-pays principle, producers and other responsible economic actors should contribute appropriately to the costs of preventing and remediating plastic pollution rather than transferring those costs to governments, taxpayers and affected communities.

Institutional coordination, public participation and transparency are equally important. National and subnational authorities, scientific institutions, civil society, affected communities, workers and the private sector should have clearly defined roles. Communities should participate meaningfully in decisions concerning identification, prioritisation and remediation of polluted sites and have access to relevant environmental and health information.

Existing and legacy pollution may also have a **transboundary or global dimension**. Parties should cooperate where pollution originates in, moves through or affects more than one jurisdiction and where accumulation occurs in areas beyond national jurisdiction. Such cooperation should include

information sharing, technical assistance, coordinated monitoring and, where appropriate, joint remediation measures.

CHRECCR therefore recommends that the instrument establish the **core** obligations to identify, assess, prioritise, cooperate, remediate and monitor existing and legacy plastic pollution, together with the applicable principles and responsibilities. The COP should develop and periodically update technical methodologies, risk-assessment criteria, remediation standards, monitoring indicators and modalities for international cooperation. This would provide a common global framework while allowing remediation strategies to respond to different national circumstances, ecosystems and levels of capacity.

Implementation requires dedicated finance, technical assistance, technology transfer, agreed assessment methodologies, monitoring capacity and meaningful participation of affected communities. Identification of priority sites should be risk-based, considering scale and persistence of pollution, threats to human health and biodiversity, impacts on livelihoods and food security, and vulnerability of marine, coastal and other ecosystems. Remediation should follow environmentally sound standards and avoid secondary pollution. The treaty should establish the obligation to identify, assess, cooperate and act; the COP can develop technical criteria, remediation guidance and a mechanism for cooperation, including for areas beyond national jurisdiction.

### **3. How can Parties cooperate in the implementation of effective waste management policies, taking into account the different national circumstances and needs?**

CHRECCR considers international cooperation on plastic-waste management to be an essential component of implementation, but it should operate within the full-life-cycle and waste-hierarchy approach. Cooperation on downstream waste management should therefore complement, and not substitute for, measures to prevent and reduce plastic pollution at source, eliminate unnecessary and avoidable products, improve product design and promote safe reuse and circularity.

Effective cooperation should recognise the different legal, institutional, technological, infrastructural and financial capacities of Parties. Developing countries should not be expected to assume disproportionate downstream costs arising from global patterns of plastic production, consumption and trade. Cooperation should therefore include adequate finance, capacity-building, technical assistance and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to strengthen national legislation and enforcement; collection, sorting and reuse systems; environmentally sound recycling and disposal infrastructure; monitoring and data systems; and institutional coordination at national and subnational levels.

Parties should promote policy coherence and mutual supportiveness with existing international chemicals and waste regimes, particularly relevant obligations under the Basel Convention and, where applicable, the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. Cooperation should strengthen transparency and controls over transboundary movements of plastic waste and prevent developing countries from becoming destinations for hazardous or difficult-to-manage plastic waste, obsolete products, polluting recycling activities or environmentally harmful technologies.

Technology cooperation should be guided by environmental integrity. Technologies proposed for recycling, treatment or disposal including incineration, pyrolysis and other emerging processes should not automatically be regarded as circular or environmentally sound. Their environmental, climate, health, economic and human-rights impacts should be independently

assessed, taking account of emissions, residual wastes, energy requirements and the potential to perpetuate unsustainable plastic production.

Parties should also cooperate in developing extended producer responsibility and other appropriate economic and regulatory instruments that internalise the costs of plastic pollution. Producers should bear appropriate financial and operational responsibility for the collection and environmentally sound management of products and wastes arising from their activities, consistent with the polluter-pays principle. Such systems should be transparent and adapted to national circumstances.

