

Monday 5 April 2017 Day 8

Greenpeace's statement on ABMTs

Thank you Mr Chair, let me also thank Madam facilitator for her excellent work and for her useful report this morning.

Greenpeace wishes to support the intervention by European Union, Algeria for the Africa Group, Nauru for the PSIDs, Belize for CARICOM, Argentina, Costa Rica, Iran, Fiji, Mexico, South Africa and many others supporting a global approach. As several delegations mentioned, the global level and existing regional and sectoral structures can coexist and complement and strengthen each other.

We join the EU in noting the varying and limited mandates of competent organizations, and we share their aspiration of a global network, which we believe requires a global overarching framework. It is because of the ineffectiveness of the current fragmented system and the limitations of the regional approach that we are here today having these discussions.

But there is another important issue with the regional approach, which is capacity and resources. For instance, we all know that establishing, and running RFMOs is resource intensive, and even the costs of attending RFMOs is too prohibitive for many States and observers. Some of our members are very familiar with establishing SIOFA in the Indian Ocean, for example, which took 10 years. We believe that the cost in terms of money and resources of establishing, running and attending regional coordination mechanisms for States and observers is vastly underestimated.

As the Federal States of Micronesia pointed out, a problem with the regional approach is that we might end up with patchwork of regional entities. This is a crucial issue: we cannot at this late stage simply wait for all gaps to be closed by new regional organizations.

As we said in previous interventions, Greenpeace believes that it is not enough to leave management solely in the hands of existing regional and sectoral organisations, and coordinate and review their activities at the global level as has been suggested. Even regular reporting and review requirements would not guarantee appropriate action by existing bodies. We believe that to be effective, the new Instrument must have the authority, via a Conference of the Parties, not only to designate MPAs in ABNJ, but also to **adopt measures** for these areas, to be developed in close consultation with existing competent bodies, including regional organisations and all relevant stakeholders. Such consultation should take place as early as possible in the process to make sure competent bodies are fully involved in the development of the measures and their expertise and interests are fully taken into account so not to undermine their mandate. As Costa Rica pointed out, it will be then for Parties of the new Instrument to implement those measures to their national, vessels and activities under their jurisdiction and to

promote the adoption of measures by organizations, including RFMOs, of which which they are members.

We have elaborated our thinking in our suggested 10 step process for the designation, implementation and enforcement of MPAs, including fully protected marine reserves, in ABNJ- which presents many commonalities with what was suggested by EU, Costa Rica and Monaco and is available in the supplement to the Chair non-paper. We refer you to our submission for further details on how this would work in practice.

Finally, Mr Chair, we listened carefully to the intervention by ICCAT. We agree there would have to be cooperation, but we cannot agree that an MPA would weaken an RFMO: scientific advice shows time and again that MPAs in fact strengthen an ecosystem and thus RFMOs. However, the issue is theoretical, as apart from the NEAFC implementation of the Charlie Gibbs MPAs and the CCAMLR protected areas, we have no examples and thus no experience of MPAs in the high seas.

Thank you Mr. Chair