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Foreword

The Mediterranean has been the birthplace of incredible civilisations – Egyptian, Hellenistic, Roman and Ottoman – but also the graveyard of plastics.

Plastic pollution is a worldwide issue; no landscape or seascape, not even the poles or remote islands, has escaped.

To effectively address the accelerated growth in plastic waste and leakage into the environment, a systems approach to addressing the problem is needed. The footprint model, and its application in the Mediterranean in this report, is an example of using a systems approach to identify actions that address the growing problem of plastic impacts on ecosystems.

This report focuses on the Mediterranean basin for several reasons. The region represents a perfect model to advance our understanding of plastic: it is a semi-enclosed sea, making the definition of plastic mass balance and the comparison between modelling approaches and field sampling approaches easier. It has also been the subject of many oceanographic field studies and thus many plastic measurements are available to help the design of local and achievable solutions. Additionally, the Mediterranean Sea is surrounded by countries with contrasting socio-economic realities and is therefore a good model to investigate and then shape a wide variety of actions related to both plastic waste and primary microplastics.

These characteristics of the Mediterranean basin make this region a perfect choice to reconcile the results of modelling with sampling approaches and provide an answer to the question, “How much plastic is in the sea?”

This report is part of a series of publications under IUCN’s Close the Plastic Tap programme. The main goal of this report is to fill knowledge gaps and contribute to the triggering of preventative and remedial actions in the countries bordering the Mediterranean basin.

A first step towards action is to identify and quantify the most critical types of plastics and plastic products discharged into the Mediterranean Sea. The report refines the estimates of the quantity of plastic currently floating into the Mediterranean, based on a compilation of data from field studies and using the footprint methodology to estimate the yearly input of plastic into the Mediterranean Sea.

The report also assesses the efficiency of a series of actions currently undertaken around the Mediterranean basin and, coupled with the modelling of hotspots for priority action, recommends targeted priorities for the countries bordering the sea.

The analysis can serve as a tool to monitor the progress of current initiatives. The report also highlights some of the challenges of modelling with existing data, where disparities can result across different modelling and sampling studies. To improve both confidence in estimates of plastic waste and the application of systems-based thinking requires paying more attention to the mechanisms to collect, store and share the data required for such assessments.

The development and application of a common framework to harmonise procedures for plastics pollution monitoring is an important foundation if science-based decision-making on plastic pollution is to be mainstreamed globally.

Minna Epps
Director, IUCN Global Marine and Polar Programme
Executive summary

Widely regarded as one of the most threatened environments in the world, the Mediterranean Sea is subject to a now ubiquitous, man-made disaster: plastic pollution.

As a result of high population densities, lack of consistent waste-management schemes, and large influxes of tourists and strategic merchant navigation, this environment is under significant pressure. This study is the first of its kind to combine:

- An estimate of the plastic stock, i.e. the quantity of plastic accumulated in the sea (Part 1);
- An estimate of the plastic leakage, i.e. the yearly flux of plastic flowing into the sea (Part 2);
- An assessment of key actions that could contribute to closing the “plastic tap” in the Mediterranean Sea (Part 3).

The total plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea is estimated in the order of magnitude of 1,178,000 tonnes, with a possible range from 53,500 to 3,546,700 tonnes.

There is high uncertainty in this estimate as most research undertaken so far has focused mainly on the plastic accumulated at the sea surface, which constitutes less than 0.1% of the total stock.

This study estimates a central annual plastic leakage of 229,000 tonnes (low and high leakage estimates equate to 150,000 and 610,000 tonnes year$^{-1}$ respectively), made up of 94%...
macroplastics and 6% microplastics. The top three countries contributing to plastic leakage are Egypt, Italy and Turkey. Plastic hotspots tend to appear near the mouth of major rivers (e.g. the Nile) and close to large cities or urban areas. These estimates are of a similar order of magnitude (though slightly smaller) as those published in a recent assessment by WWF (Dalberg Advisors, 2019).
1. Introduction
1.1. The Mediterranean basin

The Mediterranean Sea, originally the “Mare Mediterraneum”, literally meaning the sea surrounded by land, is exposed to many human activities, counting approximately half a billion inhabitants when including hydrological basins (449,074,896 inhabitants considered in the present report). It is one of the busiest and most strategic navigational corridors in the world, as well as a very attractive destination with more than 342 million tourists in 2015 (UNWTO, 2015). For the purpose of this study, we have considered 33 countries (Figure 2.1), either coastal or part of a hydrological basin flowing into the Mediterranean Sea. Due to high population densities on the coast and around the rivers draining into the sea, the Mediterranean area is considered to be the most affected environment in the world in terms of plastic pollution (Cózar et al., 2015).

A semi-enclosed sea with limited exchanges with the Atlantic Ocean (Tanhua et al., 2013), it is prone to plastic accumulation (Ramirez-Llodra et al., 2013). It is composed of two basins of approximately equal size (the western basin bordered by Spain, France, Italy, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco, and including the Adriatic Sea, and the eastern basin bordered by Greece, Turkey, the Levant, Egypt and Libya).

Figure 2.1: Map of the study area: the Mediterranean basin, including countries and watersheds of interest for the leakage modelling (Part 2 of the present report). Watersheds are shown in dark blue.
1.2. Study area

**Fact Sheet: Mediterranean Sea**

**Geographic context:**
- Sea area: 2,510,000 km$^2$
- Deepest point: -5,267 m
- Coastline considered in this study: 28,000 km
- Submarine canyons: 817
- Coastal countries: 20
- Non-coastal countries: 13
- Watersheds considered: 1,693
- Population considered: 449,074,896

**Economic context:**
- 10% of global shipping activity by vessel deadweight tonnes (DWT)
- Annual plastic production in the region: 38 million tonnes

1.3. Current state of knowledge

Many studies and reports have focused on the source and fate of marine plastics in the Mediterranean Sea, a subject of growing concern worldwide. Figure 2.2, showing the scientific articles and reports considered in the present study, highlights the growth in this domain.

However, despite this proliferation of literature, precise quantities leaking into the sea and accumulated within different compartments (e.g., sea surface, seafloor) are still debated, alongside the most efficient actions to mitigate this plastic pollution. As shown in Figure 2.3, both estimates of floating plastics (800–23,000 tonnes) and annual leakage (13,000–745,000 tonnes) fluctuate widely.

While other studies work towards refining and standardising both plastic leakage assessment (PLP 2019; Boucher, Kounina, et al., 2019; Boucher, Billard, et al., 2019) and field measurement protocols (GESAMP 2019), this report uses state-of-the-art research to fill the knowledge gaps and determine how much plastic has accumulated and is leaking into the Mediterranean Sea.

![Amount of literature for the different compartments investigated](image)

Figure 2.2: Amount of published articles considered in this study, by research area. Time period based on the publication date of each article. In 2019, many other articles published after the end of the analysis.
1.4. Aim of our work

The focus of this report is to answer three fundamental questions:

- How much plastic is currently accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea?
- How much plastic is leaking into it every year?
- What are the most efficient strategies to alleviate plastic leakage in the Mediterranean region within the next 20 years?

This report is therefore divided into three distinct parts and has three overarching objectives.

### Table 2.1: Estimated inputs of plastic litter and concentrations provided in the literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much plastic is currently floating in the Mediterranean Sea?</th>
<th>How much plastic is leaking in it every year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro- and macroplastics (tonnes)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Macroplastics (tonnes/year)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000–3,000</td>
<td>150,000–500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873–2,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288–1,840 with central value of 705 tonnes for the floating fraction, representing less than 0.1% of the total plastic accumulated</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updated annual leakage for the entire Mediterranean Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leakage estimates using three different release rates: low: 15%, central: 25% and high: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated for European seas, vast majority considered to enter the Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 1: Current situation**

Using the best available data, we will extrapolate published plastic concentrations in Mediterranean sub-basins to the entire Mediterranean Sea. The report aims to advance the data and knowledge available on plastic accumulation for different sea compartments: sea surface, seafloor, water column, stranded plastics on the shoreline, and ingested in specific marine organisms.
Part 2: Plastic Footprint

Using the model developed in the IUCN Marine plastic footprint report (Boucher, Billard, et al., 2019), this report will estimate macroplastic and microplastic fluxes from 33 countries. This is done by analysing data on management of waste generated in human settlements, their distance to shore, and environmental parameters such as surface water run-off.

Part 3: Drawdown scenarios

Based on the results of the two previous parts, we identify and assess potential interventions that would lead to a reduction in plastic leakage over the next 20 years.
2. **Current situation**

How much plastic is accumulated in the Mediterranean sea?
This section intends to answer the following question: **How much plastic is accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea?**

To do so, we rely on scientific literature published during the last decade, complemented by proprietary data from Oceaneye1 (132 sampling points in the Mediterranean Sea). In order to achieve a clear understanding of the problem and better articulate our results, we have divided the Mediterranean Sea into five different compartments, which together constitute our “box model” (section 3.1). Each compartment of this box model has then been populated with data using an extrapolation methodology (section 3.2). This chapter thus presents a “bottom-up” assessment of the quantity of plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea, based on existing data.

**Important disclaimer:** we acknowledge that our approach provides neither a precise measurement nor a statistically valid assessment of the actual quantities of plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea. However, given the current knowledge gap and range of published assessments (Figure 3.2), this study aims to provide the best possible approximation of the quantity of plastic accumulated in five compartments of the Mediterranean Sea. Limitations of our approach and need for additional research are further discussed in section 3.4.

---

1. [https://www.oceaneye.ch](https://www.oceaneye.ch) Established in 2010, Oceaneye is a non-profit organisation, with the mission to: provide information and raise global awareness on the threats of oceans’ plastic pollution; contribute to scientific research by collecting data, helping and supporting the work of the scientific community. Oceaneye has created a citizen-science approach where volunteer ships collect marine plastics and send them to the organisation for further analysis. It also provides technical and popular science for all types of audiences.

---

**Figure 3.1: Key environmental compartments considered in this study.**
2.1. The box model

The proposed box model consists of 5 compartments as presented in Figure 3.1.

There is a clear imbalance regarding the amount of data available for each compartment, with the water column being much less documented than other compartments (absence of any published article specific to the Mediterranean region, at the time of the analysis).

The goal of the present study is to estimate the likely mass of plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea. However, analysis of the literature revealed that results are often stated in terms of abundance (particle counts) and thus could not be extrapolated. Such data is therefore not used. This was found to be the case for articles related to both plastics on the seafloor and ingested in organisms. Preliminary findings from the literature review are synthesised in Figure 3.2 above, which sets out the status of and main gaps in the knowledge.

2.2. Extrapolation methodology

The challenge of our approach is to extrapolate plastic quantities for each compartment of the box model based on punctual concentrations reported in the scientific literature and official reports (NGO, international organisations, etc.). This is made harder by the significant differences between the sampling and analysis methodologies used by the different authors. Due to this lack of a standardised approach in sampling plastics at sea, and an insufficient number of replicates, only a few sets of data were tested using statistical analysis (non-parametric tests).

For each of the five compartments of the box model, the extrapolation methodology follows a series of four steps, as presented in Figure 3.3.

