Norway’s written interventions as prepared for INC-2

Contact group 1

Objective

- Norway aligns itself with the many delegations expressing support for option 9 (a).

- We believe this will provide a clear and easy to understand objective while underlining the need to protect the human health as well as the environment throughout the life cycle of plastic. The treaty and its objective would also benefit from being further supported by relevant targets throughout the life cycle.

- Norway would also be open to include progressive and time-bound targets for reaching this objective, and would propose to explore a target of ending plastic pollution by 2040.

Core obligation 1: Reduce production of primary plastic polymers

Complete version as prepared

- For every tonne of primary plastics that enters the economy, the risk of adverse effects on the environment and human health increase and the complexity and cost of solutions becomes higher. Norway is of the opinion that the plastic treaty must reduce the overall volume of primary plastic polymer production in order to achieve the objectives of the treaty.

- We suggest to include an article for Measures to reduce the supply of primary plastic production in the zero draft with the following options reflected as legally-binding provisions:

  - This delegation supports option 10 a (i) of a global science-based target. This is important to support a transition to a more circular economy and guide financial flows towards solutions throughout the life cycle, such as investment in alternative materials and service models.

  - Norway can also support option 10 a (ii) to have nationally determined targets, but this should be in relation to a global target. National targets will not alone suffice.

  - Transparency will be a prerequisite to determine progress in reducing primary production and controlling chemicals and polymers of concern, but also to assess the need for additional control measures. We also note the call from the finance sector to set mandatory disclosure requirements for businesses and financial institutions to address existing barriers for managing risk and aligning financial flows with the goal of ending plastic pollution. As such, Norway supports option 10 b (iii).
• In general, this delegation also supports pursuing option 10 c to apply market-based measures to reduce production and consumption of primary plastics while also recognizing the need for some flexibility to determine which national measures would be efficient.

• We would also highlight the removal of negative subsidies for primary plastic production (option 10 c) as an important measure to increase competitiveness of alternatives.

• When it comes to option 10 b (ii) on applying import and export requirements and option 10 b (iv) on establishing licensing schemes, this delegation will listen to other delegations’ views with interest.

Core obligation 2: Eliminate specific plastic products of concern

Complete version as prepared

• Norway does not produce most of the plastic products we see in our streets and waterways. A legally binding provision to ban those products of particular concern will help importing countries to regulate them effectively, and support a shift to more sustainable production and consumption patterns. As such, we would like to see the zero draft reflect option 11 a, b, c, d and e as legally binding provisions.

• Option 11 (c) is suitable to rapidly take action on the most obvious contributors of plastic pollution. The plastics products which have a high risk of becoming litter and those products that of particular concern given their characteristics, for example such as persistence or toxicity.

• We also would support option 11 (b) to establish criteria for products that should be considered for bans/prohibition. This could be complemented with a concrete list of products and possibly listing specific uses or sectors that might be exempted. Possible criteria include:

  a. use is avoidable or replaceable with reusable options;
  b. contain listed polymers and chemical of 2valuat or their production, use or disposal poses risks to human health and the environment;
  c. not recyclable and/or hinder the recycling of other items and/or cannot safely be recycled in light of its o hazardous content; and
  d. high likelihood of becoming litter.

• In principle, Norway supports option 11 (a), but this should be considered in relation to option 1 b (iii) under obligation 1.

• To make bans on listed plastic products effective, Norway supports option 11 (d) to apply import and export requirements referring specifically to the listed products. All
trade measures should be in line with WTO regulations and apply to all Parties and non-parties on a non-discriminatory basis.

- This delegation sees the need for undertaking technical work in the intersessional period to develop criteria and to inform our consideration of which products that would be suitable for being listed in order to have meaningful engagement on alternative provisions in the zero draft at INC-3.

Core obligation 3: Eliminate and restrict specific polymers and chemicals of concern

Complete version as prepared

- This delegation would underline the importance of eliminating certain polymers and chemicals of concern to protect the environment and human health from plastic pollution.

- As a first, and important step, chemical substances with severe long term effects on human health and the environment must be avoided in the manufacture of plastic products and in the plastic products themselves. For chemicals with such severe intrinsic hazardous properties, the risk is not adequately controlled, regardless of the exposure to humans or the environment.

