



**Greenpeace on behalf of the High Seas Alliance
Measures Such as Area Based Management Tools including Marine Protected Areas
Intervention Day 4**

**IGC2 28 March 2019
Agenda Item 6
4.3.2 Designation Process**

Thank you Madam Facilitator -

We will focus our intervention on the designation process for MPAs specifically.

With only a fraction of oceans under protection in areas beyond national jurisdiction today, **our oceans and the life they sustain** are increasingly under threat. And so are we humans; as only living oceans can help us mitigate & adapt to the impacts of climate change.

So our guiding question on this subject has always been:

What is the process that can best deliver a global representative network of effectively protected MPAs, in particular fully protected marine reserves?

To that end:

Regarding Proposals

HSA supports **Option I. para 1, Option A**, where proposals are submitted by State Parties with the possibility for civil society to co-sponsor.

In paragraph 3, we agree with the EU that proposals should be based on best available science, apply the precautionary principle- as suggested by the EU and Switzerland- and the ecosystem approach. Proposals should further take into account relevant traditional knowledge.

We strongly support having the basic elements of a proposal listed in the Agreement, as per paragraph 4 of Option A, rather than delaying this to a later stage. We agree with Micronesia on behalf of PSIDS that the current list of required elements would make it difficult for proposals to be put forward. So we agree that the list is streamlined as suggested.

In particular, under sub-paragraph M, we recommend combining options 1 and 2, which would follow the process in CCAMLR and require that the proposal includes **priority elements of a management plan** (as suggested by the EU), indicating measures to be adopted, including activities that may be restricted, managed or prohibited in the MPA.

For **sub-paragraph p)**, like the EU, Canada, Switzerland, New Zealand, Togo, Monaco, Eritrea and others, HSA strongly supports Option 2- "no text" as we are against arbitrary end dates for MPAs.

Regarding Consultation on and assessment of the proposal

The HSA supports a global consultation process that is time-bound, inclusive, transparent and open to **all** stakeholders, including regional and sectoral bodies, building on Option I. It is through this inclusive process that all stakeholders would be able to weigh in on conservation measures needed to effectively implement the proposed marine protected area.

For Paragraph 7 we support **Option A** where the Scientific Committee set forth in the Agreement shall **review the proposal** and input received during the consultation process **taking into account the cumulative impacts of activities** and **make a recommendation** to the Conference of Parties.

Regarding Decision-making

The HSA supports global decision-making on proposals through a Conference of Parties and here we support **Option I**, **Paragraph 1, Under Option A we support Option 2**. We support the suggestion by the African Group that it should be the **establishment, rather than** designation marine protected areas. We would also add that the establishment of MPAs should **include associated conservation measures**, in light of the scientific advice” etc as per the text.

We think this is necessary because referring decision making on the establishment of MPAs or the adoption of conservation measures to bodies with different mandates and membership outside this Agreement, would lead to the same fragmentation that the Agreement is meant to remedy, and may lead to the proliferation of global paper parks - areas protected on paper but not at sea.

For Paragraph 2, we support **Option B**, as suggested by Algeria on behalf of the African Group, Micronesia on behalf of PSIDS, Argentina on behalf of the Latin American Like Minded Countries, New Zealand, and would further specify here that if all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted that a **voting** procedure shall apply to avoid deadlocks and paralysis. The first UN Ocean Assessment stressed that, **“urgent action on a global scale is needed to protect the world’s oceans”** so we feel strongly that the decision making modalities of the new agreement should reflect this urgency.

Finally, for ABMTs other than MPAs: we could see a similar process for their adoption by the COP of the new agreement, as it is important to future proof the Treaty so that it can fill gaps and respond to emerging activities.

The HSA will be submitting a written statement for your consideration. Thank you madam Chair.