A just transition must be integral to waste-management cooperation. Waste pickers and other informal-sector workers make significant contributions to collection, recovery and recycling, particularly in developing countries. Policies should recognise their role and protect their rights, livelihoods, occupational health and safety, fair remuneration and social protection, while ensuring their meaningful participation in the design and implementation of waste-management and extended producer-responsibility systems.

Cooperation should further promote regional and South-South approaches, including shared technical expertise, research, training, information platforms and, where environmentally and economically appropriate, regional infrastructure. Local innovation and locally appropriate solutions should be supported so that technology transfer strengthens domestic capacity rather than creating technological dependence.

CHRCCR therefore recommends that the instrument establish common minimum requirements for environmentally sound management of plastic waste and international cooperation, while allowing implementation measures to reflect national circumstances and capacities. COP guidance can elaborate technical standards, indicators and cooperation arrangements. Finance, technology transfer, capacity-building, transparency, stakeholder participation and compliance should be linked to these obligations so that waste-management commitments are capable of effective implementation.

The ultimate objective of cooperation should be not merely to manage increasing quantities of plastic waste more efficiently, but progressively to prevent and reduce the generation, movement and harmful impacts of plastic waste while ensuring that unavoidable waste is managed in an environmentally sound, equitable and socially just manner.

Cooperation should prioritize prevention and reduction while strengthening environmentally sound collection, sorting, reuse, recycling and disposal systems. Support should include finance, technology transfer, technical assistance, institutional strengthening, data systems and regional approaches where shared infrastructure is appropriate. The instrument should reinforce relevant Basel Convention standards and promote extended producer responsibility and other suitable economic instruments. Waste management must not substitute for upstream prevention. Just-transition measures should protect the rights, livelihoods, occupational safety and social protection of waste pickers and other formal and informal workers.

CHRCCR considers international cooperation essential to the effective implementation of plastic waste-management policies and recommends that Parties pursue coordinated action towards the common objective of ending plastic pollution, while recognising differences in national circumstances, capacities and development needs. Cooperation should promote policy coherence and mutual supportiveness; exchange of information, knowledge and good practices; adequate and

accessible finance; capacity-building and technical assistance; transfer and development of environmentally sound and locally appropriate technologies; institutional and regulatory strengthening; and, where appropriate, regional and South-South cooperation and shared infrastructure.

Such cooperation should strengthen environmentally sound collection, sorting, reuse, recycling and disposal systems, while remaining consistent with the waste hierarchy and relevant obligations under existing international chemicals and waste regimes, particularly the Basel Convention. It should also strengthen transparency and controls over transboundary movements of plastic waste and prevent developing countries from becoming destinations for hazardous or difficult-to-manage waste, obsolete products or polluting technologies. Extended producer responsibility and other appropriate economic instruments should ensure that producers bear an appropriate share of the costs of preventing and managing plastic pollution, while a just transition should protect the rights, livelihoods, occupational safety and meaningful participation of waste pickers and other formal and informal workers.

Importantly, cooperation on waste management should complement, and not substitute for, upstream measures addressing plastic production, product design, unnecessary and avoidable plastics and pollution prevention across the full life cycle. The instrument should therefore establish common minimum obligations for cooperation and environmentally sound management while providing flexibility in national implementation and differentiated support according to Parties' circumstances and needs, so that international cooperation strengthens domestic capacity rather than transferring environmental, financial or technological burdens to countries least equipped to bear them.

## CLUSTER C

### Cluster C:

- **Capacity-building, technical assistance, technology transfer, including international cooperation**
- **Financial resources and mechanism**

### **1. What elements must be considered to ensure that all available financial sources, including public finance, are effectively mobilized for the implementation of the instrument?**

CHRECCCR recommends that the instrument establish a dedicated, adequately resourced financial mechanism capable of providing adequate, predictable, accessible, timely and sustainable financing, particularly to developing countries, least developed countries and Small Island developing States. Mobilisation should draw from international and domestic public finance, private finance and appropriate innovative sources, while recognising that private and domestic resources should complement, not substitute for, international public support or shift disproportionate implementation costs to countries with limited fiscal and institutional capacity.