The full database with all articles and the individual concentration data used to calculate mean concentrations per compartment (steps 1 and 2 in Figure 3.3) can be found in the appendix (page 55 onwards).
The extrapolation methodologies tested and the chosen procedure are described in Table 3.1 (expanding on step 3 in Figure 3.3). The calculations of the extrapolation made for each compartment are detailed in Section 3.3, Results.
Table 3.1: Description of the harmonisation and extrapolation methodologies considered in this study and the chosen procedure for each compartment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compartment</th>
<th>Harmonisation &amp; Extrapolation Methodologies</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface</strong></td>
<td>FAO zones of the Mediterranean Sea: Using the Food &amp; Agriculture Organisation’s regional grid, concentrations (items km⁻²) are labelled with a code based on the area they were sampled in. A total of 28 areas were investigated and tested through statistical analysis to observe any significant differences in concentrations between areas.</td>
<td>Numerical concentrations to mass equation and extrapolation to the entire surface of the Mediterranean.</td>
<td>No significant differences in plastic concentrations across the Mediterranean. Preferred method: deriving mass estimates from raw data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance to shore: Concentrations and their GPS coordinates are plotted together inside a Geographical Information System. Concentrations and their distance to land can be observed in order to identify whether higher concentrations accumulate in coastal waters or in the open sea. Highly variable concentrations are reported; no distinguishable pattern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deriving mass estimates from raw data: Data published in items km⁻² are transformed into grams km⁻² using the equation for numerical concentrations to mass from Cózar et al., 2015. Because wind is responsible for the vertical distribution of debris from the surface to a few centimetres beneath it, a correction factor of 3.2 is applied by Oceaneye to its data. Concentrations reported under wind conditions of less than 9 knots were not corrected as wind does not influence plastic distribution below that threshold (Kukulka et al., 2012). Data already published in grams km⁻² are added to the database.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seafloor</strong></td>
<td>FAO Zones of the Mediterranean Sea: Same approach as for sea surface concentrations. No significant differences in plastic loadings on the seafloor. Data presented in items km⁻² and in kg km⁻².</td>
<td>Raw data extracted from the literature (homogeneous benthos and considering canyons) and extrapolation to surface area of the Mediterranean Sea.</td>
<td>Majority of the results communicated in mass units. Extrapolated to the entire Mediterranean surface (with/without considering submarine topography).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(meso: ≥5 mm and ≤1 cm; macro: ≥1 cm)</td>
<td>Raw data extracted from the literature considering a homogeneous benthos: Obtained a median value from the raw data in kg km⁻². This raw value is then extrapolated to the surface area of the seafloor of the Mediterranean, considering a homogeneous benthos regardless of submarine topography.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw data extracted from the literature considering submarine canyons: Same approach as above, however considering 614 canyons with an average size of 237 km⁻² potentially acting as retention areas. Canyon data based on the study from Harris &amp; MacMillian-Lawler, 2015.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seafloor</strong></td>
<td>Data on microplastics in seafloor sediments: This extrapolation is based on data from one article (16 data points in the Adriatic, Mistri et al., 2017) providing microplastic and mesoplastic abundances per square meter (26.5 and 11 respectively). Using the average mass of 1 microplastic and 1 mesoplastic particle (1.5 mg and 100 mg respectively) we extrapolated to the entire Mediterranean Sea regardless of submarine topography. Other articles have found high concentrations of microplastics in the Mediterranean seafloor sediments (Abidli et al., 2017; Alomar et al., 2016; Vianello et al., 2013).</td>
<td>Data on microplastics in seafloor sediments and extrapolation to entire surface of the Mediterranean Sea.</td>
<td>Only one article providing estimates in pieces m⁻².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(micro: ≤5 mm)</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mediterranean: Mare plasticum

Current situation

Regional coastal assessments: Disparate beach litter assessments, mainly concentrated in the north-western basin. Data usually available for one or two beaches per country. Concentrations in grams m$^{-2}$.

Beach clean-up data: Data from beach litter campaigns were obtained for 11 coastal countries, with number of items collected, beach length surveyed, and number of items collected. Three hypotheses were tested: 1%, 5% and 10% of each country’s coast could act as a retention area. For countries without data, the mean value of the countries with data was extrapolated to the length of their coast.

Beach clean-up data and extrapolation to countries with no data.

Shoreline

Landing data and ingestion rates: Plastic uptake in three commercially important fish species was investigated using official landing data from 2018. Using plastic ingestion rates obtained from the scientific literature, rates were applied to the total landings of European pilchard, anchovy and sea bogue. Plastic contamination rates: pilchard 47%; anchovy 14%; bogue 57%. Ingestion in sperm whales investigated, using the data presented in the article from de Stephanis et al. (2013).

Stock Assessment Forms: Using regional validated stock assessment forms (SAF) from the FAO, derived a total stock estimate for the top three commercially important fish species of the Mediterranean using sub-basin regional assessments.

Limited amount of SAFs available. Total landing data was preferred as encompassing the entire Mediterranean area.

Marine organisms

2.3. Results

2.3.1. Overview of the plastic stock accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea: 1,178,000 tonnes (range 53,500–3,546,700)

The result of the assessment is summarised in Figure 3.4, showing that:

- The total plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean is estimated in the order of magnitude of 1,178,000 tonnes, with an uncertainty ranging from 53,500 to 3,546,700 tonnes.

- Most of the plastic seems to be accumulated on the seafloor either in the form of microplastics in the sediments, or macroplastics or mesoplastics scattered on the seafloor, with the rest being distributed in the other compartments.

2.3.2. Sea surface: 705 tonnes (range 288–1840)

Harmonisation of data

The harmonisation of data from the 20 studies, comprising 186 data points is described in Table 3.1; the granularity of the information used for further analysis is study-dependent. Presentation of results also depends on and sometimes requires transformation. To understand the potential plastic loading of the Mediterranean Sea, mass data is required.

Thus, when results are presented in average items km$^{-2}$, they are further transformed into grams km$^{-2}$ using the numerical concentrations to mass equation from Cózar et al., (2015). Data presented in grams km$^{-2}$ required no additional transformation.

Wind and sea state are responsible for the vertical mixing of debris inside the surface layer. To compensate this, a wind correction factor is required. Therefore, if the data already accounts for wind correction, no correction factor is applied, nor if sampling was conducted in low wind conditions (< 9 knots).
The average correction factor used by Oceaneye for the 132 net tows performed in the Mediterranean Sea is 3.2.

Throughout the sea surface analysis, only microplastics and mesoplastics were considered, with the exception of two articles studying all plastic sizes (Ruiz-Orejón et al., 2016; Eriksen et al., 2014). Therefore, macroplastic concentrations presented in grams km\(^{-2}\) in these two articles were added to the database.

**Extrapolation and sensitivity analysis**

The available literature presents sea surface plastic concentrations ranging from 0.3 to 10,400,000 items km\(^{-2}\). Our analysis shows a median value of 281 grams km\(^{-2}\) corresponding to a potential loading of 705 tonnes for the whole Mediterranean Sea surface.

Additionally, taking the first quartile (Q1, 114 grams km\(^{-2}\)) and the third quartile (Q3, 733 grams km\(^{-2}\)) as low and high concentrations leads respectively to 288 tonnes and 1,840 tonnes of plastic floating at the surface of the Mediterranean Sea. Note that using the average instead of the median would yield higher values: 2,483 tonnes for the central value (989 grams km\(^{-2}\)). Although microplastics constitute the majority of the data analysed, it is likely that surface macroplastics are responsible for a higher mass balance (as also noted by Eriksen et al., 2014). Our estimate of sea surface loading is based on a limited inventory of macroplastic articles.
2.3.3. Seafloor mesoplastics and macroplastics: 175,700 tonnes (range 50,000–186,000); microplastics in sediments: 1,000,000 tonnes (range 3,270–3,345,000)

Our assessment of the plastic accumulated on the seafloor includes both macroplastics and mesoplastics, as well as microplastics accumulated in the first centimeters of sediments and analysed separately.

Harmonisation of data

Due to the lack of allometric relationships for seafloor plastics, the data presented in units of mass per surface was only considered in our model to extrapolate a total loading. Regarding the size of debris investigated, most of the research effort is concentrated on macroplastics and mesoplastics. The database for these size spectrums includes 27 articles with only 11 presenting results in grams km$^{-2}$.
Extrapolation for mesoplastics and macroplastics

The available literature presents seafloor concentrations ranging from 7.5 to 1,102,000 grams km\(^{-2}\); our analysis shows a median value of 70,000 grams km\(^{-2}\) (and Q1 and Q3 ranging from 16,800 to 146,000 grams km\(^{-2}\) respectively). Assessments using remotely operated vehicles (ROV) have also brought forward the highest mean concentrations of litter ever observed on the deep seafloor (Tubau et al., 2015). Following this study, and as pointed out by Cau et al., (2017), submarine canyons can possibly act as retention areas for macro debris (e.g. derelict fishing gear and plastic bottles). For this reason the extrapolation has been carried out by considering the extent of submarine canyons versus the rest of the seafloor (Harris and Macmillan-Lawler 2015) and associating different seafloor concentrations to both of these surfaces as described in Figure 3.7. This approach yields a central estimate of 175,700 tonnes of plastic accumulated on the Mediterranean seafloor with an uncertainty range between 49,910 and 186,759 tonnes.

Extrapolation for microplastics

The assessment of microplastics in sediments constitutes a challenge, as there are few published data that allow for effective extrapolation and comparison between data sets. Still, sampling for microplastics in Mediterranean seafloor sediments has reported high concentrations, mainly communicated in the form of number of items (cf. Appendix 1.3): 672–2,175 items kg\(^{-1}\) of dry weight (DW) sediment (Vianello et al., 2013), 7,960 items kg\(^{-1}\) DW sediment (Abidli et al., 2017).

Therefore, because the majority of the articles provide results in average particles items kg\(^{-1}\) DW sediment, with one article in average pieces m\(^{-2}\), two approaches were then explored.

\(1\) As a result of the current literature review, with results synthesised in the boxplot presented in this figure (left) and the full data set reported in the appendix of this report.

\(2\) Total surface of the Mediterranean Sea: 2,510,000 km\(^{2}\). Split between submarine canyons and the rest of the seafloor obtained from Harris et Macmillan-Lawler (2015), based on 614 canyons with size 237 km\(^{2}\).

Figure 3.7: Low-central-high estimates for the seafloor concentrations and extrapolation of the quantities of plastic accumulated on the Mediterranean seafloor in the form of mesoplastics and macroplastics. The horizontal line in the middle of the box represents the median (M), the upper vertical line represents the 95th percentile, and the lower vertical line the 5th percentile. The box itself shows the interquartile range, the upper horizontal line the 75th percentile (Q3) and the lower line the 25th percentile (Q1). The red star is the outlier, the highest value reported.
Due to very limited data on mesoplastic abundances in sediments, it was decided to focus only on the presence of micro debris in sediments.

**Approach 1:** Using the article from Mistri et al., (2017) and the communicated results in grams m\(^{-2}\) obtained during an extensive sampling campaign in the Adriatic Sea, we derived a central estimate for microplastic concentration in the Mediterranean of 1,390,543 tonnes (within an uncertainty range between 3,268 and 2,777,817 for low and high values respectively), as presented in Figure 3.8. Because microplastics accounted for 65.1% of the debris found, the lowest and highest abundances of debris reported were multiplied by this percentage to only account for micro debris.

**Approach 2:** the bulk of the literature focusing on microplastics in sediments mainly present results in *items per gram of dry sediment*. To compare concentrations provided in approaches 1 and 2, the average items in dry sediments of the Mediterranean Sea were compared to concentrations found in Lake Geneva, Switzerland, reported in the article from Boucher, Faure, et al. (2019). This article provides results in pieces per gram of dry sediment, and in grams per square kilometre.