- The most efficient measure will be to prohibit the use of such polymers and chemicals, or groups of chemicals where appropriate, in plastic production and to establish a list based on relevant criteria. This is necessary to protect the environment and human health and enable the transition to a safe circular economy for plastics and in line with option 12 a (i) which Norway fully support.

- Import and export restrictions are an important tool to prevent trade of listed polymers and chemicals of concern regulated by the treaty. Norway also support option 12 a (ii) which we see as complementary to option 12 a (i). All trade measures should be in line with WTO regulations and apply to all Parties and non-parties on a non-discriminatory basis.

- The ban of chemicals with severe long term effects on human health and the environment should be based on the criteria established in the UN Globally Harmonised System for classification and labelling of chemicals (GHS) and include chemicals that for example may cause cancer, infertility, affect the hormone system, do not degrade in the environment or accumulate in the food chain.

- In addition, chemicals restricted at global level and regionally, where thorough assessments have already been done, should be restricted in the plastic treaty without further assessment. Such global treaties include the Stockholm convention, the Minamata convention and the Montreal protocol. At regional level the EU legislation is a good example (REACH, EE-products (RoHS), toys, biocides, food
contact materials etc.). Also relevant is chemicals included in the “emerging policy issues” under SAICM.

- A group approach is important when restricting the most harmful chemicals in plastics, to avoid regrettable substitution. Chemicals that belong to the same groups as chemicals identified to be a risk to human health and the environment, are presumed to also carry the same risk. That means that we must not replace those eliminated chemicals with chemicals of similar concern.

- Norway also support option 12 b (i) as transparency is necessary to make informed decisions by all stakeholders involved in plastics value chains, from regulators to designers, manufacturers, consumers, waste dealers, dismantlers, and recyclers. However, this cannot not be limited to existing national legislation because different requirements will add to the cost of compliance for producers and data will not be comparable between jurisdictions. We must develop a common approach in order to achieve a level playing field.

- Disclosed information about chemicals and polymers must also be linked to individual plastic materials and products to be traceable throughout plastics value chains. Therefore, we also support option 12 b (ii) to have this information made readily available throughout the life cycle in order to effectively protect those whom will use and manage the products, and to ensure the safety and quality in secondary materials.

- Norway is positive to pursue options that will lead to chemical simplification, as mentioned in option 12 c (i). This would need to be developed in parallel to obligation to eliminate the most harmful polymers and chemicals of concern.

- We also see the need for undertaking technical work in the intersessional period to develop criteria and to inform our consideration of which polymers and chemicals, or groups of chemicals, would be suitable for such a approach. This will contribute to clarify discussion of the alternative provisions in the zero draft at INC-3.

Core obligation 4: Reducing release of microplastics

Complete version as prepared

- To achieve the objective of ending plastic pollution from all sources, the treaty should also include microplastic as recognized in the UNEA resolution 5/14.

- Microplastic is an especially worrying source of plastic pollution found in all environmental compartments – including in the most remote regions of the world. It accumulates in the environment and poses a growing risk to the environment and human health. Its transboundary nature, being transported through waterways and air, requires international measures in a global agreement.
• Microplastic is spread both through its intentional use in products, as well as by degradation from larger plastic items. The agreement should include all sources of microplastic pollution and address both intentionally added microplastics as well as unintentional release of microplastic.

• To address the intentional use of microplastic, the agreement should include a legally binding obligation as proposed in option 13 (a) (ii). By targeting production, sale, distribution, trade and use, we ensure that the obligation encompasses the entire lifecycle of intentional use of microplastic. This will be most effective in reducing the problem. It is important however, that plastic pellets are not included in this definition of microplastics – as plastic pellets, flakes and powder will be needed in a circular economy to create secondary plastic.

• To address the unintentional release of microplastics, the agreement should include a legally binding obligation for parties to reduce the unintentional release of microplastics. In our view, such measures would benefit from a sectoral approach, considering the diverse nature of microplastic release and allowing for a start-and-strengthening approach. Option 13 (b) (iii) would be a good starting point for discussions. One could consider a legally binding obligation for parties to require the use of best available technology (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP) to address release from identified sources as listed in an annex.

• The agreement should also address the issue of plastic pellets and implement measures to minimize the risk of leakage from production, storage, handling, and transport as proposed in option 13 (b) (i). However, it is important that such an obligation include all sorts of plastic pellets, flakes and powders to be used for the production of secondary plastics. Plastic pellets should therefore be defined in terms of its use and not in terms of size, as these particles can exceed the common size limits for microplastic. One could therefore consider including option 13 (b) (i) under core obligation 9 to avoid confusion in terms of definition.

