# Analysing effectiveness of response options pursuant to UNEA Resolution 4/6 paragraph 7(d)

AHEG 4 Virtual Preparatory Meeting, Agenda item 4(d)

20-22 October 2020

# Introduction

1. Summary of the methodology
    a. Identifying response options, barriers and enabling conditions
    b. Revised methodology
2. Findings of analysis

# SUMMARY OF THE REVISED METHODOLOGY

# Identifying response option archetypes, barriers, enabling conditions

1. Submissions from Member States, Scientific Advisory Committee, major groups and stakeholders
2. Submissions on potential response options (UNEA Res. 3/7 para. 10(d))
3. 2017 UNEP study on effectiveness of governance strategies (UNEP/AHEG/2018/1/INF/3)
4. AHEG discussion papers
    - barriers (UNEP/AHEG/2018/1/2)
    - national, regional and international response options (UNEP/AHEG/2018/1/3)
    - environmental, social and economic costs and benefits (UNEP/AHEG/2018/1/4)
    - feasibility and effectiveness of different response options (UNEP/AHEG/2018/1/5)
    - consolidated background paper of the discussion papers (UNEP/AHEG/2018/2/2)

# Revised methodology overview

## Analysis of measures to address the life cycle

- Discussion of barriers and enabling conditions across the life cycle and post leakage

## Analysis of indicators

- Submitted by Member States, major groups & stakeholders
- Analysis relevant existing instruments
- Input, process and performance indicators

## Discussion on effectiveness

- Includes key findings from both approaches

# FINDINGS OF THE ANALYSIS

# 1. STRENGTHENED INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

Potential response option - international level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – All
- Environmental zones – All
- Geographic range – All
- Scale – High

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- No overarching management target has been set beyond UNEA Res 3/7
- Some operational targets set in existing MEAs
- Not quantitative
- Do not cover all life cycle phases

# 1. STRENGTHENED INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

## Maturity – High

- A number of instruments are well established over many years, broad participation

## Feasibility – Medium

- Mostly needed for land-based sources
- Negotiations could be lengthy
- Reporting across instruments challenging

## Time frame – Long

- Amendments, implementing agreements, etc may take 5+ years across all instruments

## Impact – High

- Could have global impact
- Could address gaps for microplastics and life cycle.
- Encourage upstream preventive measures, including product design standards

# 2. GLOBAL DESIGN STANDARDS

Potential response option - international level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – All
- Environmental zones – All
- Geographic range – All
- Scale – Med-High

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- No management or operational targets exist
- Some industry commitments could serve as operational targets

# 2. GLOBAL DESIGN STANDARDS

## Maturity – Low

- Not well established

## Feasibility – Medium

- Not demonstrated
- Some examples for plastics and for addressing other environmental issues

## Time frame – Medium to Long

- High level standards can be developed sooner
- Detailed standards may take 5+ years

## Impact – High

- If well-constructed
- Could address address most pressures at a global scale

# 3. A NEW INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

Potential response option - international level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – All
- Environmental zones – All
- Geographic range – All
- Scale – High

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- Management target set (UNEA Res 3/7)
- Operational targets across life cycle required

# 3. A NEW INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

## Maturity – Low

- Not well established

## Feasibility – Medium

- Not demonstrated
- Some confidence if build on existing MEAs

## Time frame – Med-Long

- Voluntary could be less than five years
- Binding could require 3+ years, depending on entry into force

## Impact – High

- Could have global impact
- Could address most pressures and barriers

# 4. STRENGTHENED REGIONAL FRAMEWORK

Potential response option - regional level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – Upstream measures
- Environmental zones – Marine, freshwater
- Geographic range – Coastal, maritime, some urban
- Scale – High

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- Some high-level qualitative management targets exist
- Some qualitative operational targets exist
- Not specific to marine litter and microplastics

# 4. STRENGTHENED REGIONAL FRAMEWORK

## Maturity – High

- A number of instruments are well established over many years, broad participation for coastal States

## Feasibility – High

- Has been demonstrated
- Greater adoption of protocols for land-based pollution and dumping are possible
- Strengthened by regional nodes in place

## Time frame – Long

- Amendments, implementing agreements, etc may take 5+ years across all instruments

