Enhancing the Knowledge Base for Cross-Sectoral Management and Ocean Governance in ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific

Dialogue Workshop organised by the CPPS Secretariat and the STRONG High Seas Project

NM Hotel, Lima, Peru
26-27 February 2020

Lima Workshop Participants © STRONG High Seas Project, 2020

The photo gallery from the workshop can be found here.
The workshop agenda can be found here.
The workshop presentations can be found here.

For more information about the STRONG High Seas project, please visit: https://www.prog-ocean.org/our-work/strong-high-seas/ or contact: stronghighseas@iass-potsdam.de

Workshop summary

The STRONG High Seas project is a five-year project that aims to strengthen regional ocean governance for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ). Collaborating with the Secretariat of the Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (CPPS; Permanent Commission for the South Pacific), the project aims to develop and propose targeted measures to support the coordinated development of integrated and ecosystem-based management approaches for ocean governance in the Southeast Pacific.

The workshop 'Enhancing the Knowledge Base for Cross-Sectoral Management and Ocean Governance in ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific', which took place on 26-27 February 2020 in Lima, Peru, is the third in a series of five Dialogue Workshops organised under the STRONG High Seas project in the Southeast Pacific region (see workshop agenda in Annex 2). The workshop series aims to bring together stakeholders to discuss current challenges as well as opportunities for global and regional ocean governance, foster exchange of knowledge and information, and build new networks. These Dialogue Workshops apply an interactive approach to enable information exchange between participants and explore various topics relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ.

A total of 57 participants – representatives from Colombia, Chile, Ecuador and Peru (CPPS member States) as well as Panama, global and regional organisations, regional scientific institutions, academia, the private sector and NGOs – took part in the workshop (see Annex 1). The workshop provided a setting for States and stakeholders to exchange in regard to lessons learnt and best practices as well as challenges and potential points for increased collaboration in ocean governance, particularly with regard to the conservation of BBNJ. During the workshop, the scientific work done under the STRONG High Seas project, particularly on the status of marine biodiversity and anthropogenic pressures as well as the monitoring, control and surveillance of human activities in ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific was presented and discussed. Upcoming scientific work under the project on the current or potential contributions of marine areas, in particular ABNJ, to human well-being through economic benefits, jobs and livelihoods and ecosystem services was also discussed. The workshop also offered the opportunity to discuss the current state of the negotiations for an international instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ (BBNJ Instrument) as well as the underlying work done by the STRONG High Seas project on underpinning a strong global BBNJ Instrument through multi-level and multi-sectoral governance, particularly in view of implementing an ecosystem-based management approach to global ocean governance.

Outlook and next steps

All workshops and events under the project are planned in close consultation with the CPPS Secretariat, its member States, and other stakeholders in order to identify topics of relevance, need and interest for the Southeast Pacific region as well as adequate methodological approaches. CPPS member States and other interested stakeholders are welcome to continue proposing specific topics they want to be presented and discussed at future STRONG High Seas workshops and to continue to actively participate and collaborate in the development of the scientific assessments under the project, including through the contribution of knowledge, expertise and data.

Key messages

- A better understanding of **the ecosystem services provided by areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ)** is important to support the evaluation of the benefits and **costs associated with changes in biodiversity in the region.**
- **It is also important to understand how human well-being is linked to biodiversity in ABNJ, including socio-economic considerations of current and future activities** in the Southeast Pacific and taking into account impacts from **climate change in order to fully value the benefits biodiversity provides and identify their global distribution.**
- **Identified potential benefits resulting from a future instrument on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ)** were highlighted notably as the development of technologies for remote areas and new professional careers, the need for trained personnel, sharing of the benefits of scientific research outcomes, benefits resulting from bioprospecting, economic benefits for lower-income countries, or increased regional cooperation for the purpose of conservation.
- **Potential negative effects resulting from a future BBNJ instrument** were considered to be resulting from stricter rules leading to a decrease in activities and thus leading to impacts on the employment sector, the increased costs of fish products, or the marginalisation of countries with limited resources to undertake activities in ABNJ.
- **Cooperation and coordination at all levels** are key in the context of monitoring, control and surveillance of human activities in ABNJ, particularly at the national level between States as well as at the regional level between neighbouring countries and through data sharing, for instance, through regional fisheries management organisations.
- **Access to technology, science and funding, effective legislation, including sanctions and enforcement procedures, as well as incentives for industry** are necessary to effectively implement monitoring, control and surveillance of human activities in ABNJ in the Southeast Pacific region.
- A new BBNJ Instrument could support the **development of capacities and technology transfer**, as well as **complement and support the work of regional fisheries management organisations** with regard to monitoring, control and surveillance of human activities in ABNJ.
- Member States of the CPPS (Permanent Commission for the South Pacific) could **articulate joint strategies, control actions and standardisation of methodologies and protocols nationally and through a regional lens**, and **invest in common technologies** with regard to monitoring, control and surveillance of human activities in ABNJ.
- **An outreach platform** for the Southeast Pacific, which provides relevant information and data for all relevant stakeholders in the region, was highlighted as an important basis for the region.
- States in the Southeast Pacific highlighted their **willingness to continue to work towards the adoption of the BBNJ Instrument**, which should be implementable in practice, enforceable, and should take into account the needs and interests of developing countries and fishing communities as well as the rights and knowledge of coastal countries.
- The **Core Latin American Countries (CLAM) Group** was highlighted as very relevant and important for the BBNJ negotiations, giving member countries a **unique strength** and highlighting their **common characteristics**.
- It is important to take into account the **knowledge and experience gathered by relevant bodies**, including regional fisheries management organisations or the CPPS, **for the**

implementation of the future BBNJ Instrument, as **regional and sectoral bodies have an important role** to play in the implementation of the instrument.

- The BBNJ process is **not sufficiently connected to the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework** negotiations taking place under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). **Concurrent processes**, such as the one under the International Seabed Authority, **are also not explicitly discussed or considered in the context of the BBNJ process**.
- STRONG High Seas can support CPPS member States through expertise with the organisation of their **national dialogues**, which could be organised back-to-back with future Dialogue Workshops.
- The **work and outputs of the STRONG High Seas project** are an **important contribution** to the CPPS, its member States and the region as a whole. Particularly, the **Dialogue Workshops** are **important for information and exchange** amongst stakeholders of the Southeast Pacific region.

Participants at the Dialogue Workshop in Lima. Photo by STRONG High Seas project

Summary of presentations and discussions

Welcome and Opening of the Workshop

Ambassador Francisco Tenya, Secretary General of Peru's Foreign Affairs Ministry, opened the Dialogue Workshop on behalf of the host country Peru. He reminded workshop participants of the vulnerability of the ocean to threats such as plastic pollution or unsustainable fishing and stressed the importance of the future BBNJ Instrument to protect high seas biodiversity. Ambassador Tenya highlighted the need for the future BBNJ Instrument to take into account the specific needs of developing countries as well as the importance for the Southeast Pacific region to have a centralised knowledge platform on BBNJ, which would help in knowledge-sharing and in the development of countries' positions for the BBNJ negotiations.

