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This submission is intended to support the INC Secretariat with considerations on potential elements in the global instrument on national action plans in advance of INC-3.

The Global Plastic Action Partnership (GPAP) hosted at the World Economic Forum (WEF) supports countries with their transition to a circular plastics economy. The initiative partners with ODA governments to build country-driven multistakeholder partnerships (so-called National Plastic Action Partnerships, NPAPs) to develop and implement national plastic action roadmaps. NPAPs are neutral, independent and locally led platforms that enable collaboration between national governments and other vital partners to turn plastic waste and pollution commitments into action.

NPAP roadmaps assess a country’s specific context and, based on that context, outline a range of scenarios and potential actions the country can prioritize. The roadmaps do not recommend or prescribe any specific direction or measures, and, therefore, do not play the role of national action plans. They can, however, serve as foundational ‘options papers’, providing a shared evidence-base and clear future scenarios that can support national governments and other relevant stakeholders in decision-making and developing their national action plans.

As such, this submission focuses on question 3 (additional considerations) with a specific lens on national action plans (NAPs) and how insights gained from existing national action can contribute to the refinement of NAP requirements in the global instrument for the highest possible level of effectiveness and impact.
Elements not discussed at INC-2

1. Scope

What is the proposed scope for the future instrument?
Which types of substances, materials, products and behaviors should be covered by the future instrument?

2. Principles

What principles could be set out in the future instrument to guide its implementation?

3. Additional considerations

Provide any other relevant inputs, proposals or priorities here that have not been discussed at INC-2 (e.g. preamble; institutional arrangements, including governing body, subsidiary bodies, scientific and technical cooperation and coordination, and secretariat; final provisions including dispute settlements; and if appropriate annexes).

1. Proposed criteria for National Action Plans (based on NPAP learnings):

- **Legislative approach**: NAPs are more effective if legally binding, supported by national legislative and institutional framework.\(^1\)

- **Compliance**: NAPs should have compliance measures to ensure member state commitments within NAPs are met.\(^2\)

- **Evidence-based approach**: NAPs should entail robust monitoring, evaluation, reporting and sharing of data. Overall, the development of the future instrument and any associated global and national frameworks and action plans should be based on credible evidence and methodologies to enable effective decision-making and align stakeholders in the country behind a shared understanding of the situation, challenges and opportunities.

---

\(^1\) University of Portsmouth – [Global Plastics Treaty Policy Brief – Effectiveness of National Action Plans](#)

- **Transparency and comparability:** The data and methodologies used in the development of NAPs should, whenever possible, align with globally harmonized, or recognized and credible standards to enable transparency and comparability across countries.

- **Revisions and updates:** NAPs should be revised according to a mandated timeline to formalise the input of new knowledge and adaptation to policy successes or failures.

- **Technical and financial assistance:** NAPs should be supported by technical and financial assistance for implementation and compliance, through a dedicated fund.

- **Multistakeholder engagement:** The development of national action plans should involve a diverse range of perspectives from civil society, academia and private sector so as to ensure the intended social impact and their commercial viability, as well as to build capacity for implementation.

- **Social inclusion:** NAPs should embed a gender and social context assessment that evaluates the impact of potential measures on women, informal sector workers and other marginalized communities who play a central role in the plastic economy. This should be implemented in a coordinated manner at global and national levels.

- **Country ownership:** The development of NAPs should be driven at the national level to ensure that they reflect local realities and priorities and empower local ownership and buy-in or target setting and implementation.

**Explanatory Text:**

The Global Plastic Action Partnership’s experience delivering national action roadmaps and working with plastic action leaders at global and national levels from public sector, private sector and civil society has given us a unique perspective on the foundational criteria to achieve national level system change and address plastic pollution. The principles above reflect our learnings based on the successes and failures since we commenced activities in 2018.

---

2. **Proposed national waste flow analysis methodology**

National action plans should include the quantification of leakage rates and solutions for the management of municipal solid waste plastic. This waste stream is primarily composed of plastic packaging and single-use products, diapers and sanitary waste, durable consumer products and household products.

Plastics typically found in municipal solid waste can be classified in five application categories: bottles, other rigid mono-materials, flexible mono-materials, multilayer or multi-material plastics, and other household goods. These plastic categories represent plastics that typically “travel” through the value chain system together, featuring similar attributes such as economics, applications, and recyclability.

**Explanatory Text:**
National baselining tools, such as GPAP’s National Analysis and Modelling (NAM) Tool, enable national decision-makers to develop an informed national action strategy to reduce plastic waste and pollution, by modelling a country’s plastic waste and pollution situation and the associated environmental, social and economic impact.

NAM is based on the Breaking the Plastic Wave methodology and compatible with UN Environment Programme’s (UNEP) hot-spotting analysis. It is designed to guide national teams through the data input and analytical process to quantify the economic, environmental, and social implications of different plastic pollution pathways for the country. The rigorous, evidence-based approach serves as a critical foundation for aligning and rallying diverse stakeholders behind a national action roadmap to address plastic pollution.