**Recommendations on President’s Aid to Negotiations
Area-based Management Tools and MPAs**

Issue	Recommendations on President’s Text (with proposed edits) ¹	Rationale	Precedent and Support (where applicable)
II.1 Use of terms (pg 4)	<p>15) “Area-based management tool” means: [OPTION I] A management tool measure designed and applicable in for a specified area located beyond national jurisdiction with a view to achieve defined the objectives of this instrument.</p>	<p>This option and the edits made to it help it better align with the IUCN definition.</p>	<p>IUCN Policy brief definition: Area Based Management Tools (ABMTs) are regulations of human activity in a specified area to achieve conservation or resource management objectives</p>
	<p>16) Marine protected area” means a geographically defined marine area which is established under this instrument where human activities are or regulated, and managed or prohibited to achieve specific long-term biodiversity conservation. objectives</p>	<p>The current definition under Art. 2 CBD is limited in that it implies that MPAs can be designated without any management in place. We therefore suggest using a definition referring to areas that can be “established” rather than just “designated” and to activities that are regulated, managed or prohibited, which is broad enough to include marine reserves (without the risks associated with trying to define marine reserves). The CBD definition is also too broad as it fails to distinguish MPAs from other area-based measures that may be short term, single sector, or single habitat/species. Accordingly, we suggest adapting the CBD definition as indicated.</p>	<p>IUCN defines a protected area as: “A clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values- at https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/PAG-021.pdf</p> <p>CBD Art. 2 provides: "Protected area" means a geographically defined area which is designated</p>

¹ HOW TO READ THE PROPOSED EDITS: our recommended text is **in bold**, and replaces original text (~~strikethrough~~)

			or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives.”
III. 1. General principles and approaches (pg 22)	Move principles under one single Article applying to the overall Treaty, with some principles included in the preamble.	The inconsistent listing of principles (i.e. overlapping in some cases and incomplete in others) under different elements risks undermining one of the main goals of the instrument, which is to unify approaches, principles and obligations for all sectors and activities	
4.1 Objectives of area-based management tools, including marine protected areas (pg 22)	1) Area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, shall contribute to the objective of the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, including through protection and restoration of marine biological diversity	The specific objective of the ABMT/MPA section should be more compelling than simply repeating the overarching objective of the Treaty and include a reference to restoration of marine biodiversity, in line with the Rio+20 commitment to restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems	World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD); The Future We Want , Para 158
	<p>2) OPTION I: Depending on the type of tool, specific objectives of area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, may include:</p> <p>(a) enhancing cooperation and coordination in the use of area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, among States and existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies</p> <p>(b) effectively implementing related existing international obligations, in particular those under the Convention, and international commitments</p> <p>(c) promoting a holistic and cross-sectoral approach to ocean management</p> <p>(d) conserving and sustainably using areas designated to recognized as having special value under existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies so as to preserve these special values</p> <p>(e) [Option A] establishing a connected network of effective</p>	<p>The Agreement should enable the international community to meet longstanding global commitments to establish a representative network of MPAs and protecting 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020, together with the IUCN goal, following scientific recommendations, to set aside at least 30% of the ocean as highly protected MPAs by 2030.</p> <p>With only a fraction of oceans under protection in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ), marine animals and areas critical for their survival are increasingly under threat; and so are natural ocean carbon sinks that help the planet mitigate against the impacts of climate change. Establishing highly protected MPAs are necessary to halt biodiversity loss, safeguard natural carbon sinks from further degradation and increase the resilience of nature against the manifold of pressures, including ocean warming and acidification.</p>	<p>- CBD’s AICHI target 11</p> <p>- SDG 14.5</p> <p>- IUCN WCC-2016-Res-050 “Increasing marine protected area coverage for effective marine biodiversity conservation”, Para 2 and 4.</p> <p>- Conservation Measure 91-04 (2011) General framework for the establishment of CCAMLR Marine Protected Areas, Para 2.</p> <p>UNCLOS Article 194.5</p> <p>Madrid Protocol, Annex V.</p>