Ambassador Méntor Villagómez, General Secretary of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS), welcomed participants to the Dialogue Workshop. He highlighted the contributions of the STRONG High Seas project in strengthening CPPS member States' capacity for the BBNJ negotiations through the exchange of lessons learned and best practices on ocean governance, and particularly on the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ. Ambassador Villagómez also highlighted the importance for the Southeast Pacific region of the upcoming discussions during the workshop on the current or potential contributions of ABNJ to human well-being through economic benefits, jobs and livelihoods and ecosystem services as well as the monitoring, control and surveillance of human activities in ABNJ.

Dr. Carole Durussel, Ambassador Hubert Wieland, Ambassador Francisco Tenya, and Ambassador Méntor Villagómez at the opening of the Dialogue Workshop. Photo by Andrés Garrido.

Dr. Carole Durussel, IASS and Co-lead of the STRONG High Seas project, highlighted the timeliness of this Dialogue Workshop in view of the important global discussions on the conservation of biodiversity taking place in 2020, and particularly the discussions on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the discussions on the status of the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 at the UN Ocean Conference, as well as the BBNJ negotiations. With recent reports from the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) highlighting the continuing degradation trends of marine and coastal ecosystems, Dr. Durussel stressed the key role that the ocean, including ABNJ, play in sustaining life on Earth and the importance of taking into account the ecological connectivity of the ocean. She reiterated that the STRONG High Seas project is dedicated to making tangible scientific contributions not only to strengthening ocean governance at the regional level but also to ensuring a link and coherence between the development of an international instrument on BBNJ and regional initiatives.

Session 1: BBNJ Negotiations

The first session of the workshop focused on highlighting the importance of conserving and sustainably using marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, and more specifically on the ongoing negotiations taking place at the United Nations for a legally-binding instrument under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) on BBNJ.

Importance of BBNJ and the Ongoing BBNJ Negotiations

Dr. Gustavo Arévalo (CPPS) gave an overview of the importance of ABNJ, which make up 64% of the surface of the ocean, about 95% of its volume and contain about 90% of marine habitats, and highlighted that they are also subject to many anthropogenic pressures, such as overfishing, unsustainable fishing practices, marine pollution through hydrocarbons, plastics or ballast water, as well as exploration and future exploitation through deep seabed mining. He also highlighted the importance of marine biodiversity as fundamental for the good functioning of our planet and for the ecological, social and economic dimensions of sustainable development, for example, through contribution to global economic development, the generation of oxygen, food security, health and carbon sequestration. Dr. Arevalo presented chronology of the BBNJ process, from the Stockholm Environment Summit in 1972, the Rio Summit in 1992 highlighting the importance of conserving biodiversity, to the discussions in Johannesburg in 2002 on a process towards the conservation of ABNJ. In 2004, the General Assembly established the BBNJ Working Group through Resolution 59/24. The discussions in the BBNJ Working Group took place between 2006 and 2015, with the official start of the BBNJ negotiations in 2018. He presented the four elements on which the BBNJ negotiations are focused, namely marine genetic resources (MGRs), area-based management tools (ABMTs), environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and capacity building and the transfer of marine technology. The fourth and last[1] BBNJ negotiations session in March 2020[2] will require States to come to a consensus but many differences remain, particularly with regards to the governance regime to be set up for marine genetic resources, the thresholds and minimum criteria required to trigger environmental impact assessments and the capacities of States to manage marine areas beyond their exclusive economic zones (EEZs).

Draft BBNJ Negotiations Text

Klaudija Cremers (IDDRI) gave an overview of the state of the BBNJ negotiations, by first highlighting the negotiations timeline, the four negotiations elements, as well as general principles to be included in the treaty text and the decision-making mechanisms that are currently being discussed. Ms. Cremers presented an outline of the revised draft BBNJ negotiations text published in November 2019 and provided reflections on each of the draft treaty sections, with implications for the next round of BBNJ negotiations. The draft treaty has 12 parts, 70 articles, 2 annexes and a lot of brackets, indicating that it is currently unclear whether States will be able to finalise the treaty during the fourth – and currently final – session of the BBNJ negotiations. In her analysis of the draft treaty text, she highlighted the state of play, the aspects for which no consensus has yet been reached and she provided recommendations on how the various sections could be strengthened. This analysis can be found in IDDRI's report 'A preliminary analysis of the draft high seas biodiversity treaty' published in January 2020. In her key messages, she emphasised the importance of setting up an ambitious and robust BBNJ instrument to deliver an effective governance framework, considering alternative voting rules to allow for decision-making to go beyond consensus, enhancing international cooperation, including at the regional level, and encouraging the adoption of complementary measures within existing frameworks.

[1] At the moment, this is the last session that is scheduled and approved by the United Nations Assembly.
[2] Due to the situation with COVID-19, the session has been indefinitely postponed.

BBNJ Element: Benefit-sharing of Marine Genetic Resources and Intellectual Property Rights
Prof. Abbe Brown (University of Aberdeen) gave a remote presentation on the intellectual property rights (IPRs) related to the benefit-sharing of marine genetic resources (MGRs). She firstly clarified that MGRs come from all living marine organisms, whether of plant or animal origin. She then explained that IPRs confer exclusive rights to control specific activities, for a limited time, with some exceptions, in a specific country (ex. being able to reproduce a story, but without having control over the physical book). With regards to marine genetic resources, this could apply for instance to drugs, special diving equipment or DNA analysis equipment. In this respect, IPRs become increasingly relevant as we move from the physical to the informational realm and develop technical solutions to problems. In terms of the scope of rights, Prof. Brown highlighted that IPRs can cover a single country or a specific region (ex. Andean Pact), but that often IP owners have a portfolio of the equivalent rights in different countries. She emphasised that IPRs are relevant to ABNJ, as many key activities affecting ABNJ take place within national borders. Examples of an application of IPRs relevant to ABNJ are, for instance, patents, copyrights, or databases. Royalties resulting from the use of patented subject matter and the sale of these products would have a positive impact on benefit-sharing. However, there are several possible negative impacts that need to be considered, for instance: when private control through patents are obtained too early in the pipeline from raw material to commercialised product, this might lead to limiting the use for research; private control of information in databases can also result in limiting the use for research and education; control over the software which operates databases might lead to the relevant sectors having to pay for access; and finally if a particular technology is required for special activities, such as deep seabed mining, for instance, Intellectual Property (IP) owners can have power over license holders and the delivery of benefits. In terms of the BBNJ process, Prof. Brown recommends to consider the disclosure of origin and source of MGRs to be done through patent offices without links to the validity of rights, explore what is meant by open access, open source and place of patents for benefit-sharing, and clarify in the future BBNJ Instrument how benefit-sharing will work with IP. For more information on IPRs, see: https://www.ip-watch.org/trips-flexibilities-series-translations/, https://www.grain.org/es/article/80-la-comunidad-andina-adopta-nuevo-regimen-de-proteccion-de-los-derechos-de-propiedad-intelectual, or https://www.abdn.ac.uk/stories/song-of-the-oceans/index.html.