Core obligation 5: Strengthen waste management

Complete version as prepared

• Plastic waste generation is on track to triple by 2060. The world will not be able to manage the volume of plastic waste and avoid leakage. In addition to minimize plastic waste generation and reduce pressure on overburdened waste management infrastructure worldwide, this delegation emphasize the need for provisions to ensure environmentally sound waste management in line with the waste hierarchy.

• This section provides a comprehensive list of options and should be consolidated as many of them are overlapping.
• We support **option 14 a (i)** as there is a clear need for scaling up waste management infrastructure.

• We should commit to working towards **global targets** for collection and recycling, as well as setting appropriate **national targets** for this, and we would therefore support **option 14 b (iv)**.

• We prefer setting targets upstream, including recycled content and recyclability, and midstream, including for reuse, as well as downstream for collection and recycling. A separate target for generation of plastics waste for final disposal in line with option 14 a (ii) would then be redundant.

• While there is a need for guidance to ensure environmentally sound waste management, we should avoid duplicating the work under the Basel Convention, including its recently updated Plastic Waste Technical Guidelines.

• Regarding **option 14 a (iii)** on guidance, we would highlight that the Plastic Waste Guidelines under the Basel Convention covers both point (b) and point (c). When it comes to point (a), Norway could support the notion of developing guidance for encouraging investment in waste management infrastructure and highlights the possibility to consider this in relation to options related to EPR.

• It is clearly necessary to address leakages from movement and end of life management of plastic waste. Norway would support in principle **option 14 b (i)**, but underline that this could be consolidated with other options under waste management as well as potential linkages with core obligation 9 on eliminating the release and emissions of plastics to water, soil and air.

• Norway would not support banning the practices listed in **option 14 b (ii)** except from open burning.

• When it comes to **option 14 b (iii)**, we believe that such guidance has been developed for the Basel technical guidelines for plastic wastes.

• We do not see the need to pursue specific treaty requirements for producers to develop action plans as suggested in **option 14 b (v)**. But we support the notion of holding producers responsible for waste generation.

• **Option 14 c (i)** deals with the environmentally sound management of plastic waste, which is an important issue. However, the Plastic Waste Guidelines under the Basel Convention covers these aspects, and we should avoid duplicating this work.

• We agree that the treaty should rely on the Basel Convention regarding control of transboundary movements of hazardous waste and their disposal, as suggested in **option 14 c (ii)**.
• Norway agrees that statistical data for exports of plastic waste is an important issue. This is covered by reporting obligations under the Basel Convention. Quotas for exports, as suggested in option 14 c (iii), seems like an inflexible solution, but it could be interesting to discuss the setting of targets for exports, in order to stimulate national waste treatment capacity.

• When it comes to option 14 c (iv), (v) and (vi), Norway believes that these should be addressed under the Basel Convention.

• Option 14 d (i) deals with the demand for secondary plastics and with environmentally sound recycling of plastic waste. The latter aspect is already covered in the Plastic Guidelines under the Basel Convention. We support to include requirements to increase demand for secondary plastics in the treaty, but it should be left to parties to develop specific measures, such as using public procurement. However, specific measures could be the subject of guidance that are developed under the treaty.

• Norway would like to underline the importance of obligations and targets for recycling, and would therefore support option 14 d (ii). However, this should be combined with option 14 b (iv), which is very similar, and possibly incorporated with other options under waste management.

• We underline the relevance of using EPR schemes as a national measure to incentivize recycling, as suggested in option 14 d (iii), and to secure other interventions along the value chain of plastics. We would be interested in an open discussion as to how EPR schemes should be incorporated in the treaty and whether using them should be a binding or a voluntary provision. It should furthermore be noted that a practical manual on EPR was adopted under the Basel Convention in 2019, and we should avoid duplicating this work.

• While recycling is key to strengthening waste management, requirements covering financial support or tax exemptions, as outlined in option 14 d (iv), and investments in recycling facilities, as suggested in option 14 d (vi), is quite specific aspects that could be included in guidance under the treaty but not as binding obligations.

