Cuba’s statements on CG1 about Core obligations

Option 1: Phasing out/or reducing the supply of, demand for and use of primary plastic polymers

Cuba support the position presented by Samoa on behalf of AOSIS. In addition we only will point out the following:

1. The main goal of this instrument should be end the plastic pollution, and not ban or eliminate any product itself when it is not dangerous to the human health. My country is not producer of primary plastic, but any measure based on production restriction will have an economic impact on global trade, in particular on prices of the products. So, for that reason, we can’t support 10 a i.

2. However we agree that there should be measures related to sustainable production and this should be reflected in national commitments, so for that reason we consider that 10 a ii is very necessary.

3. Also it is important transparency on information related to the production of raw material, especially for countries that are not producer. So, we are able to discuss the idea that is in 10 b iii, taking into account the national circumstances and capabilities of the countries, in particular the developing ones.

4. We don’t support the use of licensing schemes for import and export of virgin and secondary plastic polymers.

5. Finally, any market-based measures should be consider as part of a voluntary contribution to the national commitments, and not mandatory at global level.

Option 2: banning phasing out and/or reducing the use of problematic and avoidable plastic production

In addition on the Samoa statement of behalf of AOSIS we would like to add that:

A clear definition is required within the instrument on problematic and unnecessary plastics. So, we strongly support number 11 b and consider that it is essential to start defining that.
There are notable differences between the plastic products that could be considered problematic and unnecessary in terms of their use, waste management, and environmental and health impacts.

For example, single-use plastics that are used in the health sector are very different than those used in tourism. Nor are there alternative substitutes for all these products.

So, we consider that any decision of measures such as ban, phase out, reducing or control will depend on the product. Based on that, Cuba is able to negotiate the different measures that are listed in Option 11 c), using a possible annex to the instrument.

**Options 3 and 4:**
Cuba considers that options 1 to 4 (in particularly 13.a) should be clustered under an article related to *Production*.

About Option 3 it is important to have a clear list of the chemical and polymers of concern, based on scientific evidence and also this instrument should not duplicate regulations of products made by other conventions like Stockholm.

The list can be as an annex of the instrument and be updated over time, as new scientific evidence becomes available.

Transparency is important and it should be applied depending on the national circumstance and capabilities. We support option 12 c roman 2.

About microplastic we support 13 a roman 1 and b romans 2 and 3.

Finally, we reiterate that for all measures it is essential that developing countries can receive financial support, capacity building and access to technologies.
Option 5: Strengthening waste management

Cuba joins the statement of Samoa on behalf of AOSIS and in addition considers that actions on this issue are very important to achieve the objective of the instrument. At the same time, these actions are among those that most demand means of implementation for developing countries, in particular access to technologies.

It is also necessary to explicitly recognize that developing countries will be able to implement the different measures depending on their national circumstances and capacities.

So, in this sense we support option 14 a) roman 1 and 4.

We support 14 c) roman 2 to avoid duplication of work that Parties already started doing in Basel Convention for regulating the transboundary movements of plastic waste.

Options for regulating plastic waste (as appear in 14 b) have to be determine at the national level, depending the capacities of each country, in particular the prohibition of certain practice to waste management and any kind of indicators. In that sense we support that was explained by Bahrain about the use of waste-to-energy processes.

About EPR schemes, we support that the scope and their options have to be nationally determine on a voluntary base. At the global level it could be useful to monitoring examples of how it works.

Options 6, 7 and 8:

Cuba support the Samoa statement. In addition I wish to point out the following:

1. Some measures presented in options 6, 7 and 8 can be applied at global level and other at national one.
2. In that sense, we consider that 15 a) is very important and should be defined in a subsidiary body of the instrument. Labelling is also important to be globally implemented, but taking into account the national circumstance and capabilities.
3. Measures 15 b), c), e) and f) can be adopted at the national level in a voluntary bases.
4. Related to reduce and reuse we consider that it is necessary to have general and sectorial guidelines. For that reason we support 16 b) roman 1.
5. The rest of the measures include in 16 shall be applied at national level, that is 16 a) and b) roman 2 to 5, depending on national circumstances and capacities; as well as the means of implementation available for developing countries.
6. Option 8 is very important and developing countries need to have access to the new technologies and participate in scientific and innovation projects in cooperation with developed countries. So, in that sense we support in particular measure 17 a) roman 1.
7. Cuba also support 17 b) roman 2 and 3. The number 4 can be applied at national level.
8. We don´t support the establishment of a mandatory certification scheme at global level.

**Options 9 and 10:**

Cuba joins Samoa statement on behalf of AOSIS in relation to option 9, especially the cooperation on science, technology and innovation is crucial.

In addition we want to refer that options 9 and 10 should be clustered in one article related to **Addressing pollution**. So for that reason I will comment both options.

All measures propose in option 9 para 18 should be country driven and will also depend on the national circumstances and capabilities.

At global level it is important monitoring and exchange information about the best available technology and best environmental practices, under the conduction of a subsidiary body in the Instrument. This idea is close to one appears in para 19 b) roman 3.

We also support options for specific sectors like 19 b) romans 1 and 2, but they should be decide at the national level on a voluntary base.