For a viable future instrument, targets at both global or national levels must be informed by high quality evidence. Countries can assess their specific context by creating a baseline of plastic waste flows as a starting point to developing national action roadmaps. Building upon a national baseline, the National Assessment and Modelling Tool simulates a range of scenarios and potential actions the country can prioritize to address plastic pollution. The roadmaps do not recommend or prescribe any specific direction or measures, and, therefore, do not replicate the role of national action plans (NAPs). They can, however, serve as foundational ‘options papers,’ providing a shared evidence-base and clear future scenarios that can support national governments and other relevant stakeholders in taking informed decisions and developing their NAPs.

We recognize that the scope of plastic included in the NAM Tool is not exhaustive. For example, plastic excluded from this model that could be considered in the scope of the future instrument and NAPs include:

- **Other macroplastics**, not typically entering municipal solid waste and with a much lower propensity to leak to the environment: medical waste, hazardous waste, electronics, textiles, furnishings, agricultural waste, and transportation, construction, and other industrial waste.
- **Microplastics**, which enter the environment via significantly different systems to municipal solid waste and entail greater constraints on data availability. Primary microplastic sources include tyre, abrasion, textile losses, pellet losses, personal care products, artificial turf, paint, packaging abrasion, and other products such as fertilisers.

The scope of the future instrument should be broad enough to allow inclusion of different products, sectors, polymers and chemicals as the evidence base develops, but should allow for prioritization that will address the areas of greatest leakage informed by approaches to quantify leakage rates and solutions for municipal solid waste plastic. For NAPs, based on the Global Plastic Action Partnership experience, the instrument’s elements on NAPs should entail, at a minimum, the five municipal solid waste categories included in the scope of the NAM tool (listed above).
### 3. Institutional arrangements; National platforms could include the following governing bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: National platforms could include the following governing bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Steering Board**  | Senior leaders from public sector, private sector and civil society (including informal sector) who represent stakeholders across the plastics ecosystem. | Provide strategic direction to the NPAP/national strategy on plastic pollution  
- Participate in the development of national action roadmaps.  
- Drive enhanced cooperation and coordination |
| **Expert Panels**   | Expert panels are selective groups of leading experts from scientific and technical communities. | Provide strategic advice and impartial reviews on the national action roadmaps.  
- Deliberate and align on the input data and validity of results generated by the baseline assessments and scenario modelling exercise. |
| **Task Forces**     | Task forces are multistakeholder groups of technical specialists from government, academia, the private sector and civil society. | Implement the recommendations of national action roadmaps, providing technical input, guidance and resources to support delivery.  
- Development and implementation of programmes, partnerships and policies. |
| **Secretariat**     | The secretariat is a neutral and independent body to support the coordination of national activities. | Manage the day-to-day operations of the national platform, including but not limited to organizing governance meetings.  
- Develop regular updates to global bodies.  
- Support impact measurement and reporting. |
| **Evaluation, monitoring and review committee** | The evaluation committee is an independent body to undertake monitoring and evaluation activities to track progress of implementation of actions on the instrument. | Coordinate and manage regular monitoring activities  
- Conduct annual waste audits  
- Feed in to any policy or legislative review processes. |
Under Means of Implementation, the instrument should foresee adequate resourcing for capacity building measures that support countries, in particular developing countries, in leading and implementing the above-mentioned institutional arrangements. National governments and stakeholders should be empowered with technical and financial assistance to set up appropriate institutional arrangements such as those suggested above. Practical, user-centric tools that ensure process guidance, consistency and quality without overburdening stakeholders should be made available to support development and implementation of national action roadmaps and NAPs.

4. Capacity building and financial assistance

The global instrument should foresee adequate resourcing for capacity building and resourcing measures that support countries, in particular developing countries, in leading and implementing the comprehensive process to develop NAPs. This could also include the creation of public-private (philanthropic) financing mechanisms that enable finance providers to take investment decisions on the basis of NAPs that are derived from robust, transparent and consistent processes.

Core activities requiring technical and financial support include:

i. Convening, including organization and curation of workshops among stakeholders from government, civil society, academia and business (e.g. steering board, metrics taskforce).

ii. Data approach & collection, including identification and evaluation or relevant data sources and targeted data collection efforts to fill critical gaps.

iii. Metrics tools support, including support with data input, analysis of outputs, and technical support.

iv. Monitoring and evaluation: There should be robust monitoring, evaluation, reporting and sharing of data within NAPs. Consistent mandatory national monitoring and reporting is critical to achieving effective NAPs. There should be a globally agreed baseline or year of reference, and a timeline to assess progress against. A transparent mechanism for the assessment of national actions, based on standardised and periodic reporting and peer review is recommended. Self-reporting is unlikely to be sufficient, therefore a dedicated, independent review committee is recommended.

v. Project management & operations to support countries in completing overall step-by-step NAP development process.

vi. Policy and legislation development to support countries in developing the legislative and institutional frameworks necessary to support the delivery of the NAPs.