## Impact – High

- Could have strong impact at regional level
- Strengthened by engaging non-coastal States
- Strengthened by adopting upstream measures specific to marine litter and microplastics

# 5. REGIONAL MARINE LITTER ACTION PLANS

Existing response option - regional level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – End-of-life, monitoring
- Environmental zones – Marine, some freshwater
- Geographic range – Coastal, marine, urban
- Scale – High

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- High-level management targets for marine litter are limited
- Many operational targets inferred, some for microplastics
- Targets in recent RAP-MaLis may be difficult to achieve
- Increased coverage of life cycle phases

UN environment programme

# 5. REGIONAL MARINE LITTER ACTION PLANS

## Maturity – High

- A number of instruments are well established over many years, broad participation (2008 – present)

## Feasibility – High

- Strongly demonstrated
- Upstream preventive measures need strengthening

## Time frame – Long

- Some have no time frame
- Others timelines set for activities and RAP-MALis

## Impact – High

- Effective in facilitating national action
- Current focus on end-of-life, monitoring, clean-up
- Can encourage actions that address most pressures and barriers across life cycle

UN environment programme

# 6. NATIONAL MARINE LITTER ACTION PLANS

Existing response option - national level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – End-of-life, some upstream
- Environmental zones – Freshwater, marine
- Geographic range – Most
- Scale – Small

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- Limited management targets for overall reduction in marine litter
- Some operational targets set for recycling, reuse and recovery, single-use plastic, non-biodegradable bags, collection of ALDFG

# 6. NATIONAL MARINE LITTER ACTION PLANS

## Maturity – Medium

- In place since 2009

## Feasibility – Medium

- Moderately demonstrated
- Mostly developed countries
- Capacity-building, technology transfer, funding required

## Time frame – Medium

- Most have adopted a medium timeframe for implementation (2-5 years)
- Specific dates for particular activities and review

## Impact – High

- Can address most national pressures and barriers if integrated across relevant sectors
- Can engage multiple actors across life cycle
- Wider adoption could strengthen impact globally

# 7. STRENGTHENED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT USING REGULATORY AND MARKET-BASED INSTRUMENTS

Existing response option - national level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – All
- Environmental zones – Land, freshwater
- Geographic range – All terrestrial, coastal
- Scale – Small

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- Management targets set for overall recycling rates, phasing out
- Some operational targets for specific product return, recycling, refillable.
- Do not cover all life cycle phases or wide range of products
- Can expand to include rate of repair and reuse

# 7. STRENGTHENED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT USING REGULATORY AND MARKET-BASED INSTRUMENTS

## Maturity – High

- A number of instruments are well established over many years and across a number of countries

## Feasibility – Medium

- Has been demonstrated
- May require strengthened legislation, infrastructure, stakeholder engagement
- Impact assessments are important

## Time frame – Medium-Long

- Some require less time, e.g. pay-as-you-throw
- Methods to determine real-time and full costs may be challenging to develop

## Impact – High

- Could address many pressures and barriers towards preventing national discharge
- Multiple actors engaged across life cycle
- Wider adoption would improve global impact, particularly where collection rates are low

# 8. NATIONAL STRATEGY TO PREVENT MICROPLASTICS

Potential response option - national level

## INPUT INDICATORS

- Life cycle phases – All
- Environmental zones – Marine, freshwater (soil, air emerging)
- Geographic range – all land, some marine
- Scale – Small

## PROCESS INDICATORS

- No management targets set
- Some operational targets exist
- Mostly limited to pellets and microbeads

# 8. NATIONAL STRATEGY TO PREVENT MICROPLASTICS

## Maturity – Low

- Not adopted as a holistic strategy
- Some well-established examples for limited range

## Feasibility – Medium

- Demonstrated for some products across a number of countries
- Some labelling schemes adopted
- Further use of design standards, labelling and certification schemes needed

## Time frame – Medium - Long

- Phase out of some primary microplastics may be achievable in the short term
- Standards, certification schemes may take 5+ years to develop

## Impact – High

- Could address pressures and barriers for national microplastic releases across the life cycle
- Wider adoption would increase global impact

# Thank you

Dr Karen Raubenheimer
University of Wollongong, Australia
kraubenh@uow.edu.au

www.unep.org