Proposed response template on written submissions prior to INC-3 (part b)

Potential Areas Identified by the Contact Groups

At its second session, the intergovernmental negotiating committee (INC) requested the secretariat to invite written submissions on:

- Any potential areas for intersessional work compiled by the co-facilitators of the two contact groups\(^1\), to inform the work of INC-3.

The template below was prepared by the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair, and is meant as a guide to assist Members and Observers in preparing their written submissions.

All written submissions must be sent to unep-incplastic.secretariat@un.org. The submissions received will be made available on the INC webpage.

Please note that not all fields in the template need to be answered in the submission.

**Deadline for submissions:**

I. By 15 August 2023 for written submissions from observer organizations.

II. By 15 September 2023 for written submissions from Members of the Committee.

---

\(^1\) Contact Group 1 focused on Section A: Objective(s). Section B: Substantive Obligations; Contact Group 2 focused on Sections C: Means of Implementation. D: Implementation measures. E: Additional matters as contained in part II of the Annex to document UNEP/PP/INC.2/4.
NAME OF COUNTRY
Guinea-Bissau

NAME OF ORGANIZATION
Isabel Maria Almeida Evangelista Sanha
E-mail: belitaevangelista@gmail.com
Phone/Whatsapp: +245 966 761 059

DATE OF SUBMISSION
14 September 2023

Input on the potential areas of intersessional work to inform the work of INC-3 (following the lists compiled by the co-facilitators of the two contact groups)

Potential areas for intersessional work

The list of potential areas for possible intersessional work compiled by the co-facilitators of the two contact groups at INC-2 is set out below. Members and observers may wish to provide input on one or more of these areas.

Contact group 1:

1. Information on definitions of, e.g., plastics, microplastics, circularity
2. Information on criteria, also considering different applications and sectoral requirements, including:
   a. Chemical substances of concern in plastics,
   b. Problematic and avoidable plastic polymers and products and related applications
   c. Design e.g., for circularity, reuse
   d. Substitutes and alternatives to plastic polymers and products
3. Potential substances of concern in plastics, problematic and avoidable plastic polymers and products
4. Potential sources of release of microplastics (applications and sectors).

(Please note: A longer list is included in the co-facilitators report on discussions in contact group 1. Submissions may also include input on any of the items in that longer list, such as, amongst others, the development of criteria to prioritize problematic and avoidable plastics; the development of targets for the reduction, reuse and repair of problematic and avoidable plastic products; or the guidelines on EPR)

2 The report can be accessed here: https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/42621/CG1.pdf
Contact Group 2:

1. To consider the potential role, responsibilities and composition of a science and technical body [to support negotiation and/or implementation of the agreement]
2. To consider potential scope of and guidance for National Action Plans [including optional and/or suggested elements]
3. To identify current provisions within existing MEAs [and other instruments] on cooperation and coordination that could be considered
4. To consider how other MEAs provide for monitoring, and suggest best practice
5. To consider options to define ‘technology transfer on mutually agreed terms
6. To further consider how a potential financing mechanism could work [including a new standalone mechanism, a hybrid mechanism, or an existing mechanism]
7. To identify options to mobilize and align private and innovative finance (including in relation to matters at 24(e) and the proposed Global Plastic Pollution Fee (GPPF))
8. To map current funding and finance available [to address plastic pollution] and determine the need for financial support for each Member
9. To identify capacity building and training needs for each Member.

Inputs relating to potential areas for intersessional work. Please identify clearly which area your input relates to. Contact Group 2:

Guinea-Bissau intends to participate in Contact Group 2.

- To further consider how a potential financing mechanism could work [including a new standalone mechanism, a hybrid mechanism, or an existing mechanism]

States should establish a new, dedicated plastics multilateral fund with funding originating from member states and other sources. There is so much to do to end plastic pollution yet the existing GEF funding which is shared among other chemicals MEAs will not be enough to effectively implement the treaty. Intersessional work is needed to determine how this fund could be created, replenished and function to implement the treaty.

- To identify options to mobilise and align private and innovative finance (including in relation to matters at 24(e) and the proposed Global Plastic Pollution Fee (GPPF))

Producers of chemicals, plastics and other related industries will have to contribute towards the plastics treaty fund through fees, taxes and other schemes such as the EPR schemes. These finances have to address plastic pollution across boarders as plastics are often exported to either as a material, product and packaging. In addition, some plastics leakage may occur during flooding and be deposited in the ocean and may need a mechanism to mop them. The Intersessional working
group will have to determine the structure of remittance and the methods of cost internalization and implementation.

- To map current funding and finance available [to address plastic pollution] and determine the need for financial support for each Member:

The intersessional group should focus on identifying the areas that need funding, those that are already receiving funding and those that are not. The areas identified to not receive funding but are crucial for effective implementation of the treaty should be prioritised. This will also ensure that there is no duplication of activities.

Prioritization of intersessional work

There is need for prioritization of the intersessional work to begin with the upstream measures including the elimination, reduction and phase down targets, on chemicals and substances of concern, on the problematic and avoidable plastic polymers and high-risk products and the criteria for granting exemption in uses. The plastics treaty will be effective if the upstream sources are significantly addressed and as urgently as possible.

Priority should be focused on the criteria of identifying and scaling up sustainable alternatives systems, including reuse systems. These will ensure that all the problematic and non-essential plastics will have sustainable replacements.

Furthermore, mandatory requirements and standards on how products are designed and manufactured (including the materials/chemicals they contain) should be defined products that do not meet the requirements are effectively prohibited or phased out.

As part of intersessional work, Technical Expert Working Groups with clear mandates and expected outputs should be established to guide the committee with best available technical knowledge and science.

Priority should also be given on the work on financial mechanism to ensure implementation and compliance to the treaty.