**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:
   1. Chemical substances of concern in plastics,
   2. Problematic and avoidable plastic polymers and products and related applications
   3. Design e.g. for circularity, reuse
   4. 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 prioritise 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)*

**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 mobilise 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.

We suggest the following areas should be prioritized for intersessional work:

Contact group 1:

1. Information on definitions of, e.g. plastics, microplastics, circularity

A broad working definition of plastics is key to an effective instrument that actually reduces plastic pollution. Plastic should be defined as all stages of the plastic lifecycle including fossil fuel feedstock extraction that is destined for use in plastic production, chemicals and polymers made from fossil fuels, resins used in producing plastic items, the plastic products themselves, and the waste products that derive from plastic along its lifecycle.

“Circularity” should not be defined in such a way that it serves to perpetuate the myth that recycling can solve the plastic pollution problem. Many kinds of plastic can’t be recycled or can’t be safely recycled. Globally recycling has proved a failure in efforts to address plastic pollution, with only 9% of plastic recycled on average. It is a myth that plastics can be truly “circular,” or recycled in perpetuity. When recycling is feasible, it results in material degradation over a brief span of time.

Instead, we support a definition of circularity that prioritizes reuse and sharing (e.g. circulation of reusable, refillable, or repairable items), and economic instruments to support and incentivize reuse systems. Circularity of durable goods within closed loop systems (such as hospitals, schools, and government buildings) have enormous potential to lead the way towards uptake of reuse systems more broadly, such as within cities, industries, or supply chains.
2. **Information on criteria, also considering different applications and sectoral requirements, including:**
   
c. **Design e.g. for circularity, reuse**

The treaty should set up binding targets for reuse and repair, key upstream solutions that can help reduce overall plastic production. It should further include more aggressive targets in consumer goods and packaging where scalable solutions for reuse already exist. For fuller comments on design for reuse please refer to a joint statement signed by Pacific Environment (Contact org for joint submission is Hasiru Dala; Contact names: Pinky Chandran and Nalini Shekar).

3. **Potential substances of concern in plastics, problematic and avoidable plastic polymers and products**

The instrument should take lessons learned from past treaties governing chemicals such as the Stockholm Convention. **Key steps include grouping chemicals of concern, identifying and eliminating chemicals that should be banned to protect human health and the environment, and ensuring no use of chemicals for which there is no adequate safety data (No Data No Market.)** We support suggested criteria for chemical groupings and bans listed in this IPEN report.

4. **Potential sources of release of microplastics (applications and sectors).**

The instrument should address intentional and unintentional release of microplastics into the environment (including human bodies) all along the plastic value chain. This includes release from plastic production facilities (where nurdles and microplastics often leak into the environment), and from plastic disposal facilities, such as incinerators (where microplastic escapes as part of incinerator ash). **With mounting evidence of plastic accumulating in human bodies, including this latest study finding plastic in many heart tissues,** now is a critical time to assess the full extent of microplastic release and the impacts of microplastics in the environment.

**Contact Group 2:**

10. **To consider the potential role, responsibilities and composition of a science and technical body [to support negotiation and/or implementation of the agreement]**

**Intersessional work should be done to organize and fund independent scientific research** by individuals and institutions that have no ties to the plastic industry. Such research should: (a) guide and inform Working Groups, member states, and the negotiation process including the design of effective control measures; (b) support member countries, particularly lower income countries, to obtain data on plastic production, use, and pollution in their region.