



**High Seas Alliance
Agenda Item 6
Intervention Day 5
IGC2 29 March 2019**

FULL INTERVENTION FOR PAPER SMART

4.4. IMPLEMENTATION

Greenpeace is delivering this statement on behalf of the High Seas Alliance.

For 4.4, we support Option I, like the G77, the African Group, the EU, PSIDs, Latin American Like Minded Countries, New Zealand, Canada, China and others. On subparagraphs 1 and 2 according to which State Parties will be primarily responsible to implement measures and ensure full compliance by their vessels and activities, and agree with the African Group and NZ on the inclusion of a reference to “nationals” in subparagraph 2 and also further down in subparagraph 4. We also support subparagraph 3, and here we support as stronger language as suggested by the EU to convey the concept that States are bound by this Agreement to carry forward its decisions in other bodies. Similarly regarding more stringent measures in subparagraph 4 as mentioned by the EU and the United States.

Finally, for paragraph 5, we support that States Parties shall request, and not just encourage non-Parties whose activities, vessels, or nationals operate in the newly established ABMT/MPA to adopt measures to support its conservation objectives and shall also take measures consistent with international law to deter activities by non-Parties that undermine the effective implementation of the Agreement. This is established in the UN Fish Stock Agreement, under Article 33 and South Pacific RFMO Convention, Article 32.

4.5 on Monitoring and review

Like G77 and China, the African Group, CARICOM, the Latin American Like Minded Countries and others we support Option I and we agree that there should be regular monitoring by State Parties and a regular process under the Agreement for review of the effectiveness of the AMBT/MPAs and their conservation measures in reaching their objectives, based on reports

submitted by Parties. The scientific/technical body should conduct such a review/ as in Option A under paragraph 2- based on reports submitted by Parties. Relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies should be also requested by the decision making body under the Agreement to submit reports on implementation of measures designated under such bodies, as under Option II, Option A. And here we can think of ways to streamline the reporting so to avoid duplication. Such a review may lead to amendment of the ABMTs/MPAs and associated measures by the decision making body under the Agreement based on recommendations of the scientific/technical body to ensure they are fit to meet their objectives- as per Option I, Paragraph 4, Option B. The review should be carried out by the Conference of the Parties, rather than a separate mechanism as suggested in Option II, Option C.

We also suggest that the scientific/technical committee established under the Agreement should be tasked by the decision-making body 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.

For 4.1 Objectives, we refer to our statement under “identification of areas” 4.3.1 the HSA recommends that MPAs are identified on the basis for **their contribution to the conservation objectives** and therefore support inclusion of the objectives listed in 4.1, para 2, Option I.

Thank you Madam Facilitator.

END