Using these findings as a basis, a ratio was obtained by dividing the mass of microplastics per m\(^{-2}\) (grams) and their corresponding concentration in *items per gram of dry sediment*. This was performed for 12 samples. Once the ratio for each of the twelve samples was obtained, the median of these twelve ratios was taken (2.33) and applied to the median *items per gram of dry sediment* in the Mediterranean (0.16).

The results of these two analyses suggest that the seafloor sediment compartment may be the main sink for the accumulation of microplastics.

With an estimate of 1,300,000 tonnes for Approach 1 and 935,000 for Approach 2 it was decided to round the microplastic sediment compartment to 1,000,000 tonnes.

Note that in both cases this extrapolation methodology has relied on the extent of the sea surface, i.e. the total area of the sea at the air-water interface. It has not considered the extent of the seafloor, which potentially makes our estimates conservative.
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Current situation

2.3.4. Water column concentrations: 325 tonnes (range 0–705)

Key findings from the literature

The question of whether plastic is accumulated in the water column is still being debated. There is currently no available data for this compartment in the Mediterranean region; however some recent studies have investigated the distribution of plastic of different sizes range (from 10 µm to 5 mm) within the water column (between the surface and 1000 m depth) in the Atlantic and Pacific regions (Reisser et al., 2015; Enders et al., 2015; Choy et al., 2019). We propose to use the findings of these studies to evaluate whether the water column could be a significant accumulation compartment for plastic in the Mediterranean.

The main findings of the above-mentioned studies are summarised below:

- Macroplastics and mesoplastics that are positively buoyant concentrate on the surface.
- Microplastics with size > 300µm follow the same dynamic, as their concentration decreases exponentially with depth, with no detectable plastic below 5 m (Reisser et al., 2015).

- Small microplastics (<300µm) behaviour in the water column is more complex. It is assumed that microplastics of 100 µm and 10 µm are widely dispersed in the water column (up to 250 m according to Enders et al., 2015, and up to 1000 m according to Choy et al., 2019), with maximum abundance potentially driven by the position of the pycnocline (the layer of water in which there is a steep gradient in density with depth – International Seabed Association).

These studies discuss the potential role of the water column in concentrating the “missing plastic” i.e. the quantity of plastic estimated by models but not yet discovered in the marine environment. The number of (smaller) particles dispersed in the water column seems to largely overcome the (larger) particles present at the surface, and estimating a mass remains a very challenging endeavor.

Extrapolation and sensitivity analysis

Based on the findings from Enders et al. (2015), for both microplastic particles (in the size range 10–300 µm) and microplastic fibres (in the size range 10–2,500 µm), assuming that 40% of all microplastics identified are attributed to fibres, we derive that approximately 30% of all particles/fibres have a size > 300 µm and mostly

Table 3.3: Extrapolation based on previously obtained concentrations of microplastic (items per gram of dry sediment) and their corresponding mass per square metre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Ratio derived from Boucher et al., 2019</th>
<th>Concentrations in sediments of the Mediterranean Sea</th>
<th>Extrapolation</th>
<th>Surface of the Mediterranean Sea</th>
<th>Amount of plastic in the compartment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grams m(^{-2}) ÷ items.g dry sediment</td>
<td>items.g dry sediment</td>
<td>km(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low estimate Q1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10×1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>310,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central estimate Median</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16×2.33</td>
<td>2,510,000</td>
<td>935,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High estimate Q3</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45×2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,345,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accumulate at the surface. The rest accumulates in the water column below 300 µm in size.

Low estimate scenario: From this split, and assuming a spherical shape, with the volume (or mass) increasing to the power of three of the increasing diameter, we conclude that the mass of microplastic accumulated in the water column is negligible. Indeed, if we take the example of a 50 µm versus 1,000 µm particle, it takes 8,000 of the smaller particles to match the mass of one of the bigger particles. In other words, it seems that the number of particles is larger in the water column than at the surface, but the mass is much smaller due to the smaller size of particles.

High estimate scenario: If we take the estimate from Choy et al. (2019), assuming an average particle concentration of 1 particle.m⁻³ close to the surface (assumed to be a 1 metre layer) and reaching up to 12 particles.m⁻³ at a depth of around 200 m with a slow decrease up to 1,000 m, we can deduce that there may be 2,000 times more particles below the surface than at the surface. Again, assuming that the surface particles have an average size of 1 mm and smaller particles below the surface have an average size of 50 µm and the mass of one of the bigger particle is equivalent to the mass of 8,000 of the smaller, we conclude that the maximum particles mass in the water column could be equivalent to the particle mass at the surface (2000 and 8000 being in the same order of magnitude).

We propose to use the mean of the two as the "central estimate" for this assessment, as further explained in Figure 3.4.

There are a couple of limitations to our estimates:

1. The split between the number of particles at the surface and below the surface is based on the extrapolation from only two studies that show very conflicting results. The spatial and size distribution of particles within the water column should be better understood in order to refine our findings.

2. The mass doesn’t necessarily reflect the associated environmental impacts related to a higher number of smaller particles and fibres that may enter the food web.

### 2.3.5. Ingested plastic in marine organisms: fish, 240 tonnes (range 10–9,400); marine mammals, 31 tonnes

Investigating the contamination rate for all marine species in the Mediterranean would be impossible, and only a few species have been studied for plastic ingestion. Therefore, this study focuses on three key fish species, widely fished in the Mediterranean, representing 36% of total landings. Using the methodology described in Table 3.1 and Table 3.5, we assume that plastic loadings in the three fish species would equate to:

- **European pilchard** (*Sardina pilchardus*): central value of 12 tonnes on a total landing tonnage of 178,860 tonnes.
- **European anchovy** (*Engraulis encrasicolus*): central value of 31 tonnes on a total landing tonnage of 124,293 tonnes.
- **Bogue** (*Boops boops*): central value of 1 tonne on a total landing tonnage of 28,800 tonnes.

---

**Table 3.4: Estimation of plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean water column**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plastic accumulated in the water column compartment (tonnes)</th>
<th>Low estimate (1)</th>
<th>Central estimate (2)</th>
<th>High estimate (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>352.5</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Based on particle size distribution deduced from Enders at al. 2015  
(2) Average of “low” and “high” scenarios  
(3) Based on the hypothesis that the particle size in the water column increases to a power of 3 to the decreasing diameter, and thus an equivalent mass of particles in the water column as at the surface.
Using these data and contamination rates, we have derived a potential plastic concentration in marine organisms using three scenarios. These scenarios are based on the central estimate of plastic in the three species (44 tonnes) and are extrapolated to all species based on fishing effort.

From the fish stock estimation and our estimate of the plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean

### Table 3.5: Estimation of plastic accumulated in the marine organisms of the Mediterranean investigated in this report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fish species</th>
<th>Total landings in tonnes (1)</th>
<th>Estimated individuals in landings (2)</th>
<th>% contamination (3)</th>
<th>Average particle / individual (4)</th>
<th>Number of particles in fish stock (5)</th>
<th>Particle weight (6) (mg)</th>
<th>Estimated plastic in stock (all species) (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European pilchard (sardine)</td>
<td>178,860</td>
<td>13,758,461,538</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11,689,188,923</td>
<td>High estimate</td>
<td>(Cózar allometric relationship) 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European anchovy (Engraulis</td>
<td>124,293</td>
<td>24,371,176,471</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31,321,836,001</td>
<td>Central estimate</td>
<td>(Cózar allometric relationship) 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogue (Boops boops)</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>622,222,222</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.348,666,666</td>
<td>Low estimate</td>
<td>(Cózar allometric relationship) 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Estimated plastic in stock from the 3 species (sardine + anchovy + bogue) (tonnes)</th>
<th>Percentage of the fish stock (based on landings) (%)</th>
<th>Percentage of capture in the fish stock (%)</th>
<th>Estimated plastic in stock (all species) (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High estimate</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central estimate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low estimate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Landing data provided by Mediterranean Fisheries. Stocks, Assessments and Exploitation Status, 2015 (European Institute of the Mediterranean) using the FAO-GFCM 2014 data.
(2) Number of individuals in stock was derived by obtaining the average weight of one individual, using FAO Stock Assessment Forms (sardine and anchovy), and scientific reports on the average catch size of the bogue. Once the average size was obtained, weight estimations was derived from the FishBase calculator.
(3) % contamination were derived from a meta-analysis of plastic ingestion in Mediterranean fish species. If two or more % contamination were provided, the average was taken.
(4) Same approach was adopted for the average particle / individual. Usually provided with contamination data as complementary information.
(5) Three hypotheses were tested with regard to particle weight. The first approach relied on the mass to numerical equation provided by Cózar et al., 2015. This equation allows the transformation of a given amount of plastic particles into a mass. Using the total amount of particle in fish stock, a mass was then derived. Second approach: Using data provided by the article published by Romeo et al., 2016 on the plastic ingestion in lanternfish. Microplastic range (1.37 - 2.47 mm): corresponding weight range is 0.0001-0.0022 g (0.1–2.2 mg; average: 1 mg). Based on the data provided by Gajst et al., 2016, a total number of microplastics with corresponding weight in grams was used, providing a mean microplastic weight of 0.07 mg (0.00007 g).
(all compartments) we can conclude that there may be currently much more plastic in this sea (1,178,000 tonnes) than the combined annual catch of the three species of fish investigated (332,000 tonnes). For more information on plastic contamination of the three fish species investigated, refer to Appendix 1.4. Because this plastic ingestion affects not only fish but also the wider food web, one species of marine mammal was also studied to compare the potential loading. This extrapolation is based on the plastic ingestion in a single stranded sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*). Plastic debris contained in the

| Table 3.6: Estimation of plastic accumulated on the Mediterranean shoreline |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Plastic removed during beach clean-ups</th>
<th>Length of coastline cleaned</th>
<th>Total items collected</th>
<th>Plastic accumulated per length of coastline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(kg)</td>
<td>(km)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(kg/km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,347</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64,793</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54,865</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,828</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1- COUNTRIES WITH DATA**

**2- OTHER**

**3- TOTAL**

(1) Building a Clean Swell, Ocean Conservancy, 2018 report.

(2) The coastline length of the 12 countries with data was obtained through the GIS. Total Mediterranean coastline extracted from the GIS. Due to a coarser map with less precision (e.g., number of islands), the total coastline is estimated at 28,041 km. Official length is estimated at 46,000 km. Therefore, plastic quantities can be higher.