Discussion on the BBNJ Negotiation
Workshop participants discussed and exchanged views on the ongoing BBNJ negotiation process. It was noted that the President of the BBNJ negotiations has made an important effort to include various views and perspectives of States into the draft BBNJ Instrument as well as including other important considerations. The BBNJ Instrument has the objective of filling a legal gap in the ocean governance framework and thus needs to consider which required information may not yet be available as well as take into account possible benefits that may potentially arise from the implementation of this instrument. As an implementing agreement, rather than a procedural one, a complete decision-making process, including coordination mechanisms, will need to be established. Decision-making must be based on the best possible science, for which a scientific and technical advisory body should be established. It was highlighted that the consideration of 'not undermining existing agreements' must be oriented towards generating coordination between relevant bodies to ensure effective implementation of the future BBNJ Instrument. It was also noted that the BBNJ process is not sufficiently connected to the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework negotiations taking place under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Concurrent processes, such as the one under the International Seabed Authority, are also not explicitly discussed or considered in the context of the BBNJ process. Participants also highlighted that there are currently no international standards for environmental impact assessments (EIAs) in place and that the success in implementing area-based management tools (ABMTs), including marine protected areas (MPAs), will be dependent on accountability as well as stakeholder involvement and management.

The morning session was then followed by a discussion in break-out groups and in plenary on ABMTs and EIAs. The questions provided to the workshop participants are found in Table 1. States of the Southeast Pacific region have established several ABMTs and/or MPAs, with each State having a different authority responsible for its designation. Participants concluded that there is limited coordination and cooperation among States in the region in terms of the monitoring, control and surveillance of MPAs. Some MPAs also do not have a management plan in place yet. A great variety of activities take place in the EEZ and the surrounding high seas of the Southeast Pacific, such as fishing, shipping, scientific research and tourism activities. Not all of these activities require EIAs. Workshop participants compared the different national procedures for EIA and concluded that States define regulation and approve EIAs at the national level, but third parties are responsible for conducting the EIA.

Table 1: Questions related to ABMTs and EIAs provided to the workshop participants

Questions related to area-based management tools (ABMTs) and marine protected areas (MPAs)
1) Does your country have ABMTs and MPAs in its exclusive economic zone (EEZ)?
2) Which institution is responsible for the designation of the ABMTs/MPAs?
3) What is the procedure for identifying and submitting a proposal for a new ABMT/MPA?
4) Is there a management plan for the ABMTs/MPAs?
5) What capacity does your country have to carry out monitoring, control and surveillance activities of the ABMTs/MPAs?
6) Can we use some of the lessons learned from the national implementation of ABMTs/MPAs on the high seas?
Questions related to environmental impact assessments (EIAs)
7) What kind of human activities take place in your country's EEZ and in the surrounding high seas?
8) For which activities does your country require an EIA?
9) Who is responsible for carrying out the EIA (e.g. the state or a management body) and who decides if the requirements for an EIA are fulfilled?
10) What is the effect of an EIA?
11) What kind of national EIA requirements can also be used at global level to set a minimum standard?

Session 2: Engagement related to ABNJ and BBNJ

The second session of the workshop focused on advances at the global, regional and national level with regard to the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ, with a special emphasis on the Southeast Pacific region.

UN Environment's ongoing work related to ABNJ and BBNJ

Shuang Zhu (UN Environment) presented UN Environment's ongoing work related to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity through its Regional Seas Programme (RSP). Established in 1974, the RSP provides a framework to protect the marine environment through the cooperation of neighbouring countries at the regional level, with the main objective to address the degradation of the environmental quality of oceans and seas. There are a total of 18 Regional Seas Programmes, which are governed by the participating countries through Conference of the Parties. They function through their Action Plans and are funded by the participating countries. They focus on land-based pollution, biodiversity, sustainable consumption and production, monitoring and

assessment, ship-based pollution and ecosystem-based management. Five Regional Seas Programmes have a mandate for ABNJ, namely the North-East Atlantic (through the OSPAR Commission), the Southern Ocean (through the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources – CCAMLR), the Mediterranean (through the Mediterranean Action Plan – MAP), the Southwest Pacific (through the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme – SPREP), and the Southeast Pacific (through the Lima Convention). The Lima Convention defines the inclusion of the high seas areas as 'up to a distance within which pollution of the high seas may affect that area' within its geographical coverage. Although the Nairobi Convention (Western Indian Ocean) does not include ABNJ in its mandate, its COP 9 adopted two decisions[3], which mention that States shall 'cooperate with existing regional institutions on ocean governance and the conservation of marine biodiversity in adjacent ABNJ… to promote blue economy pathways in the Western Indian Ocean region' (Decision CP.9/10.2) and that they shall 'prepare a report on the feasibility, options and scenarios for the establishment of marine protected areas in ABNJ" (Decision CP.9/10.3). The UN Environment Assembly (UNEA) at its second meeting in 2016 adopted a resolution encouraging contracting parties to existing Regional Seas Conventions to consider the possibility of increasing the regional coverage of these instruments (Resolution 2/10.13). Ms. Zhu further presented a joint UNEP – European Commission project, titled '*Integrated Management and Governance Strategies for Delivery of Ocean-related Sustainable Development Goals'*, which aims to increase cross-sectoral cooperation to achieve integrated regional ocean governance and operationalise area-based management for implementation of the ocean-related Agenda 2030. She also gave an overview of the *WCMC-GEF ABNJ Deep Seas Project*, which focused on topics such as data sharing and storage options for area-based planning in ABNJ, marine biodiversity datasets, and cross-sectoral planning tools.

SPRFMO's ongoing work related to ABNJ and BBNJ

Dr. Martin Cryer (SPRFMO) presented the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation's (SPRFMO) ongoing work related to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ. SPRFMO's objective is to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources through the application of the precautionary and ecosystem approaches and thus safeguard the marine ecosystems in which these resources occur. SPRFMO has 15 contracting parties and 3 cooperating non-contracting parties. Key species targeted by the organisation are the Chilean jack mackerel, jumbo flying squid as well as demersal fish species, such as the orange roughy. Dr. Cryer discussed SPRFMO's efforts to improve the implementation of policy and legal frameworks for sustainable fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the deep seas in ABNJ. He gave an overview of the new conservation and management measures (CMMs) adopted in 2016 for new and exploratory fisheries, in 2019 for deepwater species, and the upcoming one (2020) on the management of squid fisheries. He also showed the positive results from measures to rebuild the jack mackerel fishery or the higher number of reported catches of demersal species. Dr. Cryer also presented SPRFMO's work with regard to reducing impacts on vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) and in improving the conservation and management of EBSAs, for example through 100% observer coverage on bottom trawlers and through restricting bottom trawling to 0.13% of its Convention Area within carefully designated spatial management areas. SPRFMO has also developed and tested a methodology for area-based planning, which clearly shows, through better protection at less cost to the fishing industry, the benefits of shifting to an area-based approach to management. Lastly, Dr. Cryer also presented the comprehensive ongoing work programme for SPRFMO's Scientific Committee to improve planning and adaptive management for deep sea fisheries in ABNJ.

