1. With regard to Provision 3(a) “Problematic plastic products”, the Russian delegations supports Option 3 with certain substantial drafting amendments:

[1. Each Party should identify at the national level problematic plastic products.]

1. [2.] Parties [Each Party is] are encouraged to take measures, consistent with their regulatory frameworks and processes, to gradually reduce the use of problematic and avoidable plastic products, identified within their national jurisdictions on the basis of relevant parameters, and based on taking due account of the availability, accessibility[,] and affordability [and environmental impact] of sustainable alternatives [like products made of any alternative materials, as well as socio-economic effects of such measures], in particular to developing countries, taking into account their national circumstances and capability.

Explanatory note:

- The focus should be on “problematic” products only, because this generic term would include all other specific circumstances that are captured by the text.
- Parties are “encouraged to take measures” given that there is a huge array of considerations that should be taken into account and which eventually could impede the adoption of any limitations at the national level.
- Measures and the relevant preceding decision-making processes should be “consistent with regulatory frameworks and processes” to ensure that Members maintain full sovereignty in this respect and the agreement does not prescribe any direct application of the disciplines.
- Any changes should be “gradual” in order for the consumers, industries, and all other related parties to gradually adapt to new rules and avoid any shortages and bottlenecks.
- “Problematic” products should be identified “within national jurisdictions” following national “regulatory frameworks and processes” and in accordance with the “relevant parameters”, because any attempts to reach consensus on either global list of products or common criteria for their definition would fail bearing in mind the wide range of national circumstances that could influence the choosing of products or criteria.
- In the process of decision-making Members should take due account of the following factors in order to avoid discrimination of plastic products vis-à-vis like products made of any alternative materials (i.e. not only alternative plastics, but also paper, aluminium, glass etc.):
  - availability, as technical ability of the industry to produce alternatives in the required volumes,
- accessibility, meaning the ability of consumers to obtain the required volume of alternatives in the market,
- affordability, which should be measured in terms of costs related to alternative material’s use relating to the consumers’ income,
- environmental impact of the alternative, which should be considered throughout its full life cycle.

And finally, domestic regulators should take due account of “socio-economic effects” of such restrictive measures based on the whole set of data and evidence that they would get throughout the process of public consultations about the proposed measures aimed at reducing the use of “problematic” plastic products.

2. With regard to Provision 3(b) “Intentionally added microplastic”, the Russian Federation supports **Option 0** – deleting Provision 3(b). We cannot support the restrictions on using microplastics as a material for production.