(3) Extrapolation Methodology: three hypotheses are tested here. Using total plastic weight removed for each of the 12 countries, we obtain a plastic weight estimate per 1 km of coastline. Then we extrapolate this weight to the entire coastline of the country. We assume that either 1%, 5% or 10% of the total plastic load extrapolated would accumulate on the coast. The rationale behind these three scenarios was that plastics do not accumulate evenly on the coastline of each country. Due to local currents and environmental parameters, we assume three scenarios, where 1%, 32%, and 80% of the coast would retain plastics.
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2.3.6. Shoreline: 1,020 tonnes (range 32–2,551)

The extrapolation for shoreline plastics was based on the Ocean Conservancy “Building a Clean Swell” report. For the Mediterranean region, 12 countries were cleaned through beach clean-up campaigns, each clean up varying in size and effort. For each of these countries, the following information was provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen value</th>
<th>GIS DATA</th>
<th>EXTRAPOLATED RESULTS (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic accumulated per length of coastline (kg/km)</td>
<td>Total coastline length (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low estimate</td>
<td>Central estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Countries with data:

- **Cyprus**: 115 kg, 4 km, 5,347 tonnes, 29 kg/km.
- **Egypt**: 50 kg, 0 km, 146 tonnes, 167 kg/km.
- **France**: 511 kg, 29 km, 2,748 tonnes, 18 kg/km.
- **Greece**: 6,800 kg, 75 km, 64,793 tonnes, 91 kg/km.
- **Israel**: 355 kg, 1 km, 974 tonnes, 355 kg/km.
- **Italy**: 140 kg, 5 km, 858 tonnes, 28 kg/km.
- **Malta**: 169 kg, 24 km, 976 tonnes, 7 kg/km.
- **Morocco**: 35 kg, 2 km, 175 tonnes, 33 kg/km.
- **Slovenia**: 356 kg, 14 km, 18,300 tonnes, 25 kg/km.
- **Spain**: 4,160 kg, 27 km, 54,865 tonnes, 154 kg/km.
- **Tunisia**: 54 kg, 7 km, 391 tonnes, 8 kg/km.
- **Turkey**: 747 kg, 2 km, 12,828 tonnes, 374 kg/km.

2. Other countries:

- **Other countries (7)**: 107 kg, 6,329 km, 6.7 tonnes, 216.0 kg/km.

3. Total:

- **Total**: 28,041 kg, 32 km, 1,020 tonnes, 2,551 kg/km.


(5) Own estimations


(7) Morocco, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania, Syria, Lebanon, Libya and Algeria
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- Mass of plastic removed (kg);
- Length of coast cleaned (km);
- Total items collected.

Through GIS analysis, the coast length of each of these countries was calculated. The average plastic mass per kilometre of coast was extrapolated to the entire coastline. Because litter does not accumulate evenly, we bring forward three hypotheses: 1%, 32% and 80% of the coast likely to retain plastic debris.

The 32% scenario was kept as a central value based on the proportion of sandy beaches on coastlines worldwide (Earthobservatory, 2016).

The average value for plastic accumulated per kilometre of coastline from countries with data was applied to the countries without data.

2.4. Key takeaway points from the plastic accumulation assessment and knowledge gaps

As main takeaways, the following points are to be considered:

- Most of the current research is focusing on the sub-300 µm and < 200 mm size fraction at the surface while most of the plastic seems to accumulate in other compartments of the sea.

- Some compartments – such as the water column, marine organisms and the seafloor – would require further research as they could possibly be holding the “missing fraction” of marine debris. The data regarding these compartments is still very scarce and we lack an understanding of the vertical distribution and size distribution of microplastics and nanoplastics throughout the water column, as well as mechanisms for entering the food web.

- It is obvious that the north-western section of the Mediterranean Sea concentrates most of the research effort. The eastern section urgently needs new investigations. Many studies using numerical models to predict plastic loading on the sea surface also predict higher amounts in the eastern sector. This can be attributed to very long residence time of surface waters due to lack of exchange with the North Atlantic (Van Sebille et al., 2015).

- There is a need to develop models to better understand the contribution of point sources (cities, rivers). This limitation is preventing researchers from establishing possible correlations between point emissions and concentrations recovered at sea. As a matter of fact, the inclusion of hydrological parameters (e.g., gyres or water stratification) and understanding the settling pathways governing the transport of debris towards the seafloor are the essential next steps towards better understanding the plastic pollution in the Mediterranean Sea.

We are conscious of the limitations of our approach; however, the objective is to provide orders of magnitude. It also constitutes a framework for other researchers to replicate the approach once new and more standardised data are available.
### How much plastic is accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching question</th>
<th>Level of certainty</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much plastic is accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea?</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Several tens of thousands of tonnes of plastic are currently accumulated in the Mediterranean Sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>The total plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean is estimated in the order of magnitude of 1,178,000 tonnes, with a possible range from 53,500 to 3,546,700 tonnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is the plastic accumulated?</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Plastic has been found in the five environmental compartments studied: sea surface, water column, seafloor, shoreline and marine organisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Plastic seems to be ubiquitous at the sea surface, but the quantity of floating plastic is not a significant part of the total plastic accumulated in the Mediterranean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>The vast majority of the plastic is accumulating on the sea floor, mostly in the form of microplastics in the sediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>There is much more plastic in the Med (1,178,000 tonnes) than the combined annual catch of the three fish species investigated (332,000 tonnes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Sea surface and water column concentrations, along with plastic in marine organisms, constitute 0.0008% of the total stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>The water column does not seem to accumulate an significant mass of plastic although the number of particles present may be very high (these small size particles do not constitute an significant mass).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>The shoreline may be the second largest compartment in terms of accumulated plastic, although much smaller than the seafloor. This points to beach clean-up as an efficient instrument to remediate plastic leakage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Plastic footprint

How much plastic is leaking into the Mediterranean sea every year?
This section intends to answer the following question:

**How much plastic is leaking into the Mediterranean Sea every year?**

The majority of marine plastics originate from land, reaching oceans and seas through several pathways, such as rivers and sewage systems. This leakage concerns all plastic sizes, from nanoplastic particles to macroplastic debris. Data extracted from the literature indicates that the Mediterranean Sea is widely affected by this pollution (cf. Chapter 3), with a significant stock of plastic accumulated in different compartments. Chapter 4 will focus on assessing the flows of both macroplastics and microplastics from land to sea (i.e. the leakage), using a “top-down” modelling approach based on socio-economic activity data from the countries.

This report tackles both leakage in the form of macroplastics from mismanaged waste, as well as leakage from four plastic commodities known to release primary microplastics in the environment:

- tyre dust generated during driving;
- fibre shedded during the washing of synthetic clothes;
- microbead release in cosmetics;
- industrial spills of plastic production pellets.

Primary microplastics refer to plastic entering the marine environment already in a micro format, due to the alteration of its chemical composition (marine paint, tyre abrasion) or intentionally manufactured in a sub-millimeter format (microbeads, pellets) (Boucher, Billard et al., 2019).

Beyond providing a better understanding of the plastic leakage hotspots in the Mediterranean region (essential to drive solutions), this modelling approach is complementary to the approach based on field studies presented in Chapter 3. Indeed, this complementarity of the two approaches will reinforce the argument that plastic leakage is real. This has already been demonstrated on a smaller scale in Lake Geneva, Switzerland (Boucher, Faure, et al., 2019).

### 3.1. The marine plastic footprint model applied to the Mediterranean basin

This assessment is based on the newly developed methodology by the same authors previously applied to the Baltic basin, in the Marine plastic footprint report (Boucher, Billard, et al., 2019), for macro-sized, mismanaged plastic waste and microplastics. We thus provide here only a summary of the approach; for a more detailed description of the methodology we recommend referring to the afore-mentioned publication.

The modelling of plastic leakage into the Mediterranean Sea targets 33 countries. These countries are either coastal or part of a hydrological basin that is connected to this sea. The leakage rate of waste was calculated by applying population figures to waste data (illustrated in Figure 4.1).

For each country, plastic waste generation data as well as mismanaged waste indexes (total waste in countries with mismanaged waste problems), have been computed using data from the World Bank (Silpa et al., 2018) and population densities from the NASA Socioeconomic Data and Application Center (SEDAC - Gridded Population of the World - v4). Data for the distance driven by road, household washing, use of cosmetics, and plastic production pellets come from different sources as listed in Figure 4.1 and from Boucher, Billard, et al. (2019).

Using this raw data, a regionalized model has been created using geographical information systems (GIS), the catchment run-off of watersheds (derived from the article of Lebreton et al. 2017), the population densities from SEDAC, and the distance to shore (using geospatial tools in QGIS mapping software).
Figure 4.1: Overview of the modelling approach. For further details on the modelling stages and supporting data, refer to the Marine plastic footprint report (Boucher et al., IUCN, 2019). The leakage is computed both for macroplastics and microplastics and accounts for a first stage of loss from a plastic source and a second stage of release to the environment through a given pathway.

The 1,693 watersheds considered can be seen in Figure 2.1, including basins ranging from 15 km$^2$ to 2,916,242 km$^2$ (Nile watershed). In addition, this approach has also relied on the demographics of the 53 countries, obtained via census and national statistics, compiled in the Gridded Population of the World dataset. The number of inhabitants is given per locality, i.e. village, town or city, and ranges from one inhabitant per locality to above a million. More than 34,000 localities were analysed, for a total of 449,074,896 inhabitants. Leakage rates are then generated and based on watershed configuration, population, and waste generation patterns.

Plastic leakage consists of a first stage of loss and a second stage of release

1. The loss, translated into a loss rate, is the quantity of plastics that leaves the product system, as the fraction of materials that is detached from the plastic product during manufacturing, use, or transport for microplastics, or as mismanaged waste for macroplastics. Losses are specific to sources and activities. Examples include the: processes of losing all types of plastics into the environment through abrasion, weathering or unintentional spills during production; transport, use, maintenance or recycling of products containing plastics; littered plastic packaging; etc. The probability of waste being transferred to the
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The release rate can be calculated by applying the release rate to the overall waste loss.

2. The release, translated into a release rate, is the fraction of the loss that is ultimately released into the various marine compartments through different pathways. We include releases to waterways and rivers, as the plastic may be transported to the estuary (Hurley, Woodward, and Rothwell 2018).

### 3.2. Results

#### 3.2.1. Overview of the plastic flows leaking into the Mediterranean Sea: 230,000 tonnes year⁻¹ (range 150,000–610,000)

The result of our assessment is summarised in Figures 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, displaying macroplastic and microplastic leakage at country level; the detailed contribution of the different sources is further presented in sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

Key findings are summarised as follows:

- The quantity of plastic (macro and micro) flowing every year into the Mediterranean is estimated at 229,000 tonnes year⁻¹ (central estimate) with low and high estimates of 148,000 and 610,000 tonnes year⁻¹ respectively.
- The leakage is dominated by macroplastics, with only 6% stemming from microplastics in the central estimate (3% and 16% for the low and high estimates respectively). The high mean mismanaged waste index in the Mediterranean basin (67%) explains the very high leakage from this source. Note that maritime sources (e.g. lost fishing nets) have not been accounted for in this assessment.
- The countries contributing the most to the leakage are Egypt, Italy and Turkey, as a result of high quantities of mismanaged waste and/or large coastal populations. These three countries may contribute over 50% of the total leakage, and the ten countries that contribute most are responsible for almost 90% of the total leakage in the Mediterranean basin.

![Figure 4.2: Total annual macroplastic and microplastic leakage into the Mediterranean Sea using three estimates (low, medium and high)](image-url)
Figure 4.3: Overview of the plastic leakage in the Mediterranean basin for macroplastics and microplastics.

Figure 4.4: Overview of the plastic leakage in the Mediterranean basin for macroplastics and microplastics.
• The per capita leakage is greater in countries with high proportions of mismanaged waste and a high proportion of the population living in coastal areas. Also, a high catchment runoff (e.g., rain) in a watershed combined with a high proportion of mismanaged waste will increase the probability of leakage (e.g., Montenegro). The range of annual per capita leakage is 0.02 - 8.7 kg, with an average value of 1.0 kg.