[3] https://www.nairobiconvention.org/CHM%20Documents/COP%20Decisions/UNEP-EAF-COP-9-5%20-%20Nairobi%20Convention%20COP9%20meeting%20-%20Report%20-%20Advance.pdf

State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ at the National Level

Piero Villegas (IMARPE) gave an overview of the Instituto del Mar del Perú (IMARPE)'s ongoing scientific research in the national waters of Peru as well as the ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific. IMARPE is a specialised technical organisation under Peru's Ministry of Production, which undertakes scientific research with the aim to study and provide knowledge on Peru's sea and its resources and advises the Peruvian government in decision-making regarding the sustainable use of fishing resources and the conservation of the marine environment. IMARPE has several laboratories located along Peru's coast monitoring populations of marine and coastal species of economic and social importance, such as pelagic fish species (anchovy, sardine, jack mackerel, mackerel, tuna and others), demersal fish species (hake and others) and marine invertebrates (squid, fan-shell, clams, mackerel and others). Mr. Villegas presented IMARPE's scientific research to understand the space-time fluctuations and behaviour of highly migratory and straddling fish species, such as jack mackerel, mackerel, swordfish, merlin, bonito or tuna species, as well as its scientific research on large pelagic fish populations, including the anchovy, and water masses. He highlighted that IMARPE also conducts research on shark species within the framework of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Although IMARPE collects information on many marine and coastal species, it has limited resources to undertake research in ABNJ. Mr. Villegas also presented IMARPE's scientific research on oceanographic, physical, chemical, biological and geological processes in the context of climate variability, as well as studies on the impact of climate change on marine and coastal ecosystems. Remote sensing data and satellite tracking of fishing vessels are used by the institute to retrieve important scientific and monitoring data, for instance to combat IUU fishing, as a means of evidence for sanctioning, to protect areas prohibited to industrial fleet entry, to ensure safety at sea, or ensure sustainable management. Such data is not limited to areas within national jurisdiction. IMARPE also undertakes research on genetic resources and collaborates with various institutions to undertake conservation research on ecologically or biologically significant areas (EBSAs), and particularly on the Dorsal de Nazca y de Salas y Gómez. All information collected by the IMARPE is freely available through its website.

Piero Villegas presenting IMARPE's scientific research. Photo by STRONG High Seas project

CPPS Presentation on State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ

Dr. Marcelo Nilo (CPPS) presented the ongoing work under the Permanent Commission on the South Pacific (CPPS). The role of CPPS is to catalyse action, articulate, coordinate, and generate enabling conditions for the knowledge sharing to support decision-making by its member States based on the best available science. This is done through various binding and non-binding institutional arrangements. Dr. Nilo highlighted several relevant plans of action and agreements under the CPPS that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ. These include the 1992 Protocol for the Regional Study of El Niño (ERFEN), which collects data through joint research cruises to monitor ocean circulation; the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) Regional Alliance for the South-East Pacific (GRASP) working group established in 2006 to model and share oceanographic and climate data; the Scientific Technical Committee established through the 2010 Regional Action Plan for the Conservation and Management of Sharks, Rays and Chimaeras in the Pacific Region, which undertakes research, fisheries management, species and ecosystems conservation, control and monitoring, as well as capacity building; and the working group established in 2014 on early-warning

systems for tsunamis, which established a regional communication protocol as well as a communication platform. To undertake these activities, CPPS collaborates with more than fifty specialised institutions at the regional level, including research institutes, universities, government agencies and navies.

State Presentations: State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ at the National Level
Representatives of the Foreign Affairs Ministry of Chile, Ecuador, Peru and Panama presented ongoing work at the national level with regard to ocean governance, with a focus on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity.

With its long coastline and offshore islands and archipelagos, the ocean plays an important role for **Chile.** Gabriel González Videla, then President of Chile, declared Chile's sovereignty up to 200 nautical miles in June of 1947, which was followed by the signing of the Santiago Declaration in 1952. These declarations were pivotal in the development of the international Law of the Sea through the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Chile has notably ratified the UNCLOS, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA), the Implementing Agreement on Part XI of UNCLOS, the FAO Port State Agreement, and is also a member of SPRFMO as well as a cooperating non-member of IATTC. Chile noted that the BBNJ negotiations are a very complex and technical process but highlighted that it will be important for the future BBNJ Instrument to be consistent and coherent with previous international agreements and mandates, including with the Agenda 2030, and particularly Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 14, and to not undermine other instruments or principles in operation. In this respect, the precautionary principle and ecosystem approach should form the basis of the future instrument. It will also be important to respect the relationship with UNCLOS as the umbrella convention. Chile highlighted that the implementation of the future BBNJ Instrument will depend on the institutional arrangements put into place as well as how each of the BBNJ elements is negotiated. A Conference of the Parties (COP), a scientific body and a secretariat should be established, although their function is still to be determined. COP decisions should be made by consensus with a voting rule option, should consensus not be reached, in order to ensure the advancement and implementation of the future BBNJ Instrument. Chile also emphasised the importance of ensuring that the BBNJ Instrument is widely applicable to ensure ratification from all – or most – countries and also that it takes into account the situation and interests of developing countries. Finally, Chile noted that it will be important to ensure that the BBNJ Instrument is enforceable.

Ecuador is also one of the signatories of the 1952 Santiago Declaration, which promoted States' sovereignty up to 200 nautical miles. Ecuador ratified UNCLOS in 2012 and focuses on two main aspects of ocean governance: conservation and fishing. As a fishing nation, the health of the fishing sector is important to the country. Ecuador currently has a Fisheries Law being discussed by parliament and maintains close cooperation with its neighbouring countries, notably in regard to IUU fishing. At the same time, Ecuador works towards the protection of its marine environment, such as the Galapagos Islands, to keep them in a good state of conservation. Ecuador established in 2011 the *Comité Interinstitucional del Mar* (Inter-institutional Committee of the Sea), which gathers different national institutions to discuss ocean affairs. In terms of the BBNJ negotiations, Ecuador believes that reaching an agreement at the fourth – and currently last – negotiation session will be difficult. It hopes that the future BBNJ Instrument can complement other existing instruments and that it takes into account the needs and interests of developing countries.