	<p>and equitably managed, ecologically representative marine protected areas</p> <p>(f) protecting, including preventing damage or degradation, or, as appropriate, rehabilitating and restoring key ecosystems processes and biodiversity, including but not limited to those which are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. vulnerable to impacts, including from climate change, ocean acidification, anthropogenic ocean noise pollution, and other cumulative effects, such as unique, fragile/sensitive, rare or highly biodiverse habitats and features; 2. essential for the survival, function, or recovery of rare depleted, threatened or endangered marine species and other forms of marine life; 3. natural carbon stores; <p>including with a view to enhancing productivity, health and building resilience to stressors, including those related to climate change, ocean acidification and marine pollution</p> <p>(g) supporting food security and other socioeconomic objectives</p> <p>(h) creating scientific reference areas for baseline research</p> <p>(i) safeguarding aesthetic, natural or wilderness values</p> <p>(j) maintaining areas of particular interest to ongoing or planned scientific research</p>	<p>Regarding (d) it is important to include areas that have been recognized for their special values, not just those that have been designated. It would also be important to ensure that these areas are managed so as to preserve their special values.</p>	
<p>4.2. Relationship to measures under relevant instruments, frameworks and bodies, (pg. 22)</p>	<p>1). The implementation of this Part shall not undermine existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies.</p>	<p>The Aid to Negotiations, at pg 7, under general elements, “4. Relationship to the Convention and other instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies”, under 4 (2) OPTION II provides that “The implementation of this instrument shall not undermine existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies.” Thus, It is sufficient to mention it in one single Article under the general provisions applicable to all elements, and need not be repeated within each element.</p>	<p>UNGA Res. 72/249, Para 7, “Recognizes that this process and its result should not undermine existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies”.</p>

<p>4.2 Promotion of coherence and complementarity in measures related to area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, (pg 23)</p>	<p>OPTION I:</p> <p>2) States Parties shall promote coherence and complementarity in measures related to area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, through:</p> <p>(HSA recommend combining Option A & B): the global overarching framework for the recognition, establishment, implementation, enforcement, monitoring and review of such measures set out in this Part, including in particular a global network of marine protected areas.</p> <p>3) Option B: Measures related to area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, may be established, in accordance with this Part, to complement measures designated under existing instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies</p> <hr/> <p>4) Option B: Without prejudice to the mandates of existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies, ABMTs, including marine protected areas, established under such instruments, frameworks and bodies shall may be recognized under this instrument, provided that such measures are established in accordance with the requirements set out in this Part.</p> <p>5) Non-recognition of a measure established under an existing relevant legal instrument or framework or a relevant global, regional or sectoral body under this instrument shall not affect the legal effect of that measure in relation to the Parties to that instrument, framework or body.</p>	<p>The Treaty should provide a global overarching framework for the establishment and effective implementation of ABMTs including MPAs, in particular a global network of MPAs. Although there are uncertainties around what measures would constitute ABMTs under this part, it is important to “future proof” the Treaty to allow it to fill gaps and provide a framework for new/emerging activities which are not under the competence of existing bodies. ABMTs/MPAs may be established to complement regional and sectoral action. There should be a process, upon initiative of State Party(ies), for the global recognition of MPAs already established under existing regional frameworks, as long as they meet the requirement under the Treaty.</p>	
<p>Enhanced cooperation and coordination (pg 24)</p>	<p>1) Cooperation and coordination between relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies, with regard to area-based</p>	<p>Strong support for the need to enhance cooperation and coordination among existing frameworks and bodies (para 1), but via the Treaty and not via</p>	