• The contribution from maritime sources has not been assessed in this report because of a lack of data. Reports from the 1990s already estimated a fishing gear loss of 3,000 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) (Golik, 1997), which is far below the order of magnitude of leakage from mismanaged waste, but close to the order of magnitude of microplastic leakage. The refugee crisis, beyond the humanitarian catastrophe, also represents another source of plastic leakage (through vessels that sink and abandoned safety flotation devices, Figure 4.10). This has not been quantified neither.

3.2.2. Annual macroplastic leakage: 216,000 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) (range 144,000–577,000)

The annual macroplastic leakage \( \text{Leak}_{\text{waste}} \) from waste is estimated at a central value of 216,269 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) (low value: 144,180 tonnes year\(^{-1}\), high value: 576,718 tonnes year\(^{-1}\)). Each watershed contains in its vicinity dozens to hundreds of villages, towns or cities hosting

![Figure 4.5: Leakage of macroplastic from mismanaged waste into the Mediterranean Sea, watershed view. For presentation purposes, the countries upstream of the Nile river are not shown. They are responsible for 9% of the total leakage.](image-url)
different population densities, which, in turn, consume goods and generate waste. Surface water run-off (e.g., rain) greatly fluctuates between watersheds, entailing significant differences in the total macroplastic leakage between countries. The parameters used to compute low/central/high estimates are provided in Appendix 1.7.

The top three contributors to the overall leakage are:

- Egypt: 74,031 tonnes year\(^{-1}\)
- Italy: 34,309 tonnes year\(^{-1}\)
- Turkey: 23,966 tonnes year\(^{-1}\)

Cities and towns directly located in coastal areas (defined as areas < 23 km from the coast) are responsible for 35% of the total macroplastic leakage. The remaining 65% is generated further inland and carried by surface run-off directly towards the marine environment.

Surface run-off has been identified as a key contributor density high leakage, although not in all cases. For instance, run-off rates for Egypt, averaging 0.11 mm.day\(^{-1}\), do not explain the considerable leakage generated by this country. A high population (85 million) and a high mismanaged waste index (95%) explain Egypt’s significant contribution to the overall leakage.

For a detailed presentation of the results per country, a table is available in Appendix 1.5. Detailed results, both per watershed and per locality are respectively presented in Figure 4.6 and Figure 4.7.

**Watershed information:** it appears that the watersheds hosting major rivers connected to the Mediterranean Sea present the highest leakage rates. The watersheds of the Nile, the Po and the Rhone rivers are responsible for macroplastic exports ranging from 900 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) (Rhone) to 55,000 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) (Nile). On a wider scale, it appears that all, watersheds export plastic debris into the marine environment in variable concentrations. In some cases, countries with a low population density present very high leakage rates per capita, i.e., emitted by each inhabitant of the country. This can be seen for Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, with an annual leakage of 3 and 8 kg per inhabitant respectively.
Locality information: when compared to the watershed mapping, it appears that some localities show high leakage even though they are not in a watershed or country that otherwise ranks high in the leakage assessment.

This can be the case when a densely populated city is located within a watershed with relatively few inhabitants (e.g. Libya). Thus, representing the leakage with different levels of granularity is key in order to shape interventions. Indeed, these key localities should be made a priority for urgent remediation. The top 100 localities are responsible for 54% of the total macroplastic leakage, with 38% of them located in the coastal areas defined in this study. The list of the top 100 localities contributing to plastic leakage in the Mediterranean Sea (based on our modelling approach and its underlying assumptions) is provided in Appendix 1.8.

### Table 4.1: The top 10 contributing localities and the total waste leakage into the Mediterranean Sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Income level</th>
<th>Leakage, tonnes year⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muntazah</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Podgorica</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waraq</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Umranjyya</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kafr Al-Dawwar</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Al-Husayniya</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3. Annual microplastic leakage 13,000 tonnes year⁻¹ (range 4,000–33,000)

In addition to macroplastic pollution, the Mediterranean Sea is facing microplastic contamination. Of the four main sources investigated in this report, tyre dust appears as the largest contributor. Leakage in the form of microplastics (Leak_micro) is estimated at 13,196 tonnes year⁻¹ for the central estimate (respectively 3,875 and 33,393 tonnes year⁻¹ for the low and high estimates). The parameters used for computing low/central/high estimates are provided in Appendix 1.7.

For a detailed presentation of the results per country, a table is available in Appendix 1.6. Below, the results are presented both by watershed (Figure 4.8) and locality (Figure 4.9).

Watershed information: Some of the patterns already identified for macroplastic leakage can be seen for microplastic fluxes. Indeed, the watersheds hosting major rivers are still prone to considerable leakage (from 1,000 to 7,000 tonnes year⁻¹). However, some uncertainties remain.

The Nile river catchment is considered as one of the 10 most contributing rivers to ocean plastic leakages (Schmidt et al., 2015), yet it is not known whether the several dams along this river (11 main dams) play a role in mitigating this leakage (by preventing plastic debris from reaching the open sea).

Given the large drainage basin of the Nile River (eight countries) there is a need to prioritise the most appropriate locations for action to abate most of the leakage and to test the solutions by involving local communities. Implementing technologies/solutions to recover floating plastic upstream of dams could be an effective option
Table 4.2: Top 10 contributing localities in total microplastic leakages, per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Income level</th>
<th>Leak_{\text{micro,tonnes year}}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Genova</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Malaga</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: Primary microplastic leakage per type, investigated in this report.
Figure 4.8: Leakage of microplastics into the Mediterranean Sea, watershed view.

Figure 4.9: Leakage of microplastics into the Mediterranean Sea, locality view.
to mitigate ocean plastic leakage from the Nile watershed.

**Locality information:**

Microplastic leakages follow the same patterns as macroplastic waste fluxes; highly populated localities emit the most plastic into the sea. Areas with high levels of consumption are usually linked to significant microplastic leakage. In fact, all but two of the top ten contributing localities are located in high income countries (Table 4.2).

Libya and Sudan both lack efficient wastewater treatment (8% and 1% wastewater treatment respectively), which could explain the high fluxes of microplastics (e.g. textile and cosmetics). It is also worth noting that 35% of the 100 top contributing localities are located in coastal areas.

### 3.3. Key takeaway points from the plastic footprint assessment and knowledge gaps

Uncertainties underlying these conclusions stem from two main causes: the structural uncertainties and the parametric uncertainties.

The structural uncertainties in the model primarily result from three aspects:

1. Our fragmented understanding of the leakage pathways. Indeed the release rate matrix used in the model (Boucher, Billard, et al., 2019), allowing the calculation of more region-specific release rates based on distance to shore and catchment run-off, has not been calibrated and relies mainly on expert judgement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching question</th>
<th>Level of certainty green: very probable orange: probable red: uncertain</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much plastic is leaking into the Mediterranean Sea every year?</td>
<td>The quantity of plastic flowing every year into the Mediterranean Sea is in the order of magnitude of 229,000 tonnes year⁻¹, with a low and high estimate of 150,000 and 610,000 respectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage into the Mediterranean Sea is dominated by macroplastics from mismanaged waste (94%) as the average mismanaged waste fraction in the basin is very high (67%).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on current waste management information, the three hotspot countries for macroplastic leakage are Egypt, Italy and Turkey, together contributing over 50% of the total leakage. The ten most contributing countries are responsible for over 80% of the total leakage in the Mediterranean basin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For primary microplastics (13,196 tonnes year⁻¹), tyre dust is the largest source of leakage (53%), followed by textiles (33%), microbeads in cosmetics (12%), and production pellets (2%). The three most contributing countries are Italy (3,000 tonnes year⁻¹), Egypt (1,200 tonnes year⁻¹) and Uganda (990 tonnes year⁻¹).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nile watershed represents a significant input of total leakage into the Mediterranean Sea (25% of total inputs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top 100 localities generate 23% of the total microplastic leakage, a key finding that could serve to prioritise action. The coastal areas are responsible for 30% and 35% of microplastic and macroplastic leakage respectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita leakage is more significant in countries with a high proportion of mismanaged waste and with a high proportion of their population living in coastal areas (e.g. Montenegro). Mean per capita leakage of macroplastics is 1 kg year⁻¹, ranging from 0.02 kg year⁻¹ for Ethiopia to 8.7 kg year⁻¹ for Montenegro. Mean per capita leakage of microplastics is 40 grams year⁻¹; ranging from 10 grams (Serbia) to 200 grams year⁻¹ (Malta).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Littering rates are considered as being constant for all countries (2%). It is known that this parameter may vary widely from one country to another (due to culture and differing street cleaning and sweeping operations), as illustrated in Figure 4.10.

3. The model does not account for maritime sources because of a lack of data. It is therefore not possible to estimate the relative importance of this source, which may influence the overall conclusions of the study.

The parametric uncertainties in the model result from the following data-related challenges:

1. The results are mainly driven by the mismanaged waste index (MWI). In general, this index is very high in the Mediterranean basin (67%), with a few countries displaying a comparatively lower index in the north-western sector. This study used waste management data provided by the World Bank (Silpa et al., 2018) extrapolated to plastic. The data rely on the information provided by each country based on its own waste generation patterns. To fine-tune this data, a case-by-case waste characterization should be conducted to see if the data reflect the reality for plastic.

2. Microplastic estimates are still uncertain. Such uncertainty applies to, for example, the loss rate of plastic pellets as the plastic industry cannot currently provide better estimates.

3. The parameters for tyre dust rely on a study that is not necessarily representative of the whole study area (Boucher, Billard, et al., 2019; Unice et al., 2018a; 2018b). As previously stated, this report has relied on the best available data and some future research is required.

To compare the predictions of the model and the concentrations reported in the literature, a measure of ground-truthing is required. As previously stated, microplastic data, as well as the parameters required to calculate the leakage (e.g. road coverage), would benefit from a higher level of precision.

This study has considered only areas with direct contact to the sea. We refer to this methodology as the watershed approach. Waste generation data, population numbers and environmental parameters are all factors that are input into the model to calculate plastic leakages.

As it has focused on a smaller scale, this report presents lower orders of magnitude that some
previous reports (e.g. WWF, 2019; plastic leakage into the Mediterranean Sea of 570,000 tonnes). These differences are attributed to the different scale used (such as the size of the population targeted) and release rates into the environment. Here we have created a granular matrix with fluctuating release rates based on the distance to the shore and other parameters, with a maximum release rate of 15% for our central estimate. Waste data has been based on the *What a Waste* report of the World Bank (Silpa et al., 2018). However, both reports are in the same orders of magnitude, and the conclusions remain the same with Egypt, Italy and Turkey being the three most contributing countries.

It is worth pointing out that the results of the bottom-up approach (Chapter 3) and those of the top-down approach (Chapter 4) validate each other, as illustrated in Figure 4.11. This adds credibility to the results in spite of the embedded uncertainties discussed above. Indeed, the stock of plastic currently accumulated in the Mediterranean (1,178,000 tonnes for the central estimate), matches the order of magnitude of ten years of leakage (based on 229,000 tonnes year⁻¹ for the central estimate). This comparison can only be made for a small-scale basin with limited exchanges with other water bodies. Similar results have been shown for Lake Geneva (Boucher, Faure, et al., 2019).