• Option 14 d (v) deals with best available technologies for recycling, which is already covered in the Plastic Waste Guidelines under the Basel Convention.

Core obligation 6: Enabling design for circularity

Complete version as prepared

• Plastic products need to be designed to be reusable and recyclable while containing recycled plastic content free from chemicals and polymers of concern to enable the

1 See working document UNEP/CHW.14/5/Add.1
safe circulation of plastic materials. More sustainable design of plastics products will also spur innovation to avoid leakage of macro- and microplastics during the use-phase.

- Norway calls for legally binding obligations to ensure that plastic products produced, manufactured and put on the market are in line with certain sustainability or circularity criteria. As such, we support both option 15 (a) and option 15 (b).

- In order to establish a level playing field for businesses, we need global rules to guide design. National requirements for design criteria, without a basis in the treaty’s global criteria, will not be an efficient solution, and is not in line with our position.

- International sustainability criteria can guide the standardization of plastics for different materials, products and sectors. However, we should not confuse the role of the plastic treaty with bodies such as the ISO in terms of developing technical standards and sectoral codes of practice. However, the Conference of Parties may encourage such bodies to take up complementary work.

- This delegation also support option 15 (e) to set a clear global target for required minimum recycled content. This should be complemented by sector-specific targets, starting with high priority sectors such as single-use and packaging. This will incentivise investment in new product design, increase competitiveness of secondary plastics and is a key indicator of progress towards circularity.

- In general, Norway support option 15 (d) regarding labelling measures. Harmonizing product information and avoiding misinformation about environmental performance of products. We would however note that transparency and traceability is also addressed in option 12 b (ii) and should be complementary.

- We are also supportive of option 15 (f) to establish a central data registry to support transparency and traceability.

Core obligation 7: Reduce, reuse and repair of plastic products

Complete version as prepared

- Transitioning to a circular economy for plastic, which is underpinned by the waste hierarchy, is a key part of the solution to end plastic pollution. As such, we are generally supportive of obligation 7 on reduce, reuse and repair.

- This said, discussions about reduction measures are broadly covered by obligations 1-4 and would like to focus discussions on reuse and refill-systems for this obligation.

- Each rotation or ‘use’ of a plastic product further reduces the environmental impact associated with producing and disposing of an item. Reusing items as many times as possible significantly improves resource efficiency and reduces the constant need to
discard and manage the waste, decreasing its chances of ending up in the environment.

- Recycling is often framed as the solution to the plastic crisis despite the fact that waste management systems are currently overwhelmed and only a fraction of waste generated is recycled.

- Wherever possible, reducing the production and usage of non-essential plastic products should be the first priority. Waste prevention means measures taken before any product or packaging has become waste. Reuse reduces the quantity of waste generated. Therefore, reuse should be prioritized over recycling as a more resource efficient approach which reduces carbon emissions over the entire material lifecycle and prevents waste generation.

- This is particularly, but not exclusively, the case for packaging, which has rightfully been identified as one of the worst causes of plastic pollution and avoidable resource consumption. About one third of the global plastic production is used in the production of packaging and results in about 40% of global plastic waste. The overwhelming majority of plastic packaging is single-use, so that on average the total lifespan for plastic packaging is only 6 months.

- We recognize the need to set out a harmonized policy framework to level the playing field and encourage the private sector to scale reuse solutions and services. This will also help build consumer habits and acceptance of reuse models. Refill-systems are also relevant in many contexts.

- Setting an overall reuse target for all goods placed on the market will also send a strong signal to all market sectors to transition. Reuse targets may be set regardless of material to avoid an unintended increase in multi-use plastic products where other materials are fit for purpose.

- Norway would like to pursue option 16 (a) to set a target on reuse as well as continue discussions on appropriate regulatory measures such as those outlined in option 16 (b), including developing guidance and criteria.

- We are also cognizant of significant differences between both sectors and product segments and would support developing sector-specific guidance in line with option 16 b (i) as well as setting sector-specific reuse targets, especially for packaging.

**Core obligation 8: Alternatives and substitutes**

**Complete version as prepared**

- In our view, the most important consideration regarding alternatives and substitutes must be to avoid using primary raw materials when possible. Rather than substituting
single-use plastic products with single use products using alternative materials, we need to consider reuse and refill systems that keeps materials in the economy.