	<p>management tools, including marine protected areas, shall be enhanced, without prejudice to their respective mandates.</p> <p>[NEW TEXT (2) “The Conference of the Parties shall facilitate coordination and cooperation between regional and sectoral organizations and the bodies of the Instrument, including through the consultation processes on the establishment of ABMTs, including MPAs under the instrument”.</p> <p>NEW (3) [EX OPTION II (2)] States Parties shall promote coherence and complementarity in measures related to area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, through:</p> <p>a) NEW TEXT: advancing and promoting the implementation of such measures within existing relevant legal instruments and relevant regional and sectoral bodies.</p> <p>b) [Revised text of Option II, Option C]: the application of the requirement set out in this part for advancing and promoting consultation, cooperation and information sharing between relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies.</p>	<p>external coordination mechanisms (as suggested in (2) Options I, II, III, IV. which we do not support). External coordination mechanisms risk to lead to regional/sectoral implementation replicating the same fragmentation we are trying to overcome. Dictating to regional/sectoral bodies how they should coordinate among themselves would inevitably risk undermining them. Instead, we recommend that the CoP will facilitate cooperation for instance via MoUs between the instrument and sectoral bodies, and via the public consultation processes for the establishment of MPA/ABMTs.</p>	
<p>Respect for the rights of coastal States over all areas under their national jurisdiction, including the continental shelf within and beyond 200 nautical miles and the exclusive economic zone, pg.25</p>	<p>OPTION II: This Part is without prejudice to the rights, jurisdiction, freedoms and duties of States under the Convention, including the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of coastal States in areas within their national jurisdiction, including the continental shelf within and beyond 200 nautical miles and the exclusive economic zone.</p>	<p>It is important to acknowledge that with rights also come duties of States in these areas.</p>	<p>- UN Fish Stocks Agreement, Art. 4 [Nothing in this Agreement shall prejudice the rights, jurisdiction and duties of States under the Convention....] - Agreement on port State measures,</p>

<p>Relationship between measures under this instrument and those established by adjacent coastal States, including issues of compatibility p. 25</p>	<p>OPTION II: In establishing measures under this Part, States Parties shall have due regard to the rights and legitimate interests of coastal States. Consultations shall be undertaken with the States concerned, including coastal States, in accordance with the process established under this Part, with a view to with a view to avoiding infringement of such rights and interests adverse negative impacts on the marine environment.</p>	<p>ABNJ and NJ conservation measure should seek to be compatible and harmonised.</p>	
<p>4.3 Process in relation to ABMTs, including MPAs p. 25</p>			
<p>4.3.2 Designation process (pg. 27) (i) <i>Proposal</i></p>	<p>OPTION I:</p> <p>1) Option A: Proposals may be submitted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) States Parties (b) Option 1: States parties and non-States parties, on the understanding that the latter would be bound by any relevant measures established; Option 2: States entitled to become parties; (c) <u>Option 2:</u> relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies together with [sponsored by] States Parties (d) the scientific/technical body set forth in Part based on a mandate from the decision-making body ... (e) Natural or juridical persons sponsored by a State party; (f) civil society, as contributors to other proponents [sponsored by a State Party] <p>2) Proposals may shall be submitted to: Option C: The secretariat set forth in Part ...</p> <p>3) Proposals shall be based on the best scientific evidence</p>	<p>We are in support of having elements of the proposal listed in the Agreement, as per Option A (or an Annex to be adopted at the same time?) rather than having them developed later on by the CoP. However, the current list is complex and would make it very difficult for proposals to be put forward based on the amount and type of data needed. We recommend to introduce some flexibility (“may”) to ensure that we don’t end up making it impossible to put forward proposals. Following the process in CCAMLR we recommend that the proposal includes primary elements of a management plan, indicating conservation measures to be adopted and including activities that may be restricted, managed or prohibited in the MPA. Primary elements of a research/monitoring plan should be also part of the proposal. A detailed management plan (and a research/monitoring plan), once finalised could be annexed to the MPA.</p> <p>We firmly stand against having “sunset clauses” indicating the duration of the MPA, as it’s conservation objectives are long-term and areas can be used as scientific reference areas. However,</p>	<p>- Conservation Measure 91-04 (2011) General framework for the establishment of CCAMLR Marine Protected Areas, Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.</p>