![Figure 4.11](image.jpg)

**Figure 4.11:** Comparison of the top-down (flux) and bottom-up approaches (stock), with a plastic production growth rate of 4%.
4. Drawdown scenarios

What are the key actions that could ensure plastic leakage abatement in the Mediterranean Sea?
4.1. Inventory and assessment of key high-level actions to mitigate plastic leakage in the Mediterranean Sea

Various solutions have been put into practice in the Mediterranean region, including bans and taxes on certain plastic goods, improvements to recycling and collection facilities, and clean-ups targeting plastic waste on beaches and in the sea (for a review see Appendix 1.10).

This section intends to model a set of these interventions that could be applied to the Mediterranean basin in order to mitigate plastic leakage. Figure 5.1 below summarises the key actions that have been studied: five actions concern bans, two actions concern lifestyles and behaviours, three actions concern waste and wastewater management, and finally one action is related to clean-up activities (post-leakage intervention). They represent high-level potential actions for the purpose of identifying orders of magnitude of potential leakage savings, and thus prioritising further research and actions. The description of these actions and the quantitative hypotheses used are provided in Figure 5.1, together with the result in terms of leakage reduction per year; detailed data sources are provided in Appendix 1.9 and Appendix 1.10.

We conclude that the most efficient actions are related to the improvement of waste management, a global ban on plastic bags, and the collection of floating debris in the Nile river (taking advantage of the presence of multiple dams on the river). Furthermore, action 9 shows that addressing the waste management in the 100 most contributing cities around the Mediterranean basin would eliminate a quarter of the total leakage. The list of these target cities is provided in Appendix 1.8.

The results also show that current planned interventions consisting of bans of some specific items are far from sufficient for solving the plastic crisis and restoring a healthy Mediterranean Sea.

4.2. Leakage drawdown scenario over the next 20 years

Plastic pollution is now global and is expected to rise in future as plastic production is forecast to increase by 4% every year (PlasticsEurope, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MAIN HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>CALCULATION ROUTE</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BANS</td>
<td>Ban straws</td>
<td>Plastic use reduction</td>
<td>Nstraw * Wstraw * P</td>
<td>1,396,125</td>
<td>488,642</td>
<td>50,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BANS</td>
<td>Ban plastic bags (current commitment)</td>
<td>Plastic use reduction</td>
<td>Nbag * Wbag * P</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BANS</td>
<td>Ban plastic bags (global ban)</td>
<td>Plastic use reduction</td>
<td>Nbag * Wbag * P</td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>196,902</td>
<td>52,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BANS</td>
<td>Ban microbeads (current commitment)</td>
<td>Plastic use reduction</td>
<td>Qmicrobeads * P</td>
<td>32,279</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td>4,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BANS</td>
<td>Ban microbeads (global ban)</td>
<td>Plastic use reduction</td>
<td>Qmicrobeads * P</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 PLASTIC-FREE LIFESTYLE &amp; CITIZEN BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>Decrease in the plastic production (by reducing consumption)</td>
<td>Plastic production growth rate reduced from 4% to 2%, assuming a linear reduction of leakage based on annual leakage of 25% 200 tonnes</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 PLASTIC-FREE LIFESTYLE &amp; CITIZEN BEHAVIOUR</td>
<td>Campaigns to reduce littering</td>
<td>Set littering rate to 0.4% instead of 2%</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 WASTE AND WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Improve waste collection and management in 50%</td>
<td>General improvement across all countries to that the average mismanagement index reduces that of high-income countries</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>32,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 WASTE AND WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Improve waste collection and management in 100 key cities</td>
<td>General improvement across all countries to that the average mismanagement index reduces that of high-income countries</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 WASTE AND WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Improve waste collection and management</td>
<td>General improvement across all countries to that the average mismanagement index reduces that of high-income countries</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>196,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 WASTE AND WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Improve wastewater collection and treatment</td>
<td>General improvement across all countries to that the average mismanagement index reduces that of high-income countries</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>52,779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CLEAN-UPS</td>
<td>Waste capture at Nile river dams</td>
<td>Recovery of 80% of plastic waste floating on the Nile river</td>
<td>(based on the GIS model)</td>
<td>44,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: Key actions for reducing the plastic leakage into the Mediterranean Sea and quantification of the associated annual benefits (baseline 2018).
This will inevitably influence waste production and increase the fraction released into the environment if nothing is done to turn the tide on plastic pollution. For this reason, the efficiency of the interventions must be considered over time, considering different growth rates of the plastic industry.

Figure 5.2 and Figure 5.3 show the drawdown analysis from 2018 to 2040 of the different scenarios for annual growth rates of plastic production of 4% and 1%, respectively. Improving waste management by 4% in the entire Mediterranean basin would greatly contribute to the reduction of plastic leakage.

The purpose of the analysis is not to compare one scenario against another, but rather to lay down all possible solutions to closing the plastic tap. These measures would have the greatest impact if combined and implemented together. Doing so would constitute a challenge and would not produce results overnight: marine plastic pollution has high inertia, and only by acting now will we have the ability to reduce this inertia to its minimum before environmental thresholds are exceeded.

The figures show that:

- with a growth rate of 4%, the only action shown to deliver an improvement on...
The Mediterranean: Mare plasticum

The baseline leakage (2018) is a radical improvement in waste collection and management in all countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea. With the same growth rate in plastic production and use, stabilising the leakage with respect to the 2018 baseline would require decreasing the level of mismanagement by 1.7% per year throughout the Mediterranean basin.

- When considering a growth rate of 1% for the production and use of plastic, the situation is more favourable, with six of the tested scenarios showing an improvement with respect to the 2018 baseline.

- Without radical intervention, the leakage will easily double and reach over 500,000 tonnes per year by 2040.

4.3. Key take away points from the drawdown assessment and knowledge gaps

The key findings of our assessment are summarised in the table below.

Uncertainties related to our assessment of the drawdown scenarios stem from the plastic footprint model and the underlying data; they are listed in section 4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching question</th>
<th>Level of certainty</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the current effort enough to reduce the leakage?</td>
<td>Green: Very</td>
<td>Current and planned measures are not significantly reducing plastic leakage into the Mediterranean Sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange: Probable</td>
<td>Reducing the leakage level in 20 years to below current levels requires implementing a set of ambitious interventions on the downstream side (waste management and post-leakage collection), as well as reducing the growth rate of plastic production and use in the Mediterranean basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red: Uncertain</td>
<td>Without radical intervention the annual leakage is expected to double over the next 20 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most efficient interventions?</td>
<td>Green: Very</td>
<td>Improving waste management, starting with waste collection, should be the priority as this is the intervention showing the greatest leakage abatement over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange: Probable</td>
<td>Considering a growth rate of 4% for plastic production and use, stabilising the leakage to the 2018 level would require reducing the mismanaged waste index by 1.7% per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red: Uncertain</td>
<td>Bans can be effective as interventions if widely implemented – a full plastic ban in the basin would reduce plastic leakage by 23%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving waste management in the top 100 contributing cities would deliver a reduction of 25% in the plastic leakage in the Mediterranean basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-leakage management in rivers can be an efficient intervention, with the Nile river alone representing a potential abatement of 20%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix 1.1 Sea surface data

Sea surface concentrations extracted from the literature. Other concentrations in this table labelled as “Oceaneye” are courtesy of Oceaneye, a Swiss non-profit organisation collecting citizen science data across the Mediterranean Sea. The level of detail regarding sampling methodologies and sea-state conditions vary between studies. No concentration is corrected for wind if the study does not provide information on sea-state/wind conditions during sampling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface concentrations (grams km(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Surface concentrations (items km(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Wind mixing correction applied</th>
<th>Numerical abundances to mass transformation equation (Cózar et al., 2015)</th>
<th>Only sampled during low wind conditions (&lt; 9 knots)</th>
<th>Chosen value for surface concentrations</th>
<th>Author (et al.)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>Collignon</td>
<td>Neustonic microplastic and zooplankton in the North Western Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>746.9</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>746.9</td>
<td>Fossi</td>
<td>Are baleen whales exposed to the threat of microplastics? A case study of the Mediterranean fin whale (Balaenoptera physalus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>451.4</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>451.4</td>
<td>Fossi</td>
<td>Are baleen whales exposed to the threat of microplastics? A case study of the Mediterranean fin whale (Balaenoptera physalus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>De Lucia</td>
<td>Amount and distribution of neustonic microplastic off the western Sardinian coast (Central-Western Mediterranean Sea)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>Collignon</td>
<td>Annual variation in neustonic micro- and mesoplastic particles and zooplankton in the Bay of Calvi (Mediterranean-Corsica)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69,197</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>Eriksen</td>
<td>Plastic Pollution in the World’s Oceans: More than 5 Trillion Plastic Pieces Weighing over 250,000 Tons Afloat at Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,592</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eriksen</td>
<td>Plastic Pollution in the World’s Oceans: More than 5 Trillion Plastic Pieces Weighing over 250,000 Tons Afloat at Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,563</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Eriksen</td>
<td>Plastic Pollution in the World’s Oceans: More than 5 Trillion Plastic Pieces Weighing over 250,000 Tons Afloat at Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Eriksen</td>
<td>Plastic Pollution in the World’s Oceans: More than 5 Trillion Plastic Pieces Weighing over 250,000 Tons Afloat at Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eriksen</td>
<td>Plastic Pollution in the World’s Oceans: More than 5 Trillion Plastic Pieces Weighing over 250,000 Tons Afloat at Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Pedrotti</td>
<td>Plastic fragments on the surface of Mediterranean waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>129,682</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Faure</td>
<td>An evaluation of surface micro- and mesoplastic pollution in pelagic ecosystems of the Western Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Faure</td>
<td>An evaluation of surface micro- and mesoplastic pollution in pelagic ecosystems of the Western Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface concentrations (grams km$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>Surface concentrations (items km$^{-2}$)</td>
<td>Wind mixing correction applied</td>
<td>Numerical abundances to mass transformation equation (Cózar et al., 2015)</td>
<td>Only sampled during low wind conditions (&lt; 9 knots)</td>
<td>Chosen value for surface concentrations</td>
<td>Author (et al.)</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,464.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,507.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>3,980,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9,905.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,321.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7,406.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>2,340,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5,209</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>870,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,573.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>930,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,705.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Suaria</td>
<td>The Mediterranean Plastic Soup: synthetic polymers in Mediterranean surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144,098</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>144,098</td>
<td>Pedrotti</td>
<td>Changes in the Floating Plastic Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea in Relation to the Distance to Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113,460</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>113,460</td>
<td>Pedrotti</td>
<td>Changes in the Floating Plastic Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea in Relation to the Distance to Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77,176</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77,176</td>
<td>Pedrotti</td>
<td>Changes in the Floating Plastic Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea in Relation to the Distance to Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5591</td>
<td>5591</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>Gundogdu</td>
<td>Micro- and mesoplastics in Northeast Levantine coast of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,518,340</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,086.4</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>3,086.4</td>
<td>Van Der Hal</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>Micro- and mesoplastics in Northeast Levantine coast of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>Exceptionally high abundances of microplastics in the oligotrophic Israeli Mediterranean waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>285.0</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>Exceptionally high abundances of microplastics in the oligotrophic Israeli Mediterranean waters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mediterranean: Mare plasticum