Financing should cover the full implementation chain including development and enforcement of national legislation and plans, institutional and scientific capacity, monitoring and reporting, pollution prevention, safe alternatives and reuse systems, environmentally sound waste-management infrastructure, technology transfer, just transition and remediation of existing and legacy pollution. Grant-based and highly concessional resources should be prioritised where debt burdens and limited fiscal space would otherwise constrain implementation, and access procedures should be simplified,

transparent and responsive to nationally identified needs. The polluter-pays principle, extended producer responsibility and other appropriate economic instruments should ensure that producers and other responsible economic actors contribute to the costs of preventing, managing and remediating plastic pollution rather than transferring those costs to governments and affected communities. The treaty should establish the financial mechanism, its core obligations, sources and functions, while the COP should operationalise eligibility, allocation, access, replenishment, monitoring and accountability arrangements. Importantly, the level and accessibility of financial support should be commensurate with the obligations undertaken under the instrument so that ambition and implementation capacity advance together.

The financial architecture should deliver adequate, accessible, predictable, timely and sustainable resources, particularly for developing countries, least developed countries and Small Island Developing States. It should combine international public finance, domestic resources, private finance and appropriate innovative sources without shifting agreed responsibilities onto countries with limited fiscal capacity. Grant and concessional finance should support enabling activities, institutional capacity, infrastructure, technology transfer, just transition and remediation of legacy pollution. Access procedures should be simplified and equitable. The treaty should establish the financial mechanism and its core functions; the COP should adopt operational policies, eligibility criteria, allocation arrangements and results frameworks. Polluter-pays and extended producer responsibility approaches should help internalize pollution costs.

## **2. What role should the private sector have in facilitating the mobilization of financial resources, capacity building and technical assistance, and what elements could be considered under the financial mechanism to promote such a role?**

CHRCCR considers that the private sector should be both a contributor to and an accountable participant in the implementation of the instrument, reflecting its role throughout the plastics value chain. Private-sector resources, technology and expertise should support pollution prevention, safer product design and substitution, reuse and refill systems, research and innovation, collection, environmentally sound waste management and remediation. However, private finance should be additional and complementary to public finance and international support and should not be used to transfer public obligations or pollution costs to developing countries and affected communities.

The financial mechanism should incorporate appropriate incentives for investments demonstrably aligned with the instrument's objectives, together with extended producer responsibility and polluter-pays approaches that internalise environmental and social costs. Private-sector participation should be subject to transparency and disclosure requirements, conflict-of-interest safeguards, environmental and human-rights safeguards, independent assessment, measurable outcomes and accountability, including safeguards against greenwashing. Companies benefiting from the mechanism should demonstrate consistency of their activities and investments with the objectives and obligations of the instrument. Public resources should not subsidise technologies, products or activities that perpetuate plastic pollution or transfer environmental and health risks between countries or communities.

The private sector should mobilize additional finance and expertise for safer product design, reuse systems, alternatives, pollution prevention, collection and environmentally sound waste management, while bearing appropriate responsibility for impacts across the value chain. Private finance should complement, not replace, public finance and international support. Any interface under the financial

mechanism should include transparency, conflict-of-interest safeguards, environmental and social safeguards, measurable results and accountability. Incentives should favour investments demonstrably aligned with the objective of the instrument and should prevent greenwashing or transfer of pollution costs to governments and communities.

### **3. What provisions related to technology transfer could foster international cooperation, considering the capacity differences between countries?**

CHRECCR recommends that technology transfer be expressly recognised as a core means of implementation and structured to reduce, rather than reinforce, technological inequalities between countries. Parties should cooperate to facilitate access to environmentally sound, safe, effective, affordable and locally appropriate technologies, on mutually agreed terms and consistent with applicable international obligations. Technology transfer should extend beyond equipment to include technical knowledge, skills, training, research partnerships, institutional and regulatory capacity, adaptation of technologies to local conditions and support for local innovation and manufacturing.

