



High Seas Alliance
Agenda Item 6
Intervention Day 6
IGC2 1 April 2019
Environmental Impact Assessments

5.5 Content

Thank you Mr Facilitator

This is a short intervention for the High Seas Alliance, and we make some suggestions which could also shorten the document. But first it is important to say to the delegate for Algeria, and I apologise in advance for mangling the Arabic language, eyed mawlid saeid. And in response to the United States suggestion of flexibility for the day, we suggest that we meet until midnight.

Mr Facilitator, we would agree with the EU and Uruguay for the Latin American like minded countries and almost all others, that the Instrument does not need to go into detail on the contents of EIA report, and if necessary it can be detailed later, and with China, that the content could be streamlined.

But we do believe that the agreement or an annex thereto needs to contain enough detail to ensure a basic level of consistency and rigor among EIAs prepared across sectors and regions, without being overly burdened by excessive detail. With that in mind we have tried to suggest possible ways of incorporating important content through combining options and making structural suggestions.

With almost all delegations, we support Option II, and suggest that we could capture the most important elements of the 32 options and suboptions listed in a revised subpara in Option II, 1, d, Option A, which could read as follows:

“A description of the potential effects of planned activities on the marine environment, including reasonably foreseeable potential direct, indirect, cumulative and transboundary impacts of the proposed activity and reasonable alternatives, including a no-action alternative, along with a description of the worst-case scenario that could be expected to occur as a result of the planned activity, a description of the methodology and sources of information used in the assessment, including traditional knowledge, and alternative measures to prevent, mitigate, monitor, manage and compensate for adverse effects.”

This intervention will be put on papersmart.

These basic requirements are drawn from existing instruments and requirements, and represent in our view the minimum standards for content that should be included in the agreement or an annex. Like the Solomon Islands for the PSIDs, we have suggested including traditional knowledge, and with India, this language includes transboundary and cumulative impacts. We think this would also satisfy Norway's suggestion of having enough detail as well as the worst case scenario. Many of us who work with EIAs have found it helpful to describe a worst-case scenario, as well as a no-action alternative. We believe it is best practice. We would also support Australia and New Zealand in including consultation undertaken.

Thank you Mr Facilitator

End