	<p>available, apply the precautionary approach/principle and the ecosystem approach, and take into account relevant traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities.</p> <p>4) Option A: Required elements of proposals may include: [...]</p> <p>(m) <u>Option 1:</u> primary elements for a draft management plan, including <u>Option 2:</u> Conservation and management measures to be adopted to reach the specified objective, based on the best available scientific information, including activities that are restricted, prohibited, or managed in the ABMTs, including MPA or parts thereof</p> <p>(n) Priority elements for a Monitoring, research and review plan, including priority elements</p> <p>(o) Option 1: A duration, which is linked to the conservation and sustainable use objectives <u>Option 2: No text</u></p>	<p>MPAs and associated conservation measures can be reviewed and amended based on best scientific information to make sure they are fit to meet their objectives.</p>	
<p><i>(ii) Consultation on and assessment of the proposal (p. 28)</i></p>	<p><u>OPTION I:</u></p> <p>(1) Consultation on proposals shall be inclusive, transparent and open to all relevant stakeholders. The consultation process shall be facilitated by the Secretariat set forth in Part.</p> <p>(2) Option C: <i>No text</i></p>	<p>Listing stakeholders that need to be consulted may unnecessarily delay the negotiations. It will be helpful to clarify that this is a function that we want the Secretariat to carry out.</p> <p>We suggest deleting reference to “relevant” stakeholders to be as inclusive as possible</p>	
	<p>3) The proposal shall be published by the Secretariat set forth in Part ...</p> <p>4) Any contributions received during the consultation process shall be published by the secretariat.</p> <p>5) The consultation period shall be time-bound.</p> <p>6) The proponents shall consider the contributions received during the consultation period and may revise the proposal to reflect those contributions.</p> <p>7) Option A: The scientific/technical body set forth in Part</p>	<p>We are supporting a Scientific Committee as part of the institutional framework of the Treaty. Other options relying on external bodies may lead to a dangerous “forum shopping” for the assessment of proposals. We can guarantee the independence of the Scientific Committee by making sure that the Committee is composed by a poll of independent experts- including those nominated by NGOs.</p>	

	<p>... shall review the proposal and any comments received during the consultation process and make a recommendation to the decision-making body/forum set forth in Part ...</p>		
<p>(iii) Decision-making (pg. 29)</p>	<p>OPTION I:</p> <p>(1) The decision-making body/forum set forth in Part ... shall take decisions on: Option A: the establishment designation of: [suggest combining Option 1 and Option 2]: area-based management tools, including marine protected areas, including associated conservation and management measures, in light of the scientific advice or recommendations and the contributions received during the consultation and assessment process established under this Part.</p> <p>(2) Option B: As a general rule, decision-making by the decision-making body/forum set forth in Part ... under paragraph (1) shall be by consensus. If all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted, the following voting procedure shall apply ...Decisions of the conference on substantive matters shall be taken by a two-thirds majority of the representatives present and voting, before which, the presiding officer shall inform the conference that every effort to reach agreement by consensus has been exhausted</p> <p>(3) Option A: The consent of adjacent coastal States shall be required to establish measures under paragraph (1). Option B: <i>No text</i></p> <p>(4) In circumstances where a decision taken under paragraph (1) may impact on the activities regulated by a global, regional or sectoral body, or require the cooperation of such a body, the decision-making body/forum set forth in ... shall request the secretariat to communicate that decision to the relevant global, regional or sectoral body and request its cooperation in giving effect to the decision.</p>	<p>To change the status quo, Parties to the Treaty, acting via a CoP, need to be empowered to establish (rather than simply designate) ABMTs, including MPAs with concrete conservation measures, following the recommendations of the Scientific Committee and the results of the consultation process with relevant stakeholders. To avoid deadlocks and paralysis, decisions need to be taken by qualified majority voting, when consensus is not possible. Adjacent coastal States will be consulted and their interests will be carefully balanced against the interests of the international community to conserve BBNJ (“due regard” as a two way street) but their consent should not required in order to establish an ABMT/MPA, not to upset the delicate balance of rights and jurisdictions set out in UNCLOS.</p>	<p>On voting procedure, see: - UNGA Res 72/249, Para. 19 -Charter of the United Nations, Art.18. - - - Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, Art.16</p> <p>On the interactions between coastal States and other States: -Continental shelf (within and beyond 200 nautical miles): exercise of rights by coastal State must not infringe or result in any unjustifiable interference with rights and freedoms of other States as provided for in the Convention (UNCLOS, Article 78)</p>