- In those instances where primary raw materials cannot be avoided, this delegation would see merit in developing criteria to guide the promotion of safe alternatives and substitutes in line with option 17 b (ii), in order to avoid negative impacts such as land and water use, human health and greenhouse gas emissions.

- We would underline that criteria for safe alternatives and substitute must adhere to the same sustainability requirements as plastic products, in option 15 (a) and (b).

- Norway also supports option 17 b (iv) to use economic instruments to reduce the use of plastics and increase the adoption of safe and sustainable alternatives. According to UNCTAD, plastic materials and products generally have lower tariffs than plastic substitutes. This suggests the need to take action to change the incentive structure of plastics versus substitutes.

- For example, paper straws have a global average tariff rate of 13.3 per cent, while plastic straws’ global average tariff is 7.7 per cent.

- In general the environmental cost of a plastic product must be reflected in the market price to enable guide the market in the use of materials.

- There are still many areas where plastic is used where it can be replaced by other materials. Many alternatives are well used/proven and can be recycled or are biodegradable, but the alternative materials will vary in different sectors/areas of use. Today many well-functioning systems (such as multiple-use glass bottler for beverages/steel boxes for spices and food) are replaced by plastic.

- There is a danger in creating lock-ins to certain plastic polymers if countries establish infrastructure for recycling for uses where plastics could easily/preferably be substituted. Some alternative materials do not have the risk of chemical migration.

- Aluminum, steel, glass, wood, paper, banana leaves are example of materials in use. Some of these can be used multiple times and recycled in infinity. Life cycle analyses (LCA) have often had a bias on climate considerations and looked less at pollution and biodiversity. A life cycle analyses must also include end-of-life considerations - waste.

**Core obligation 9: Eliminate release of plastic to air, water and land**

**Complete version as prepared**

- All provisions on reduction, waste management and circularity will support eliminating emissions and release of plastics through prevention. But even if we can include
effective obligations upstream, we will also need to directly target release and emissions to the environment.

- Plastic is a pollutant like any other and must therefore be treated as such in national legislation. The treaty should include a legally binding obligation as the proposed option 18 (a) for parties to reduce, and where possible eliminate, release of plastics to water, soil and air.

- To identify appropriate measures to reduce release for each source and each pathway, a sectoral approach should be taken. With a focus on prioritizing the largest known sources and strengthen the measures over time as new knowledge is developed.

- Through a sectoral approach one can develop and require the use of best available technology (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP) for different sources and activities releasing and emitting plastic as proposed in option 18 (b).

- In addition to this general and sectoral approach to release of plastics, there are certain plastic products that are used directly in the environment, and therefore pose a higher risk of littering and harm to the environment.

- It should be legally binding for parties to take effective measures to prevent and reduce loss of certain plastic products particularly likely to end up in and causing harm to the environment and animals or marine life such as fishing gear, agricultural products or similar. We therefore support the inclusion of a provision like the suggested option 18 d). It is however important to cover all sources of littering applied directly in the environment, including but not limited to fishing gear. We would appreciate further research on similar sources within aquaculture, agriculture and possibly others.

Core obligation 10: Addressing existing plastic pollution

Complete version as prepared

- To achieve the objective of ending plastic pollution, we must also address existing litter and pollution in the environment. This is important both to limit the impact of larger plastic items on nature and wildlife, as well as to reduce the risk of it breaking down into microplastics that would be almost impossible and very costly to remediate.

- The treaty should include an obligation for parties to identify, prioritize and address in an environmentally sound manner areas of plastic waste, as proposed in option 19 (a) ii and option 19 (b) i and ii.

- It is important that remediation efforts are based on best available techniques and best environmental practices, including to ensure that activities respect biodiversity
and prioritize efforts in areas that have the largest impact, such as rivers, beaches, hot spots for ghost fishing gear and similar.

- The parties should, as proposed in option 19 (b) iii, develop criteria and guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices, including to ensure that clean-up activities respect biodiversity and are tailored to specific circumstances.

- Addressing existing plastic pollution will be an important addition to address plastic pollution. This can, however, not replace prevention measures through upstream measures and actions closer to the source of pollution.

Contact group 2

Means of implementation

- We find it rewarding to hear all the contributions from member states and appreciate the good spirit in which these consultations are conducted. We are convinced it in part is due to the work of our two particularly excellent co-facilitators.