Priority should be given to technologies supporting pollution prevention, safer product design and alternatives, reuse and refill systems, monitoring and detection, collection and sorting, environmentally sound recycling and waste management, and remediation of existing and legacy pollution. Technology proposed as a solution should be independently assessed across its life cycle to ensure that it does not create secondary pollution, unacceptable health or climate impacts, or transfer obsolete or environmentally harmful technologies to developing countries. COP arrangements should facilitate needs assessments, technology-matching mechanisms, regional centres, research partnerships and South-South and triangular cooperation. Technology cooperation should ultimately build enduring domestic capacity and technological ownership rather than creating continuing technological dependence.

The treaty should recognize technology transfer as a core means of implementation and require cooperation to facilitate access to environmentally sound, safe, effective and locally appropriate technologies on mutually agreed terms, consistent with applicable international obligations. Support should include equipment, know-how, skills, research partnerships, institutional capacity and adaptation of technologies to local conditions. Priority areas include prevention, safer design and alternatives, reuse, monitoring, collection, recycling, environmentally sound waste management and remediation. COP arrangements should promote needs assessments, regional centres, South-South and triangular cooperation, and safeguards against transfer of obsolete or environmentally harmful technologies.

## **CLUSTER D**

**Cluster D:**

- Preamble
- Objective
- Principles and approaches
- Definitions
- Just transition
- Public information, awareness, education and research
- Secretariat
- Final provisions

**1. Which principles and approaches could be useful in guiding the effective implementation of the instrument, and how could these be best reflected in the instrument?**

CHRECCR recommends that principles which guide the interpretation, implementation and future development of the instrument be expressly reflected in the treaty rather than left entirely to subsequent COP guidance. These should include prevention; precaution; polluter pays; international cooperation and the duty not to cause environmental harm; sustainable development; intergenerational equity; environmental justice; a full-life-cycle approach; protection of human health and the environment; best available science; public access to information and meaningful participation; just transition; gender responsiveness; and recognition of differing national circumstances, capacities and development needs. The treaty should also expressly recognise the relevance of human rights, including the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, and protect the rights to health, information, participation and effective remedy. Core principles should therefore appear in the instrument, while COP decisions may elaborate technical guidance for their practical application.

**2. How can actions related to public information, awareness, education, and research support implementation?**

CHRECCR considers public information, awareness, education and research to be implementation and accountability tools rather than supplementary activities. Parties should ensure timely, understandable and accessible information on plastic pollution, product composition and chemicals of concern, pollution releases, environmental and health risks, safer alternatives, waste management and relevant implementation measures. Public access to information should support meaningful participation in national planning, decision-making, monitoring and evaluation. Education should strengthen behavioural and institutional change through formal, informal, professional and community programmes, while research should address knowledge gaps concerning human health, microplastics and nanoplastics, biodiversity and climate impacts, product design, safer alternatives, circular systems and socioeconomic effects. Developing-country universities and research institutions should receive targeted financial, technological and capacity support so that the scientific evidence informing implementation is geographically representative and locally relevant. Citizen science, community monitoring and traditional and local knowledge should also be appropriately recognised. The treaty should establish the core duties relating to information, education, participation and research, while the COP should facilitate international research cooperation, information platforms, priorities and programmes.

