

## **Norwegian comments to the Draft revised methodology to analyse the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities on marine litter and microplastics at all levels to determine the contribution in solving the global problem**

1. The revised draft presented in the webinar is a good report, taking into account the feedback received during AHEG3 in Bangkok. This is very welcome.
2. As stated in UNEA resolution 4/6, the task at hand is to *analyse the effectiveness of existing and potential response options and activities on marine litter and microplastics at all levels to determine the contribution in solving the global problem.*
3. Effectiveness should be understood as the potential for an initiative or activity to achieve the desired goal. In this context, the desired goal is to prevent the discharge of waste and microplastics to the ocean. It is important that the analysis highlights the potential the different response options has towards obtaining this goal.
4. The assessment of effectiveness is based on the stocktaking exercise, which gives a snapshot of existing activities on different levels. To achieve the purpose described above, we think it is important that the analysis of effectiveness is not limited to simply measuring the comprehensiveness of existing activities but adds analyses and information that goes beyond what is collected in the stocktaking exercise.
5. We suggest that the assessment makes clear what is the difference between what we have now (effectiveness towards the goal with existing initiatives) and potential response options (effectiveness towards the goal with future response options) in order to provide AHEG with useful information relevant for discussions on potential response options.
6. One important aspect in this regard is to not combine existing and potential response options into the same archetype. We believe that combining existing and potential response options will make the distinction described above very complicated.
7. To prepare the ground for productive discussions on potential response options, we think that it would be very useful to clarify what the end-product of the assessment will look like. What information will be provided, and in what format? How can the information be used to compare the different options?
8. Additionally, we would like the secretariat to present how they have planned that the assessment of effectiveness will fit with the set of other deliveries in production under the expert group and the work on gathering scientific evidence.
9. It is important that there is enough **time available for discussions on potential response options** before UNEA5. We would therefore like to see a timeline for the delivery of the end-product of the assessment of effectiveness.
10. We think that it would be very useful if the information asked for in the previous points is included in upcoming webinars.

11. In addition, we have some comments to the list of indicators presented on page 6-9 of the revised draft. Since the various response options will be assessed against these indicators, it is necessary to carefully select which ones that are used. We believe that some important indicators are missing from the list, while the use of others should be widened. A number of suggestions are provided in the points below.
12. The list of indicators does not include **lifecycle phase**. We realize that lifecycle phases are used as a characteristic to group response options into archetypes, but this is nevertheless an important parameter that should be highlighted and given priority in the assessment itself. We therefore suggest including lifecycle phase in the list of indicators.
13. **Mapping of overlaps and gaps** is an important property for response options at the regional and global level, since knowledge of overlaps and gaps that exist within for instance the geographical area that they cover, can facilitate a better planning of resources. The list of indicators does not include this property. Admittedly, "reporting" is included among the indicators, but reporting is a general term that can mean many things and is not comprehensive enough. Mapping of overlaps and gaps, on the other hand, is specific and may be done according to several resource parameters, such as activities, financial mechanisms and technology transfer. We therefore suggest adding mapping of overlaps and gaps to the list of indicators.
14. The importance of a sound scientific knowledge base for decision making has been stressed in all four UNEA resolutions on marine litter. Although the last years have seen a remarkable increase in knowledge on marine litter and microplastics, there are still knowledge gaps, with a particular lack of data outside Europe and North America. There is a need for mapping exercises to be repeated at regular intervals to ensure that new information, including potential emerging issues, is captured. Some response options can contain such mapping exercises, and we therefore suggest to add "**building a science and knowledge base**" to the list of indicators used in the assessment.
15. The list of indicators does not place sufficient emphasize on the **interaction between activities at different levels** (global, regional, national and local). Admittedly, the indicator "co-operation components" contains such an aspect but appears to be used in a rather narrow sense. Since some response options can allow for activities at several levels, for instance development of guidance at the global level and implementation of measures at the national level, we suggest widening the use of the "co-operation components" indicator. It should be fashioned so that it records activities at all relevant levels as well as the interaction taking place between the activities at different levels.
16. "**Monitoring**" is included in the list of indicators, but appears to be used only as a check of what kind of monitoring, if any, that takes place. This neglects the fact that monitoring is a complex subject, especially when it comes to monitoring of bio-physical and socio-economic effects of marine litter and microplastics. Some response options can include an element to coordinate, assist and strengthen monitoring efforts, which will lead to a better assessment of the impact of activities on the ground. We therefore propose to

widen the use of the "monitoring" indicator to describe both which components that are monitored and whether monitoring efforts are coordinated and assisted.

17. We doubt that all indicators will be of equal importance in an assessment of effectiveness and suggest that, as a minimum, results based on the *main* indicators will be presented separately. If possible, indicators should be weighted.