- MOI is always challenging, but the good discussion has brought out a number of promising factors that will help us find common ground on mobilizing resources. We are optimistic about agreeing financial mechanisms;

- The core obligations being negotiated in the other work stream will greatly affect the size of the financing challenge, and the kinds of issues to build capacity for. A big advantage in this plastics process is the opportunity to apply and operationalize the polluter pays principle. Let us as a starting point – through our work on PPP in the instrument - seek to make the need for external or domestic finance as small as we possibly can.

- We are encouraged by the many countries - across all regions - that recognize the central role of the private sector in developing and investing in solutions. Businesses can thrive and grow decent jobs while doing it.

- While a lot of the job of tackling plastic pollution can and should be done in the market, it requires markets to be well regulated and aligned across borders to succeed. Capacity-building for this purpose is one of the most important things to raise finance for, especially in the countries with the biggest gaps in technical and financial capacity.

- A great number of different methods and approaches to mobilizing more resources have been identified in the process so far, as is clear in the options paper. Different methods are suitable to different parts of the plastic value chain.
• We recognize on this background the need for the instrument to make reference to all sources, as well as to the advantages of including in the instrument language of alignment of different sources of finance with the objectives of the instrument. The effect of such a call has been compelling before.

• We further recognize that it can provide a lot of comfort to many countries, not least producing countries, to further consider the possibility of including aspects that can underpin predictable and transparent trade relations, including aspects to underpin good relations between parties and non-parties. But this is something we would welcome an opportunity to explore further with experts.

• As stated clearly at INC1, Norway recognises the need for an agreement like this to have a financial mechanism. Here is a choice to be made.

• Our preference is to build on an already established mechanism. The advantages to that are obvious to us, not only because we would like to see available funding going to financing activities towards the goals of the agreement, rather than for costs to establish and administrating a new mechanism and avoiding the long time to make it effective and well governed. But more than that, we fear that much learning could go to waste, rather than have the mechanism benefit from 30-40 years of lessons learned.

• A broad-based established mechanism, such as the GEF, has the significant advantage of being able to see different environmental issues under one lens, optimizing resources across them. Remember, we call the new instrument a plastics agreement, but we could have called it an ecosystem agreement, a species preservation agreement, a food security agreement or a health agreement, or driver of inclusive circular economy and decent jobs agreement. Our point is that we must see the issue of plastics in its wider contexts. An existing instrument like the GEF can fully leverage the advantages of a more integrated approach.

• So co-chairs, to sum up our position on financial mechanism with reference to the options paper, we are particularly supportive of article 24 b, and in the interest of time, rather than going into all of the items under 24 c about other innovative sources of finance, we refer to the EU intervention on this, sharing their support for the different elements.

• Finally, let me thank fellow delegates for all their excellent and innovative proposals.

**National action plans**

• On national action plans This delegation, support **options 29. a) b) and c)**. Under **options 30**, that we read as three alternatives, we would support **option 30 b)** Harmonized guidance on NAPs.
Exchange of information, awareness raising and education

- Norway sees Exchange of information, awareness raising and education as an important element of a new treaty. We refer to UNEAS/14 OP3. (j) “To increase knowledge through awareness-raising, education and the exchange of information”. Norway would therefore suggest that the zero draft combine the set of options E1 on awareness raising and education with options E2 exchange of information in the relevant section.

- Exchange of information is a cross cutting issue and we understand that options related to options 34 and 35 are discussed under contact group 1.

- Norway would in principle support options 35. a) and b) as presented. We note that option 35. b) I on mandatory disclosure of harmonized information on chemical/material composition of plastic products is discussed under option 3 production, consumption and use of chemicals and polymers of concern core obligation 12 a) and b) in contact group 1.

- On awareness raising and education, as regards the proposed activities and provisions under Options 34. a) and b) we see that option 34 b) iii on public access to information relates to option 12 b (ii) on increasing transparency of chemicals and polymers in plastics through marking, labeling and product passports. Option 15 d) on establishing labelling measures for plastic products will allow informed choices by consumers. We propose that the zero draft refer to the relevant core obligation discussed in contact group 1.

- This delegation strongly support 34. b) v on the role of the Global Partnership on Plastic Pollution and Marine Litter.

Stakeholder engagement

- We support initiating a multistakeholder action agenda with a sectoral focus. The objective of the multistakeholder action agenda should be to accelerate implementation and progress towards the core obligations in the Plastics Treaty. We hope to come back to this.