Peru's National Marine Policy was adopted in December 2019. Achieving five strategic objectives, the policy was elaborated in a participative manner through a multi-sectorial commission and adopted by consensus between all government ministries and sectors involved. Important considerations include strengthening maritime security, the production sector and diversified trade ensuring services and ecosystems. Marine protected areas are also key and the consideration of local and indigenous

knowledge fundamental. At the national level, this work is undertaken by the *Comisión multisectorial de gestión ambiental del medio marino – costero* (COMUMA; Multisectoral Commission on Environmental Management of the Marine and Coastal Environment) under the Ministry of the Environment. In terms of the BBNJ negotiations, Peru hopes for an active and implementable BBNJ Instrument, which aims to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in practice. It also seeks for rights and knowledge of coastal countries to be respected.

Panama is in the process of preparing its Ocean Policy, which will be presented at the end of 2020, and plans to update its Fisheries Law. Panama will also host the Our Ocean Conference in 2021. It has declared in December 2019 the protected area of Isla Bona. In terms of the BBNJ negotiations, Panama is coordinating a national position through its ministries that takes into account the interests of the different sectors. Panama is also member of the Core Latin American Countries (CLAM) Group at the BBNJ negotiations, which represents an opportunity for the Latin American region, including the Southeast Pacific, to have a firm and consistent position on BBNJ.

Discussion on advances at the global, regional and national level

Workshop participants discussed and exchanged views on the presentations made by States and stakeholders on ongoing work at the global, regional and national level with regard to ocean governance, with a focus on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity.

As the fourth BBNJ negotiation session is currently the last one planned, a question was raised with regard to the continuation of the BBNJ process: are countries already thinking about prolonging the BBNJ negotiations and is there a Plan B being considered in case there is no consensus during the BBNJ negotiations or the BBNJ Instrument is not ratified, for example through strengthening the current ocean governance framework and applying the ecosystem approach? States highlighted their willingness to continue to work towards the adoption of the BBNJ Instrument and ensure that the process continues as long as the text is not what States want it to be to avoid that the instrument does not get ratified or that it goes against the interests of countries. They also emphasised the existing differences between developed and developing countries, the different State positions as well as the different interpretations of definitions of terms in most of the major points to be negotiated. This makes the BBNJ negotiation process quite complex and it is very probable that not all aspirations will be met, but it is therefore important to have all necessary minimum requirements in the text to make the process viable and achieve progress. In this respect, it was highlighted, for instance, that States at the BBNJ negotiations have different positions with regard to the integration or exclusion of fishing issues in the instrument, there are still large position gaps with regards to marine genetic resources, not many States understand the objective and process of strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), the process

Andrés Garrido, Javier Mendoza, Salvador Vega, Bolívar Cañizales and Mariano Valverde during the State presentations. Photo by STRONG High Seas project

for submitting proposals for area-based management tools is yet to be clearly defined, and there is still no consensus on whether capacity building and the transfer of technology should be voluntary or mandatory. For States in the Southeast Pacific region, ensuring that the interests of fishing communities are taken into account, including fighting IUU fishing, is as important as ensuring better conservation of marine biodiversity.

The Core Latin American Countries (CLAM) Group was highlighted as very relevant and important for the BBNJ negotiations, giving member countries a unique strength and highlighting their common characteristics. Not being a formal negotiation structure, it also allows each country to take an individual national position, should there be a discrepancy between countries. Concern was expressed with regard to how the various existing instruments and institutions in place could be connected through this future BBNJ Instrument. However, it was noted that it will be important to take into account the knowledge and experience gathered by relevant bodies, including regional fisheries management organisations, for the implementation of the future BBNJ Instrument. For example, the implications for biodiversity of pelagic fisheries or bottom fisheries are different and this will also need to be taken into account. Although bodies such as RFMOs have a mandate to manage fisheries in ABNJ, it is limited and therefore there is a need for the BBNJ Instrument. These regional and sectoral bodies will have an important implementation role to play. It was also highlighted during the discussion that the draft BBNJ Instrument is only available in English and thus makes it difficult for non-English speaking delegations to discuss and analyse it.

Session 3: STRONG High Seas Project: State of Play

Dr. Carole Durussel (IASS) gave a brief presentation of the STRONG High Seas project. The STRONG High Seas project is a five-year project (2017-2022) funded through the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). It is coordinated by the IASS and implemented together with IDDRI, BirdLife International, the International Ocean Institute (IOI) – Southern Africa, the Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN), WWF Colombia, and WWF Germany. Working with the Secretariat of the CPPS and the Secretariat of the West and Central Africa Regional Seas Programme, this project focuses on two focal regions, namely the Southeast Pacific and Southeast Atlantic. The three main objectives of the project are: a) to facilitate the development of improved or new management approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ in the Southeast Pacific and Southeast Atlantic regions; b) to identify best practices and provide support to regional institutions and national authorities for implementing existing regional instruments; and c) to develop options for regional governance in a future BBNJ international instrument and transfer regional lessons learned to the global level to promote ocean governance. This is a scientific project that takes a collaborative approach, working directly with the Secretariats of the CPPS and Abidjan Convention and, through them, with their member States. The project's contributions to the Southeast Pacific region include: a) providing scientific support to the region in its decision-making processes on issues related to regional ocean governance and the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ, including for the negotiations on a BBNJ Instrument; b) organising regional capacity building workshops on issues related to regional ocean governance and the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ, including for the BBNJ negotiations; c) developing a stakeholder platform to ensure dialogues and exchange of knowledge and information on issues related to regional ocean governance and the conservation and sustainable use of BBNJ; d) ensuring the exchange of knowledge and best practices between marine regions as well as between regions and the global level.

Session 4: Socio-Economic Assessment

The fourth session of the workshop presented the work currently being developed by the STRONG High Seas project on the socio-economic assessment of BBNJ in the Southeast Pacific region. This session allowed brainstorming with workshop participants on important socio-economic aspects that should be included in the report as well as exchanging knowledge on the topic.

High Seas Ecosystem Services and their Valuation

Dr. Rodrigo Sfeir (UCN) gave a presentation on ways to assess high seas ecosystem services. Dr. Sfeir first highlighted that ecosystem services are to be understood as the multitude of benefits that nature or ecosystems provide to society or humans. It is the direct or indirect contribution of ecosystems to human well-being. There are several types of ecosystem services in ABNJ, including provisioning services (food, raw materials, genetic resources, medical resources), regulatory services (air purification and carbon sequestration, climate regulation, waste treatment, biological control), cultural services (recreation and leisure, aesthetic appreciation, inspiration for culture, art and design, information for cognitive development), or supporting services (species habitat – such as seamounts and hydrothermal vents – migratory routes, maintenance of genetic diversity). He pointed out that the quality of these ecosystem services in ABNJ has been significantly affected by technological development as well as by use conflicts such as with aquaculture, oil exploration and extraction and the use of underwater cables. In the case of provisioning services, such as fisheries for instance, decreases in catch per unit effort, increases in fuel and labour costs, and decreases in the average value per unit landed result in profitability loss, increased economic risk, as well as redirecting exploitation to new species and the mobility of productive factors to new productive sectors in ABNJ. It is therefore important to understand the benefits that ecosystem services provide and what their disappearance means by putting an economic value on them. Dr. Sfeir pointed out that valuing ecosystem services requires a measurement of society's benefits, which can be done using monetary methods. However, there is also a need to assess non-monetary benefits. He highlighted that the value of all environmental goods and services in an ecosystem is obtained through the concept of Total Economic Value. This concept includes the usage value (through direct and indirect uses as well as possible future uses) as well as the non-use value (which includes considerations such as 'preservation for others', 'preservation for descendants', 'own preservation' in the sense of being satisfied knowing that there are species and ecosystems). Dr. Sfeir presented in detail each of the principal monetary methods: a) direct market methods (direct market prices), b) declared preference method (contingent valuation), c) disclosed preference methods (indirect valuation, i.e. travel cost, hedonic prices); as well as non-monetary methods: a) quantitative and qualitative methods (interviews, surveys), b) participatory methods (focus groups, Delphi panels), c) participatory spatial representations, d) deliberative methods. He also emphasised that cultural services are difficult to value as benefits can be of physical, emotional or material nature. The ocean has a cultural value that generates a sense of belong, which are not properly considered. He concluded by highlighting the importance of distinguishing between instrumental and deliberative

