On Part II 9b – [Fishing gear]

The Philippines believes that abandoned lost and discarded fishing gear is a grave threat to biodiversity in the marine environment that deserves special mention in the international legally binding instrument.

The Philippines aligns with the position of SIDS and other member states to move fishing gear to Article 8 to ensure that a life-cycle approach is taken.

We recognize the links between lost, abandoned or otherwise discarded fishing gear and wider problems of pollution of the marine environment and the challenge of marine debris, including plastics and microplastics.

We should enhance efforts to prevent and mitigate the impacts of all kinds of lost, abandoned or otherwise discarded fishing gear, including from ghost fishing and marine debris from plastics and microplastics.

In line with existing multilateral frameworks, we support the establishment of mechanisms and incentives for the regular retrieval of derelict gear and for monitoring and reducing discards of fishing gear to prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds.

We should consider innovative options to address the problem, including mechanisms for the retrieval of lost, abandoned or otherwise discarded fishing gear, identification of owners of gear and gear registries, among others.

Furthermore, we emphasize the importance of a cooperation mechanism with assistance to developing countries on marking, tracing, retrieval, and reporting to reduce and ultimately eliminate the problem of fishing gear.
On Part II 3a – Problematic [plastic products]** and avoidable plastic products [and groups of such products]**, including short-lived and single-use plastic products

The Philippines supports Option 1, that is, each party shall not allow the production, sale, distribution, import or export of problematic and avoidable plastic products listed in Annex B after the dates specified in the Annex.

We believe the criteria must be science-based that address safety, sustainability, essentiality, and transparency. We feel strongly that the safety criteria should be hazard-based.

The measures taken to implement the provisions shall be reflected in nationally determined timeframes for reductions, consistent with the phase-out dates in the Annex.

Because of the potential for socio-economic impacts especially among low-income communities, bearing in mind the need for just transition, we support time-bound exemptions, and knowledge sharing, as well as robust capacity building, support and technology transfer, particularly to developing countries, in light of their circumstances, to meet their obligations under this Article.

We appreciate the work of groups of member states in developing Conference Room Proposals and we are willing to work on the basis of these proposals.

#END
The Philippines supports Option 1. In particular, we support safe and environmentally sound waste management, including minimum rates for collection, recycling, and safe disposal based on harmonized indicators set out in Annex F.

We support nationally determined targets and minimum requirements, and prioritize the top of the waste hierarchy.

We support promoting coherence and coordination being with relevant instruments and bodies including the Basel Convention.

We support the US proposal of ensuring that emissions and releases from waste management should be addressed, including microplastic generation in recycling facilities.

Last but not least, we believe that waste workers, including waste pickers and others in the informal sector many of them are women as well as communities adjacent to waste facilities, should be protected from exposure to chemicals and other hazards. Thus, this section should be linked with the Article on Just Transition, also bearing in mind the special circumstances of SIDS, and the challenges of archipelagic states, geographically disadvantaged states, most environmentally vulnerable states, and downstream states.
SG 1.3

On Part II 10b. Transboundary movement of [non-hazardous] plastic waste

The Philippines supports Sub-Option 1 but we would like to emphasize the importance of transparency as provided in Sub-Option 1 paragraph 3 which requires the exporter to provide the importing state with vital information to protect health and the environment.

Developing countries cannot protect themselves from the dumping of plastics, and even hazardous waste in the guise of waste management, without the disclosure listed in paragraph 3.

We also support paragraphs 5 and 6, Sub-Option 3 and 4, to prevent the dumping of plastic waste.

#END
On Part II 11. Existing plastic pollution, including in the marine environment

On possible streamlining of this article, we recommend that the duty to cooperate to preserve and protect the marine environment under UNCLOS and customary law be highlighted as a possible chapeau/(broad clause) under Paragraph 1.

Then following this, the specific duties could be indicated:

For instance, OP4 bis, on duty of states that are largest beneficiary of plastic goods to take the lead in tackling legacy and existing plastic pollution in the marine environment including areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Then there should be a clear path towards addressing this, and elements in current article 11 could be structured in this way: First, identification of most affected by existing plastic pollution, including accumulation areas; and then, identification of effective measures. The measures indicated could be included in an Annex, as part of Part IV.1 on national plans.

A link to the special circumstances of SIDS, and challenges of archipelagic states, geographically disadvantaged states, most environmentally vulnerable states, and downstream states could also be made under this article.