**4. Considering the progress achieved so far in the discussions related to issues such as the Secretariat and definitions, does the current formulation in the Aid to Negotiations reflect the level of detail required?**

CHRCCR supports a streamlined instrument but considers that streamlining should not come at the expense of legal certainty or effective implementation. Terms that determine the scope, application or content of substantive obligations should be sufficiently defined in the treaty to promote consistent interpretation and implementation. Technical classifications, criteria and lists that require regular adjustment should be placed, where appropriate, in annexes or addressed through COP decisions, enabling the instrument to respond efficiently to scientific, technological and implementation developments without reopening the treaty itself. Similarly, the treaty should establish the Secretariat's essential administrative, coordination, reporting, information-exchange and implementation-support functions, while detailed operational arrangements may be determined by the COP. The appropriate test should therefore be whether an issue requires treaty-level legal certainty or subsequent technical adaptability: the former belongs in the instrument; the latter may appropriately be developed through annexes or COP decisions. The interim period should be used to develop the guidance, reporting formats, methodologies and institutional arrangements necessary to avoid delays in implementation following entry into force. The current approach can be streamlined, but key legal terms that determine the scope or operation of obligations should be defined in the treaty to ensure consistency and predictability. Highly technical classifications, criteria and lists should be capable of development or updating through annexes or COP decisions so that the instrument can respond to scientific and technological change. Secretariat provisions should state the essential administrative, reporting, coordination and information-support functions, while detailed working arrangements may be decided by the COP. The interim period should be used to prepare draft guidance, reporting formats, technical criteria and institutional arrangements needed for timely implementation after entry into force.

## **CHRCCR PRIORITY BRIDGING PROPOSALS**

### **CHRCCR Priority Bridging Recommendations**

1. Establish legal certainty while preserving adaptability: place core obligations, principles, criteria, institutional functions and means-of-implementation commitments in the treaty, while allowing technical methodologies, lists, indicators and operational guidance to be developed and periodically updated through annexes or COP decisions.
2. Create one integrated implementation architecture: connect National Plans, implementation, reporting, information exchange, compliance, effectiveness evaluation, finance, technology transfer and capacity-building so that information and support flow coherently across the instrument.
3. Match ambition with implementation support: obligations undertaken by developing countries should be accompanied by adequate, predictable and accessible finance, technology transfer, technical assistance and capacity-building necessary for effective implementation.
4. Preserve the full-life-cycle mandate: upstream prevention, product design and measures addressing problematic plastics should complement, not be displaced by downstream waste management and remediation.
5. Apply common global criteria with nationally appropriate implementation: establish science-based global criteria for products and activities requiring action while permitting implementation pathways responsive to national circumstances and capabilities.

6. Prevent displacement of environmental burdens: implementation, trade, waste-management and technology-transfer arrangements should not transfer plastic pollution, hazardous waste, obsolete technologies or disproportionate financial burdens to developing countries and vulnerable communities.
7. Make polluters contribute to implementation: operationalise polluter-pays and extended producer responsibility approaches so that the costs of preventing, managing and remediating plastic pollution are not borne predominantly by governments, taxpayers and affected communities.
8. Embed rights and justice throughout implementation: human rights, environmental justice, public participation and just transition should operate across the instrument, with particular attention to affected communities, workers and waste pickers, women, youth and groups in vulnerable situations.

## CONCLUSION

CHRCCR encourages Heads of Delegation to use the Bangkok discussions to identify practical areas of convergence capable of delivering an ambitious, equitable and implementable instrument. A viable landing zone should combine clear global obligations and common minimum standards with nationally appropriate implementation; integrate National Plans, reporting, compliance and effectiveness evaluation into a coherent implementation cycle; and match obligations with adequate finance, technology transfer, technical assistance and capacity-building. The instrument should preserve the full-life-cycle mandate of UNEA Resolution 5/14, prevent the transfer of environmental and financial burdens to developing countries and affected communities, and embed human rights, environmental justice and just transition throughout implementation. Core legal obligations should be secured in the treaty while technical matters capable of evolving with science, technology and implementation experience may be progressively developed through annexes and COP decisions. This balance would provide the legal certainty, equity, adaptability and international cooperation necessary for the instrument to achieve its objective of ending plastic pollution, including in the marine environment.

### Submitted by

Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change Research (CHRCCR)

[rightsandclimatechangeresearch@gmail.com](mailto:rightsandclimatechangeresearch@gmail.com)

*Climate Justice is Human Rights Justice*