**Numerical abundances to mass transformation equation (Cózar et al., 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author et al.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Surface concentrations (items km(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Chosen value for surface concentrations</th>
<th>Only sampled during low wind conditions (&lt; 9 knots)</th>
<th>Wind mixing correction applied</th>
<th>High level of microplastic pollution in the coastal waters of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guven</td>
<td>Microplastic litter composition of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish</td>
<td>1,065,120 No</td>
<td>2,014,4 Not stated</td>
<td>41 Yes</td>
<td>298 No</td>
<td>Abundance and characterization of microparticles in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy). The application of the SEA D monitoring protocol in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baini</td>
<td>High level of microplastic pollution in the coastal waters of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish</td>
<td>41 Yes</td>
<td>73.5 No</td>
<td>161 Yes</td>
<td>706 No</td>
<td>Abundance and characterization of microparticles in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy). The application of the SEA D monitoring protocol in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz Ojero</td>
<td>High level of microplastic pollution in the coastal waters of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish</td>
<td>706 Yes</td>
<td>1,585.3 No</td>
<td>197 No</td>
<td>706 No</td>
<td>Abundance and characterization of microparticles in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy). The application of the SEA D monitoring protocol in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz Ojero</td>
<td>High level of microplastic pollution in the coastal waters of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish</td>
<td>298 Yes</td>
<td>1,585.3 Yes</td>
<td>197 No</td>
<td>706 No</td>
<td>Abundance and characterization of microparticles in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy). The application of the SEA D monitoring protocol in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz Ojero</td>
<td>High level of microplastic pollution in the coastal waters of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish</td>
<td>298 Yes</td>
<td>1,585.3 Yes</td>
<td>197 No</td>
<td>706 No</td>
<td>Abundance and characterization of microparticles in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy). The application of the SEA D monitoring protocol in the coastal waters of Tuscany (Italy).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Surface concentrations (grams km\(^{-2}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface concentrations (items km(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Wind mixing correction applied</th>
<th>Numerical abundances to mass transformation equation (Cózar et al., 2015)</th>
<th>Only sampled during low wind conditions (&lt; 9 knots)</th>
<th>Chosen value for surface concentrations</th>
<th>Author (et al.)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>433.8</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>433.8</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>265.6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>265.6</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,003.6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1,003.6</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>Vianello</td>
<td>First evaluation of floating microplastics in the Northwestern Adriatic Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>De Haan</td>
<td>Floating microplastics and aggregate formation in the Western Mediterranean Sea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 132 data points from Oceaneye

Median: 281 grams km\(^{-2}\)

Total sea surface loading: 705 tonnes
Appendix 1.2 Seafloor data

The data presented below has been extracted from the literature, targeting mainly macroplastics and mesoplastics on the seafloor. Microplastics have not been included, and indeed a specific database for microplastics sampled within seafloor sediments was created and extrapolated. We believe that extrapolating the three size spectrums together would not reflect a true picture, as the mass of debris would greatly vary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Items km⁻²</th>
<th>Total Items</th>
<th>Total weight (kg)</th>
<th>Average weight (g/km²)</th>
<th>Author (et al.)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>362.81</td>
<td>25,530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loulad</td>
<td>Quantity and spatial distribution of seafloor marine debris in the Moroccan Mediterranean Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia Riviera</td>
<td>Spatial and temporal trends of marine litter in the Spanish Mediterranean seafloor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia Riviera</td>
<td>Spatial and temporal trends of marine litter in the Spanish Mediterranean seafloor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia Riviera</td>
<td>Spatial and temporal trends of marine litter in the Spanish Mediterranean seafloor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garcia Riviera</td>
<td>Spatial and temporal trends of marine litter in the Spanish Mediterranean seafloor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunca Olgunera</td>
<td>Distribution and composition of benthic marine litter on the shelf of Antalya in the eastern Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunca Olgunera</td>
<td>Distribution and composition of benthic marine litter on the shelf of Antalya in the eastern Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunca Olgunera</td>
<td>Distribution and composition of benthic marine litter on the shelf of Antalya in the eastern Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunca Olgunera</td>
<td>Distribution and composition of benthic marine litter on the shelf of Antalya in the eastern Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koutsodendris</td>
<td>Benthic marine litter in four Gulfs in Greece, Eastern Mediterranean; abundance, composition and source identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,438.5</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,102,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guven</td>
<td>Benthic Debris Accumulation in Bathyal Grounds in the Antalya Bay, Eastern Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramirez Llodra</td>
<td>Effects of natural and anthropogenic processes in the distribution of marine litter in the deep Mediterranean Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>Marine Litter Distribution and Density in European Seas, from the Shelves to Deep Basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>Garcia Riviera</td>
<td>Composition, spatial distribution and sources of macro-marine litter on the Gulf of Alicante seafloor (Spanish Mediterranean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>Strafella</td>
<td>Spatial pattern and weight of seabed marine litter in the northern and central Adriatic Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810.4</td>
<td>Pasquini</td>
<td>Seabed litter composition, distribution and sources in the Northern and Central Adriatic Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>Alvito</td>
<td>Amount and distribution of benthic marine litter along Sardinian fishing grounds (CW Mediterranean Sea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.3 Seafloor sediment microplastic data

Compared to macroplastic and mesoplastic pollution assessment, datasets for sediment microplastic are scarce and harder to extrapolate. The calculations in this report are based on the article by Mistri et al. (2017).

Because results are provided in mass per surface area (and not by average number of particles per kg of dry sediment), the average mass was extrapolated to the entire surface of the Mediterranean Sea. Low and high values were also derived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average items km⁻²</th>
<th>Average mass items grams m⁻²</th>
<th>Average mass items kg km⁻²</th>
<th>Average items g dry sediment</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author (et al.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Adriatic</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: Deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size</td>
<td>Alomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta Island</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental quality assessment of Grand Harbour (Valletta, Maltese Islands): a case study of a busy harbour in the Central Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td>Romeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Tunisia</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The First Evaluation of Microplastics in Sediments from the Complex Lagoon-Channel of Bizerte (Northern Tunisia)</td>
<td>Abidli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligurian and North Tirrenian Sea</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic litter in sediments from the coasts of south Tuscany (Tyrrhenian Sea)</td>
<td>Cannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligurian and North Tirrenian Sea</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic litter in sediments from the coasts of south Tuscany (Tyrrhenian Sea)</td>
<td>Cannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriatic</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic litter in sediments from the Croatian marine protected area</td>
<td>Blaskovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligurian and North Tirrenian Sea</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic litter in sediments from the coasts of south Tuscany (Tyrrhenian Sea)</td>
<td>Kannas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Adriatic</td>
<td>28,430,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small plastic debris in sediments from the Central Adriatic Sea: Types Occurrence and distribution</td>
<td>Mistri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Adriatic</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small plastic debris in sediments from the Central Adriatic Sea: Types Occurrence and distribution</td>
<td>Mistri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Adriatic</td>
<td>11,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small plastic debris in sediments from the Central Adriatic Sea: Types Occurrence and distribution</td>
<td>Mistri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Adriatic</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small plastic debris in sediments from the Central Adriatic Sea: Types Occurrence and distribution</td>
<td>Mistri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Adriatic</td>
<td>87,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small plastic debris in sediments from the Central Adriatic Sea: Types Occurrence and distribution</td>
<td>Mistri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mediterranean: Mare plasticum
## Appendix 1.4 Data on marine organisms investigated, with corresponding contamination rates as reported in the literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% contamination</th>
<th>Total items</th>
<th>Total weight (g)</th>
<th>Average item, ind(^{-1})</th>
<th>Number individuals</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingestion of microplastics and natural fibres in <em>Sardina pilchardus</em> and <em>Engraulis encrasicolus</em> along the Spanish Mediterranean coast</td>
<td>Compa et al., 2018</td>
<td>Alboran Sea</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engraulis encrasicolus Sardina pilchardus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microplastics in mussels and fish from the Northern Ionian Sea</td>
<td>Digka et al., 2015</td>
<td>Northern Ionian</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sardina pilchardus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of microplastic ingestion by the semipelagic fish bogue <em>Boops boops</em> (L.) around the Balearic Islands</td>
<td>Nadal et al., 2016</td>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Boops boops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As main meal for sperm whales: Plastics debris</td>
<td>De Stephanis et al., 2013</td>
<td>Northern Alboran Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,927</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physeter macrocephalus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.5 Detailed results for macroplastic leakage per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population considered</th>
<th>Plastic waste generation (-) (kg/hab/year)</th>
<th>Mismismanaged plastic waste (tonnes) (%)</th>
<th>Average RR</th>
<th>Leak(_{\text{total}}) in the sea (tonnes year(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Leak(_{\text{sea}}) in the sea (from coastal areas) (tonnes year(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Leak(_{\text{per capita}}) per year ((\text{tonnes year}^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2,775,059</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80,403</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>24,968,872</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>288,844</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>5,531</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>299,126</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9,077</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>712,728</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1,049,892</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>85,389,137</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,544,351</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>74,031</td>
<td>18,114</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>7,412,979</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10,438</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>7,620,772</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>24,376</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>53,903,276</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>409,453</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34,309</td>
<td>15,477</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>245,458</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22,911</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>14,824,564</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13,508</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3,635,015</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46,615</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>3,703,229</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74,386</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>170,076</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>3,711,400</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43,422</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>145,647</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16,898,683</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13,196</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>1,449,687</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19,771</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swizerland</td>
<td>1,879,377</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40,78</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>803,278</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>2,062,598</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>109,492</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>16,985,586</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>396,952</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>11,295,978</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84,908</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>6,274,984</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54,216</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>34,028,098</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>260,869</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>12,279,361</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104,716</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2,661,652</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>101,198</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5,566</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>38,161,363</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51,058</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>38,761,285</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>516,235</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,744</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>37,769,569</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>307,949</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23,966</td>
<td>17,354</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>9,724,007</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127,235</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>12,570</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>7,459,590</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>192,238</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8,034</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>449,074,896</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,929,558</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>216,269</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,511</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution of coastal areas (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.6 Detailed results for microplastic leakage per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population considered</th>
<th>Tyre dust</th>
<th>Textile</th>
<th>Cosmetics</th>
<th>Pellets</th>
<th>Leak(_{\text{total}}) in the sea (total)</th>
<th>Leak(_{\text{coastal}}) in the sea</th>
<th>Leak(_{\text{per capita}}) per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) tonnes year(^{-1})</td>
<td>tonnes year(^{-1})</td>
<td>tonnes year(^{-1})</td>
<td>tonnes year(^{-1})</td>
<td>tonnes year(^{-1})</td>
<td>(-) tonnes year(^{-1})</td>
<td>(-) tonnes year(^{-1}) kg/hab.year(^{-1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2,775,059</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>24,968,872</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>299,126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>712,728</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1,049,892</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Republic</td>
<td>85,389,137</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>7,412,979</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>7,620,772</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>53,903,276</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>245,458</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>14,824,564</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3,635,015</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>3,705,229</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>170,076</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>3,711,400</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>145,647</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16,898,683</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>1,449,687</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1,879,377</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>803,278</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>2,062,598</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>16,985,586</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>11,295,978</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>6,274,984</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>34,028,098</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>12,279,361</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2,661,652</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>38,161,363</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>38,761,285</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>37,769,569</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>9,724,007</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>12,570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>7,459,590</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>449,074,896</td>
<td>7,033</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>13,196</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributions of coasts (%): 30%
### Appendix 1.7 Key data for the transportation distances (leakage due to tyre dust)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average distance per capita (car km)</th>
<th>Average distance per capita (truck km)</th>
<th>Loss rate car (mg.km⁻¹)</th>
<th>Loss rate truck (mg.km⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9,659</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8,378</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>9,617</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.8 Parameters used for the sensitivity analysis (low/central/high estimates for the plastic footprint calculation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Chosen Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRTextiles</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRCosmetic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRpellets</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRTyreRural</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRTyreUrban</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRmax</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.9 List of the top 100 contributing localities to the exports of plastic fluxes (macroplastics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Administrative region/area</th>
<th>Locality name</th>
<th>Leakage (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Muntazah</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Podgorica</td>
<td>Podgorica</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Waraq</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Umraniyya</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Kafr Al-Dawwar</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Al-Husayniya</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Al Amreia</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Basatin</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Imbaba</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Bilqas</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Zaqaziq</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Bulaq Al-DakrUr</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Monoufia</td>
<td>Ashmun</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Abu Hummus</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Garbia</td>
<td>El Mahalla El Kobra</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Minya Al-Qamh</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Sicilia</td>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Bilbis</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Kardasa</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Helwan</td>
<td>Hilwan</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kaliobia</td>
<td>Shubra Al-Khayma 2</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Antalya</td>
<td>Kepez</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Kesm than Al Raml</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Liguria</td>
<td>Genova</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Garbia</td>
<td>Tanta</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Shirbin</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Administrative region/area</td>
<td>Locality name</td>
<td>Leakage (tonnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Mit Ghamr</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Al Dikhila</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kafr El Shiekh</td>
<td>Sidi Salim</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Faqus</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>Osmangazi</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Al Salam</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Bağcılar</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Menia</td>
<td>Markz Bani Mazar</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Ain Shams</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>El Mansura</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Sinbillawin</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Banghazi</td>
<td>Banghazi</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kaliobia</td>
<td>Shubra Al-Khayma 1</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Damietta</td>
<td>Kafr Sad</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kaliobia</td>
<td>Tukh</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Garbia</td>
<td>Zifta</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Al Jifarah</td>
<td>Al Jifarah</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>Lattakia</td>
<td>Lattakia</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Marg</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Nasr City</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6 October / Giza</td>
<td>Imbaba</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Damanhur</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Al Matariyya</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Menia</td>
<td>Markz Maghagha</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Muharam Blk</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6 October / Giza</td>
<td>Badrashain</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kaliobia</td>
<td>Al Khanka</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Dikrnis</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Küçüçekmece</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kaliobia</td>
<td>Shibil al-Qanatir</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>Buca</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Aga</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Kum Hamada</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Abu-l-Matamir</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Pendik</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6 October/Gizah</td>
<td>Ayat</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Durrër</td>
<td>Durrês</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Kafr Al-Dawwar</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>Yildirim</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kafr El Shiekh</td>
<td>Al Hamul</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhila</td>
<td>Manzala</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kaliobia</td>
<td>Qanatir Al-Khayriyya</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Monoufia</td>
<td>Quwisna</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Administrative region/area</td>
<td>Locality name</td>
<td>Leakage (tonnes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Itay Al-Barud</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Garbia</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Antalya</td>
<td>Muratpaşa</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Damietta</td>
<td>Dumyat</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kalobiha</td>
<td>Banha</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Mina Al-Basal</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Garbia</td>
<td>Kafr Al-Zayyat</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Bahçelievler</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Ataşehir</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Beni Suef</td>
<td>Al Wasta</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kalobiha</td>
<td>Qalyub</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kafr El Shiekh</td>
<td>Mitubas</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Beni Suef</td>
<td>Al Fashn</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dakhlia</td>
<td>Minya Al-Nasr</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Dyarb Nigm</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Monoufia</td>
<td>Shbin al-Kum</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Sharkia</td>
<td>Abu Hammad</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kafr El Shiekh</td>
<td>Kafr Al-Shaykh</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>Al-Ahram</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Ümraniye</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Monoufia</td>
<td>Minuf</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Beni Suef</td>
<td>Biba</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Kafr El Shiekh</td>
<td>Disuq</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Al-Mahmudiyya</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1.10 Plastic bag quantification

