Greenpeace Statement on Chair's recommendations on Cross-Cutting
13 July 2017 afternoon

Thank you Mr Chair

This statement is delivered by Greenpeace.

Like others before us, we think the Chair's suggestions as currently formulated are helpful and they carefully reflect a balance of interests. But we have a couple of suggestions.

We have all learned from the lack of an institutional arrangement in the Fish Stocks Agreement. We believe that we need to learn from this. Mr Facilitator, virtually all modern international environmental organizations have a meeting of the party or conference of parties, a scientific committee and a compliance committee.

Firstly, we have heard a lot of support for a **conference of the parties**, or **meeting of parties**, and we would suggest adding both terms, for clarity, as Monaco suggested.

Secondly, there is no mention of a compliance committee. We suggest that mentioning it as a possibility does not prejudice any party or any future choices.

We would suggest that the possibility to establish subsidiary bodies which is there in the present text is nothing more than is already provided in the Instrument for the International Seabed Authority, for instance, in article 158 of the Convention, but we would also suggest that experience shows that such a power is not easily used, so we do propose stating a compliance committee, even as an option. To us it may be a little like promising to build an extension to the children's bedroom one day after the house is built. The children may be grown up and gone before that gets done. One suggestion could be to add the words **'other and'** before 'subsidiary'.

Lastly, with respect to 'not undermine' which is mentioned just before section III: we do want to point out for clarity that, according to resolution 69/292, in paragraph 3, it is the **process**, rather than the **instrument**, that is not to undermine existing legal instruments and frameworks etc. It may be that the resolution language is preferred by delegates.

Thank you Mr Chair