Rodrigo Sfeir presenting ways to assess high seas ecosystem services. Photo by STRONG High Seas project

paradigms and provided an example by presenting the Juan Fernández archipelago in Chile as a case study.

A Preliminary Assessment of High Seas Ecosystem Services in the Southeast Pacific

Marcelo Olivares (UCN) presented a preliminary ecosystem services assessment for the Southeast Pacific, focusing on high seas fishing activities. Mr. Olivares first highlighted that a 2015 study by WWF found that the annual value generated by the 'ocean economy' would position the ocean as the 7th economy in the world at about 2.5 trillion dollars. He then gave an overview of the extent of global high seas fishing activities in terms of their economic implications (i.e. in terms of profits, revenues, and incomes), before focusing on the Southeast Pacific region. Mr. Olivares showed the total volume of catches as well as total value of fishing activities in the Southeast Pacific for the CPPS member States, both within national jurisdiction and in ABNJ, as well as the total value of catches for the various flag States fishing in the Southeast Pacific. Overall, it is estimated that fishing activity in the ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific represents approximately 2.9% of total catches and 8% of the value of these catches in the region. There are inequalities in terms of access and exploitation, with many fishing activities being justified through subsidies. Mr. Olivares highlighted that distant water fishing nations' activities in the Southeast Pacific are in principle unprofitable and hence could be economically justified by subsidies, forced labour, or because these activities are being carried out in the EEZs. It has been shown by satellite imagery that many fishery activities in the ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific take place very close to the 201 nautical miles limit, with socio-economic implications for coastal countries. Mr. Olivares furthermore highlighted the extent of the fishing activity on the high seas, showing from a Sumalia et al. (2015) study that most of the catches are taken from within national jurisdiction, with about 0.1% of the catches and 0.1% of the landings coming from ABNJ. There is a significant inequality in the fishing exploitation in ABNJ so that conservation measures, such as fishery closures, could have a redistributive effect. The same study showed that having full fishery closure in ABNJ would result in no catch losses globally and the halving of unequal distribution of fisheries benefits. Mr. Olivares stressed that understanding and quantifying the link between biophysical processes and the provision of ecosystem services is necessary to approximate monetary values to the costs of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation. Given the limitations of the economic approach to the (monetary) valuation of marine ecosystems, efforts need to be directed towards a qualitative description of the importance of those services whose value cannot be quantified, and their link to the generation of value from a socio-economic perspective. Furthermore, including a value chain analysis and taking into account multiplier effects is important.

Marcelo Olivares presenting a preliminary ecosystem services assessment for the Southeast Pacific. Photo by STRONG High Seas

Discussion on the socio-economic aspects

Workshop participants discussed and exchanged views on the socio-economic assessment presentations. This discussion was followed by a discussion in break-out groups and in plenary. The questions provided to the workshop participants using the interactive presentation software *Mentimeter* are found in Table 2.

The results allowed getting information from workshop participants regarding the characteristics around ABNJ, their cultural features, the distributive implications of their exploitation, the socio-economic effect that a future BBNJ instrument might have as well as the opportunities that could be derived from this instrument for coastal States.

With regards to jobs at sea, they are considered to be precarious and of great physical and mental demand, and involve long periods at sea. They are also considered to be linked to a high level of multiculturalism, low education and high alcohol consumption. With regard to the distribution of costs and benefits, the former include impacts on the environment, biodiversity and the resources present in the countries' exclusive economic zones, while the latter indicate that the benefits are generated mainly for transnational shipping companies and large tuna fleets. Finally, on the socio-economic effects and opportunities, participants highlighted the effects resulting from greater regulation on fishing activity, maritime routes and governance, as well as opportunities in technological development, bioprospecting and greater collaboration between coastal States.

The discussion during this session mainly focused on socio-economic aspects related to fisheries. However, it was raised that the socio-economic aspects of other current and future activities, including geo-engineering, should be tackled. Furthermore, the valuation of ecosystem services under consideration of climate change also needs to be considered.

Table 2: Questions related to socio-economic assessments provided to the workshop participants and main answers

1) What are the characteristics of jobs associated with fishing activities in ABNJ?
   - They are linked and conditioned to climatic events and characteristics
   - They are informal, precarious and risky
   - They are of great physical and mental demand, mostly performed by men
   - They are more specialised and better paid than those in the EEZs, using advanced technology. However, there are fewer in number than those in the EEZs
   - Well-paid activity but with no projection for the future or quality of life
   - Cases of slavery and human trafficking on fishing boats have been reported
   - There are associated with large companies
   - They involve diverse nationalities and long embarkation periods
   - They are regulated by the national legislation of the flag State
   - They have no knowledge with regard to the impact of the fishing activity on biodiversity
   - There can be associated with cases of IUU fishing and illegal business

2) What are some of the cultural traits of people involved in fisheries in ABNJ?
   - Mulitculturalism; low level of education; no responsibility; no environmental or biodiversity education; independent; tough people used to the sea; low sense of belonging; risky; high alcohol consumption; without understanding of the implications of overfishing (filling the boat as quickly as possible)

3) Who gets the benefits and who bears the costs of the activities undertaken in ABNJ? Which information do you consider relevant in this regard?
   - Benefits: International shipping, large tuna fleets, transnationals, most powerful entrepreneurs, countries with investment capacity; fishing, shipping and mining industries; pharmaceuticals (from genetic resource research); coastal economies
   - Costs: borne by the environment; biodiversity; the poorest countries; fishing,

shipping and mining industries; governments (through surveillance and security costs as well as protection and environmental costs); smaller scale fishing economies (due to ecological and food chain degradations affecting commercial species within the EEZ); ship owners (operational costs)
- Relevant information: mapping of benthic habitats