- Norway supports initiating a multistakeholder action agenda with a focus on specific sectors, to support the implementation of the treaty, with zero tolerance for greenwashing, as well as to share knowledge, scientific evidence, expertise, and technology, and to mobilize financial resources and align financial flows to support implementation.

- The objective of the multistakeholder action agenda should be to accelerate implementation and progress towards the core obligations in the Plastics Treaty. The Multistakeholder Action Agenda could also provide a platform for business, industry,
cities, and local government as well as other stakeholders to commit to taking actions and support the implementation of the Treaty.

- This delegation underlines that Stakeholder action and voluntary commitments must be guided and supported by global rules and government action to ensure progress and a fair playing field.

- We support the proposed options 40. a) and b) to promote ambitious action and promote cooperation by high level engagement, local, regional, national and global focus, mobilizing financial and technical resources from stakeholders and of sharing knowledge and best practice to scale up what works.

- On option 40. a) ii we propose to add that the multistakeholder action agenda should also have a sectoral focus aligned with sectoral programmes of work developed by the Conference of the Parties.

- With respect to mechanisms of the multistakeholder action agenda proposed under 40. b) we believe the most important mechanisms should be on general principles of accountability, transparency and science to ensure actions accelerate progress towards the core obligations set out in the Plastics Treaty and to avoid greenwashing.

- Norway supports option 40 b) i) on models and cooperation with existing structures and coalitions.

- This delegation has called for the Treaty and the Conference of the Parties to initiate sectoral programmes of work to develop science-based sectoral strategies to address implementation of the core obligations and seek to cooperate and coordinate with other conventions, instruments and organizations and promote the involvement of stakeholders from across the value-chain, and cooperate with the Multistakeholder Action Agenda

**Compliance mechanism**

- The treaty should have a compliance mechanism.

- It should be expert-based, fair, facilitative and non-punitive. It should function in a manner that is transparent, non-adversarial and non-punitive.

- The parties to the Stockholm Convention was able to agree to a compliance mechanism, but only after 18 years of negotiations. Norway sees a compliance mechanism as an integral element to the treaty and like for the Minamata Convention, it should be negotiated as part of the final agreement at INC5.
Cooperation and coordination

- This delegation notes many of the proposed cooperation and coordination options 39. a) technologies, b) research, c) capacity building, d) awareness raising and f) monitoring refer to other obligations and that the zero draft should refer to these options as stand-alone obligations rather than options under cooperation and coordination.

- Provisions for cooperation and coordination would follow up UNEA res 5/14 OP.3 (k) “To promote cooperation and coordination with relevant regional and international conventions, instruments and organizations, while recognizing their respective mandates, avoiding duplication and promoting complementarity of action;”

- Therefore, Norway propose the treaty to further promote cooperation and coordination with relevant regional and international conventions, instruments and organizations with a focus on the different core obligations, for example as relates to chemicals and waste and the BRS conventions.

- Another example for cooperation and collaboration with relevant conventions is on options for core obligation option 13 (b) i) Minimize the risk of leakage of plastic pellets from production, handling, transport and the use of certain products. A stated in our submission, this delegation propose that each Party should be required to take effective measures to eliminate releases of plastics pellets to the environment. Measures could include regulation to prevent loss at all stages including production, handling, transport and storage. Obligations and measures should seek to complement and not duplicate efforts in other Conventions such as under the IMO.

- Equally, the core obligation option 18 (d) on taking effective measures to prevent and reduce loss of fishing gear containing plastic should leverage, cooperate and coordinate with existing efforts, including those of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and IMO.

- This delegation also recall the HAC Ministerial Joint Statement regarding the triple planetary crisis of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution and recognise that these challenges are inextricably interlinked and mutually reinforcing. We therefore propose a particular focus on coordination and coordination with the climate and biodiversity conventions in relation to the global targets to reduce pollution risks from all sources, protect and conserve at least 30 percent of ocean and 30 percent of land by 2030, and restore degraded ecosystems, as well as reducing greenhouse gas emissions to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees in line with the Paris Agreement.

- In conclusion, Norway suggests that the zero draft on cooperation and coordination be based on agreed language from other MEAs and that proposed options if binding refer to the relevant core obligation and if voluntary refers it to the multistakeholder action agenda.