<p>4.4 Implementation (pg 30)</p>	<p>Option I</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) States Parties shall ensure that processes and activities under their jurisdiction or control are conducted consistently with measures adopted under this Part. 2) States Parties shall ensure compliance by their nationals and vessels flying their flags and enforcement of measures adopted in conformity with this Part. 3) States Parties shall promote the adoption of complementary measures within competent global, regional and sectoral bodies of which they are members to support the conservation and management objectives of measures adopted under this Part. 4) Nothing in this instrument prevents a State Party from adopting measures with respect to their nationals, vessels or with regard to activities and processes under their jurisdiction or control additional or more stringent to those adopted under this Part, in conformity with international law. 5) States Parties shall encourage request non-parties to this instrument whose activities, vessels, or nationals operate in the newly established ABMT/MPA to adopt measures to support the conservation and management objectives of measures areas adopted under this Part and shall also take measures consistent with international law to deter activities by non-Parties that undermine the effective implementation of such measures. 	<p>State Parties will be primarily responsible to implement measures on their nationals [to be added], vessels and activities under jurisdiction and control while at the same time promoting the adoption of measures by competent bodies to which they are members and encouraging non-Parties to cooperate in achieving the objectives of the measures adopted under the Treaty. This is fully in line with international law. Alternatively leaving implementation exclusively to regional and sectoral bodies would replicate the same fragmentation that this Treaty intend to remedy to. It would also trigger the proliferation of “paper parks” with no effective protection in place. As the experience with the UN Fish Stocks Agreement tells us, relying on external bodies for implementation would not ensure effective action.</p> <p>As mentioned in the previous section (see consultation, point 4), upon establishment of a new area, the Secretariat set forth under this Agreement should inform and coordinate with regional and sectoral organisations to ensure that complementary action is taken.</p>	<p>-- On the relation with non-Parties, see SPRFMO Art. 32.3 - Agreement on Port State Measures, Article 23 - on the right of Parties to adopt stricter measures: see e.g., Article 2.3 of the Ballast Water Convention. Section on General Obligations. “Nothing in this Convention shall be interpreted as preventing a Party from taking, individually or jointly with other Parties, more stringent measures with respect to the prevention, reduction or elimination of the transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms and Pathogens through the control and management of ships”. Ballast Water and Sediments, consistent with international law.</p>
<p>4.5 Monitoring and review (pg. 31)</p>	<p>Option I</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) States Parties shall monitor [according to the monitoring plan] and report annually to the body set forth in Part ... on the implementation of measures such as area-based management tools, including marine protected areas and associated conservation 	<p>There should be regular monitoring by State Parties and a regular process under the Treaty to review the effectiveness of the AMBT/MPAs and their conservation measures and progress made in reaching their objectives. Such a review may lead to amendments of the ABMTs/MPAs and associated measures based on best available</p>	<p>On reporting- see: UNGA 61/105 and OSPAR recommendation 2012/01, Art. 5.1.</p>

	<p>and management measures established designated under this Part.</p> <p>2) Measures such as area-based management tools, including marine protected areas and associated conservation measures established designated under this Part, shall be monitored and periodically reviewed thought the reports submitted by States by:</p> <p>Option A: the scientific/ technical body set forth in Part ...</p> <p>3) The review under paragraph (2) shall assess the status of conservation of the ABMT, including MPA and the progress made in achieving their objectives and provide advice and recommendations to the decision- making body/forum set forth in Part ...</p> <p>4) Following the process of review, the decision-making body/forum set forth in Part ... shall, as necessary, take decisions on:</p> <p>Option B: the amendment or revocation of ABMTs, marine protected areas, including any associated conservation and management measures, on the basis of an adaptive management approach and taking into account the best available science.</p> <p>5)[NEW] In addition, the scientific/technical committee established under the Agreement should be tasked by the decision-making body set forth in Part...to conduct a regular review of the effectiveness and ecological coherence of the global MPA network in order to identify gaps and recommend amendments and/or areas that should be part of the network.</p> <p>6) [Taken from Option II (A)]: The decision-making body/forum set forth in Part ... shall review implementation of this instrument at regular intervals, including through requesting and receiving</p>	<p>science, to ensure they are fit to meet their objectives. As the experience with the UNFSA tells us, relying exclusively on a review Conference would not be enough to ensure effective implementation of the Treaty.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	reports from relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies on implementation of measures designated under such bodies.		
--	--	--	--