**Morocco**

- In 2016, ban on production, import and distribution of plastic bags³
- 26 billion bags used each year (800 bags per person)⁴
  - Moroccan authorities seized more than 420 tonnes of plastic bags per year since ban (July 2016-July 2017)⁴. First three months of 2017, 36 tonnes of plastic bags seized
- 2.96 tonnes of plastic bags seized in Tangier (March 2018)⁵
  - Monitoring appears to be done by the Ministry of Industry, Trade, Investment and Digital Economy (www.mcinet.gov.ma)
- Production capacity of substitutes to plastic bags: 4.6 billion paper bags, 100 million woven bags, 120 million non-woven bags⁶
  - Not entirely clear if this is a direct indicator of a reduction in actual plastic bag consumption
  - Within first six months of ban (July 2016-Jan 2017) 19 tonnes of plastic bags seized at the border and total of 6,800 tonnes of illegal plastic bags incinerated

**Tunisia**

- 1 March 2017 ban on supermarkets distributing single-use plastic bags⁷
- Tunisia consumes 1 billion plastic bags per year (10,000 tonnes of waste) – 315 million distributed by supermarkets (should be none after ban comes into effect)
- Implemented by the Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment with support from Carrefour and Monoprix (major supermarket chains in the area)
- Still using heavy duty plastic bags (>50 microns) – sold rather than distributed freely
- Doesn’t affect smaller retailers

**France**

- Single-use bags: 79 bags per person per year in 2010⁸
- 17 billion lightweight plastic bags used in France in 2015⁹
  - Ban effective since 1 Jan 2017
  - Implemented by the French Ministry of Sustainable Development
- 8 billion plastic bags discarded in nature – Ministry for Environment¹⁰

---

¹¹ [https://www.thelocal.fr/20160701/what-does-frances-ban-on-plastic-bags-actually-mean](https://www.thelocal.fr/20160701/what-does-frances-ban-on-plastic-bags-actually-mean)
• Bags >50 micron thickness still allowed if they are labelled as reusable. But 50 microns may still be flimsy and not reused.

• Estimated 122 million plastic bags pollute 5,000 km of the coast.

Italy

• Ban on non-biodegradable plastic bags in shops and retail points since January 2011. Previous usage >300 per person per year (data from Legambiente).

• In 2010, 181 single-use plastic bags per person per year.

• Ban not fully implemented due to disputes with EU trade laws.

• After five years of ban of plastic bags below 100 micron, the consumption of PE has been reduced by 55%, from more than 200,000 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) to 90,000 tonnes year\(^{-1}\) with a positive transition to compostable bags, necessary to develop and improve the separate collection of food waste.

Israel

• 2016 legislation to introduce USD 0.03 levy per plastic bag.

• Israel had reduced plastic bag leakage into the sea by half one year after the introduction of the levy (unsure how data was calculated as sources not given).

• Consumption of plastic bags reduced by 80%

• All supermarkets required to report statistics on sales of plastic bags to government for monitoring purposes.

• Money raised is reserved for air pollution control.

• Total annual consumption of plastic bags in 2016 was 2.7 billion (average 325 bags per person per year).

• 25% of plastic bags immediately thrown away without being reused.

• Unintended consequences, such as an increase in purchases of other forms of plastic bag, may have occurred.

• Increase in the purchase of plastic bin liners.

• Sales of all plastic bag categories increased by 56% in 2017 (just after the law had been passed).

15 https://oceanconference.un.org/commitments/?id=15599
Greece

- EUR 0.04 fee for plastic bags introduced 1 January 2018, which rose to EUR 0.09 in January 2019
  - Kiosks and market stalls are exempt from the fee
- Estimated 4 billion plastic bags used per year in Greece before the fee was implemented
  - Plastic bags reported to make up 50% of waste in Greek waters – Greek Environment Ministry
  - The fee is to be used for raising money to support production of eco-friendly bags
- Greece uses an estimated 4.5 billion bags per year – 400 per person
  - Two thirds of bags used by Greeks come from supermarkets
  - The estimate was 242 per person in 2010 – large increase in 5 years
- Use of plastic bags expected to drop by 30-50% in 2018 as compared to 2017
- January 2018: 75-80% drop in use of lightweight plastic bags in supermarkets compared to January 2017 (research carried out by the Research Institute of Retail Consumer Goods (IELKA))
  - 5,000% rise in usage of reusable plastic bags
- Fashion sector choosing paper bags to avoid being taxed for plastic
- Across whole economy, estimated 65-70% drop in plastic bag use (lower implementation in rural areas)
- 70% reduction in use of plastic bags means 110 bags per person per year, still above EU target of 90 per person per year

Malta

- Plastic bag tax implemented: 1 March 2009
  - In 2008, 40 million plastic bags used per year
  - Shopkeepers required to track all plastic bags received in store and sold on. Implementation of large fines if the policy is not respected
  - Tax: EUR 0.15 per bag
- 2010, 107 single-use bags per person per year

References:
19 http://www.keeptalkinggreece.com/2018/01/02/greece-plastic-bags-tax/
20 https://www.thenationalherald.com/175467/fee-will-drive-greek-shoppers-away-plastic-bags/
Appendix 1.11 Actions to reduce plastic waste in the Mediterranean region (blue = proactive; yellow = reactive)

For the purpose of this report, actions have been classified as either proactive or reactive. Proactive actions are those taken to stem the flow of plastic waste into the Mediterranean and surrounding waterways. Reactive actions are those that try to reduce pollution by removing plastics from in and around the sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plastic bag legislation</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Plastic bag ban covering bags &lt;10L and &lt;50 micron thickness</td>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td>(The Local, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic bags for fruit and vegetable banned</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charge on remaining bags</td>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Single-use plastic bags banned</td>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td>(Alami, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Ban on plastic bags with thickness &lt;20 micron. Tax on bags &gt;20 microns</td>
<td>Jan-17</td>
<td>(Udasin, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ban on non-biodegradable plastic bags</td>
<td>Jan-11</td>
<td>(Bardelline, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charge on biodegradable and compostable plastic bags</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>(Povoledo, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Ban on distribution of single-use plastic bags</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>(Martinko, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Charge of 4 cents on plastic bags in grocery stores</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>(Anon, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Minimum charge of 15 cents per single-use plastic bag</td>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td>(Xuereb, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Charge on single-use plastic bags until 2020 when bags will be banned entirely</td>
<td>Sometime in 2018</td>
<td>(Gerrard, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other plastic legislation</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>All plastic packaging must be recyclable by 2030</td>
<td>Jan-30</td>
<td>(European Commission, 2018b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Ban on single-use plastic plates, cups, cutlery and cotton swabs</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>(Eastaugh, 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Motivating recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Increase in taxes on landfill and incineration of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mandatory separation of waste in certain states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay as you throw policy in certain states (EEA, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Pay as you throw policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Pay as you throw policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Deposit return scheme aiming at 70% recycling rate by 2019 Jan-18 (Carauña, 2017; Pace, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Deposit return scheme on glass, plastic and aluminium, 90% returns in 2015 Jan-06 (CM Consulting, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Deposit return scheme operated by ELA recycling corporation (PET, glass, aluminium). 77% return rate in 2015 Jan-01 (CM Consulting, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Free port reception facilities to motivate proper disposal of waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Port reception facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Mandatory declaration and disposal of waste into port reception facilities Jan-18 (European Commission, 2018a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Free port reception facilities to motivate proper disposal of waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clean-ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Clean-ups conducted by civil society and individual organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Collecting waste through trawling and diving. State funded (Arroyo Schnell, et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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