4) What potential socio-economic impacts do you consider relevant for a future BBNJ Instrument?
   - Changes in maritime trade routes
   - Development of new professional careers and lines of research
   - Development of technologies for remote areas and the need for trained personnel
   - Technology standardization will benefit small-scale fisheries
   - Increased catches of migratory species
   - CPPS member States could be marginalised from research in high seas areas due to the lack of resources
   - Increased costs of fish products; fishing companies would pass on potential losses to their employees or consumers
   - Sharing the benefits of scientific research
   - Stricter rules would decrease activity with the consequent effect on employment in the sector
   - Positive impacts on lower-income countries
   - Increased fuel use associated with activity
   - Greater formality in the marketing of the various species
   - Positive effect on biodiversity, protection of seabirds and mammals, with a positive long-term economic effect
   - Higher profits for pharmaceutical companies
   - Greater regional sovereignty
   - Increased knowledge in these areas
   - Great potential for bioprospecting with benefits for all countries
   - Higher cost to States
   - Increased regional cooperation for conservation

5) What new opportunities for generating value can be identified in ABNJ? Which activities could be developed?
   - New fields of research, technological development and scientific progress, in particular for capacity building in deep-sea research
   - Opportunities for biodiversity conservation, caring for the world heritage of humanity and hence allowing for increasing future benefits
   - Opportunities to improve regional cooperation and coordination, contributing to a greater integration of South American countries
   - Creation of cross-border prospective research among Latin American countries, sharing research and technology development costs
   - Bioprospecting, marine genetic resources, and intellectual property
   - Generation, management and integration of monitoring information
   - Development of satellite technologies with emphasis on proximity to EEZs

Session 5: Monitoring, Control and Surveillance of Human Activities in ABNJ

The fifth session of the workshop presented the work currently being developed by the STRONG High Seas project on monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) of human activities in ABNJ, and particularly on ways to strengthen MCS in the Southeast Pacific, as well as important work

undertaken by organisations such as the Global Fishing Watch or the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). This session also allowed brainstorming with workshop participants important aspects regarding MCS that should be included in the STRONG High Seas report as well as exchanging knowledge on the topic.

Activity progress on Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) of Human Activities in ABNJ
Klaudija Cremers (IDDRI) presented the ongoing work under the STRONG High Seas project on monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) of human activities in ABNJ. She first defined what MCS is, namely: a) the monitoring of human activities (e.g. in the form of data collection and reporting); b) control of human activities and their impacts on marine biodiversity (e.g. through regulation, licensing, and controls on how, where and when activities in the ocean take place); and c) surveillance of vessels (e.g. through observer programmes and electronic surveillance systems). Ms. Cremers then gave an account of the MCS expert workshops held under the STRONG High Seas project, namely two workshops in Paris in July 2018 and April 2019 as well as an expert workshop for the Southeast Pacific region in Guayaquil in November 2019. An expert workshop for the Southeast Atlantic region is planned for 2020. MCS is important to ensure compliance with regulations through transparency, sanctions, and other measures such as sustainability certification schemes, and also to ensure enforcement, for instance to tackle IUU fishing and transnational illegal activities, such as human trafficking, forced labour, and trafficking of arms, drugs and wildlife. Since the adoption of UNCLOS in 1994, most of the standards regulate transport issues, but it would be important to consider other activities, such as illegal activities or the protection of marine protected areas (MPAs). Ms. Cremers outlined the different factors that need to be taken into account when choosing which MCS tool to use, namely: purpose, costs, access, reliability, coverage, cross-checking data, ease of manipulation, privacy considerations, capacity to analyse data, and the different actors/stakeholders involved. She further highlighted that although many MCS tools are available, challenges and gaps in their implementation as well as the lack of capacity remain the main challenges to effective MCS. Ms. Cremers indicated three potential pathways to strengthen MCS provisions in the future BBNJ Instrument, which could include: a) consolidating and reinforcing of MCS obligations and principles; b) developing a strong MCS role for the clearing-house mechanism; and c) requiring submission of a MCS strategy in future proposals for area-based management tools. She then focused on possible ways to strengthen MCS in the Southeast Pacific region. One particular aspect is strengthening communication, cooperation and coordination at the internal (e.g. different governmental ministries) and interstate (e.g. through a joint maritime strategy) levels as well as between regional and sectoral regimes (e.g. regional fisheries management organisations – RFMOs). Ms. Cremers emphasised that technology does not appear to be the limiting factor for MCS in the region but that complementary mechanisms need to be considered, including: a) the capacity to store, process and analyse data; b) strategy (maintenance costs, assigning responsibility to a government agency); c) training (for technical personnel and politicians); and d) a single platform to exchange information (regional or global through the clearing-house mechanism). She also noted that an appropriate penalty system and effective sanctions are dependent on political will and require enforcement through, for instance: a) cooperation with the

Klaudija Cremers presenting project work on MCS. Photo by STRONG High Seas project

Ministry of Foreign Affairs to tackle distant water fishing nations; b) a MCS strategy for marine protected areas; c) sharing of IUU lists and information about sanctions; and d) a catch certification scheme. As a conclusion, Ms. Cremers noted that MCS has not been much discussed during the BBNJ negotiations and that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to MCS. Cooperation and coordination are key.

Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS): Work done under the Global Fishing Watch

Eloy Aroni (Global Fishing Watch) presented the work undertaken by the Global Fishing Watch in Central and South America. Several countries around the world have shared the vessel monitoring system (VMS) information of their flagged vessels with the Global Fishing Watch. For instance, Indonesia has been sharing information about its ships since 2017 and is the first nation to make its data public. Peru and Panama have also shared their data with the Global Fishing Watch, with Chile joining soon. Sharing VMS information allows monitoring ships' trajectories and behaviour and can therefore, through traceability and transparency, help to combat IUU fishing as well as other illegal activities that take place in the ocean. Global Fishing Watch has already been instrumental in helping various governments tackle cases of IUU fishing in their waters. Mr. Aroni discussed the weakness of the Automatic Identification System (AIS) – the system used on the high seas – as vessels can turn the system off. With the help of the information gathered by the VMS however, the full vessel route can be defined and help to track illegal activities. Mr. Aroni presented examples of vessel catches that were made thanks to data provided by the Global Fishing Watch.

Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS): Work done under IATTC

Dr. Michael Scott (IATTC) introduced the Inter-American Tropical Tuna (IATTC) as the oldest of five tuna RFMOs that was established through the 1949 agreement between the US and Costa Rica to manage the baitboat tuna fishery. From 1960s onwards, purse-seining became the dominant fishery and thus fishing was no longer tied to the baitfish grounds. This allowed for the fishery to expand further offshore and also led to an increase in the incidental mortalities of dolphins. The observer programme was developed primarily to monitor dolphins and has been successful in reducing the incidental mortality of dolphins. Dr. Scott explained that the tuna-dolphin association is determined by the swimming depths of both dolphins and tuna. With yellowfin tuna swimming near the thermocline, the depth of the thermocline will determine whether tuna will be associated with dolphin populations. He further highlighted that the same oceanographic variables that promote the tuna-dolphin bond, namely the warming of sea surface temperatures, the shallowing of mixed layer depth, and the vertically expanding of the oxygen minimum zone, are also the ones that are changing in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. Furthermore, it has been shown that the use of alternative sets (such as FAD sets or school sets) to dolphin sets also produces high bycatch of other marine species. Dr. Scott explained that the mandate of the IATTC is to fulfil the objectives of the Antigua Convention, which entered into force on 27 August 2010, and covers a geographical area of approximately 55'000.000 km^2. It is primarily to ensure the 'long-term conservation and sustainable use of the stocks of tunas and tuna-like species and other associated species of fish taken by vessels fishing for tunas and tuna-like species in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO)', which covers both national jurisdictions and ABNJ. Specifically, IATTC is responsible for the conservation and management of tunas and 'tuna-like' species, which includes the subfamilies *Scombrinae* (except *Scombrini*), *Istiophoridae* and *Xiphiidae*. IATTC is furthermore responsible for the conservation – but not the management – of 'associated species', such as sea turtles or marine mammals. Dr. Scott highlighted that IATTC is proactive in pursuing ecological sustainability of EPO fisheries through the Antigua Convention and recent resolutions on, for instance, dolphin mortality limits, monitoring catches on incidentally caught species (purse seine), resolutions pertaining to bycatch species, supporting research on trophic ecology, development of ecosystem model of the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean, and exploring ecological risk assessment. Today, the IATTC is comprised of 21 member countries and 5 cooperating non-members.

Plenary Discussion on MCS

During the plenary discussion on MCS, workshop participants emphasised the importance of enhancing national MCS capacity and knowledge by creating more opportunities for regional data sharing on e.g. IUU fishing activities and increasing access to MCS technology. All break-out groups indicated that political will is the key requirement to strengthen MCS and that initiatives should come from the region, and not from actors outside the region. Some participants indicated that it would be useful to have easier access to data from regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs). Moreover, decisions taken under the *Estudio Regional del Fenómeno El Niño* (ERFEN) are binding upon Parties and some participants suggested that CPPS member States could take regional decisions on MCS under this scheme.

Mariano Valverde during the plenary discussion on MCS.
Photo by STRONG High Seas project

Table 3: Questions related to MCS and answers provided by the workshop participants

1) There is technology, science and funding… so what is missing?
    - A political will to ensure better governance, including new instruments and rules (legal framework)
    - Access to technology, science and funding. It is also important to link MCS to knowledge and capacity
    - Effective legislation (procedures, sanctions and reasonable response times). The current legal framework does not allow for progress on these issues
    - Evidence-based public policies
    - Inertia is a powerful force
    - Incentives for industry (labelling, conditional permits)
    - Evidence-based policy agreements
    - Coordinated regional institutions
2) How could a new treaty support the existing initiatives of CPPS member States, e.g. in the ABNJ around the Galapagos Islands?
    - Political will
    - Capacity building and technology transfer
    - Definition of protocols and guidelines for sharing information (noting that information sharing is ongoing under the umbrella CPPS and this could be exported to other areas)
    - Complement and support the work of regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs), which provide a source of information on ecosystem, climate change and risk management, and contributes to the conservation of biodiversity
    - Provide an obligation to comply

- Strengthening of joint decisions by CPPS member States
- Conservation of marine protected areas (MPAs)

3) How could CPPS member States coordinate more closely on MCS and is there motivation for closer cooperation?
   - Political will
   - Through a new platform to share data and specify and/or define how decisions are being implemented
   - National articulation through a regional projection
   - There is a need for greater knowledge and awareness of the importance of regional bodies in CPPS member States to ensure empowerment in the operational structure
   - Through joint strategies (examples of cooperation: Peru-Ecuador for the mangroves of Tumbes)
   - Joint control actions, standardisation of methodologies and protocols
   - Interconnection of existing systems
   - Strengthen technical platforms and Assembly agreements to make them legally binding
   - Investment in common MCS technologies
   - Extend cooperation with Global Fishing Watch
4) What can coastal and island nations do to strengthen MCS on the high seas, e.g. through the FAO Port State Measures Agreement, market access, observer coverage?
   - Share data and information to better understand issues (close cooperation made quickly and effectively)
   - Political will
   - Design and implement joint strategies
   - With regard to port States: the institutionalisation of MCS activities (through common criteria and methodologies)
   - Establish certification of resources' sustainability, obtain and improve the added value of economic resources
   - Prevent the entry of non-compliant vessels into CPPS ports

Session 6: Stakeholder platform

Presentation on the Development of a Stakeholder Platform

Dr. Jaime Aburto (UCN) highlighted the outcomes of the discussions and inputs from the previous dialogue workshops organised in Cali, Colombia (June 2018) and in Guayaquil, Ecuador (March 2019): Governments and intergovernmental organisations are the main stakeholders, and the Ministries of Foreign Affairs have a key role to play in coordinating national efforts on ocean governance issues. CPPS also has an important role to play in the Southeast Pacific region because it facilitates coordination and communication between its member States. Challenges identified include gaps in socio-economic information, the lack of coordination mechanism for knowledge sharing, and

Jaime Aburto presenting the stakeholder platform. Photo by STRONG High Seas project

the lack of a general vision for scientific research in the region. In this respect, CPPS can be an important coordinating mechanism. Dr. Aburto stressed that the public and private sectors, civil society as well as academia are relevant stakeholders in ABNJ issues and therefore should be included in future discussions. The inclusion and input from these sectors is considered crucial for decision-making on ABNJ issues. He also highlighted that CPPS is a very important mechanism for convening and coordinating between public and private research institutes and its member States, and also serves as an important data repository. Based on these considerations, Dr. Aburto presented the beta version of the stakeholder platform for the Southeast Pacific region under the STRONG High Seas project, which includes information about various ABNJ-relevant topics, a list of institutions working on ABNJ-related issues, a list of publications and other relevant information about ABNJ, as well as the possibility to include discussion groups to exchange ideas on relevant topics/issues. The stakeholder platform will be hosted on the CPPS website.

Plenary Discussion on the Stakeholder Platform

It was discussed that this should be an outreach platform, which enables the inclusion of all groups of stakeholders, including for instance the fishing communities. The platform should contain relevant information and data on ABNJ, although some caution was raised with regard to having third parties uploading information to the platform as the information would need to be previously checked. It was also proposed that the platform could be broader and include topics associated with sustainable development. Whether the platform should also offer the possibility for stakeholders to communicate and exchange views and ideas was discussed, but most participants agreed that the main objective of the platform should be of an informative and outreach nature. The longevity of the platform was also discussed, in terms of upkeep and maintenance costs. A proposal was made to have certain functions on the platform be administered in a rotation manner between the CPPS member States.

Session 7: Next steps

STRONG High Seas Project next steps

Dr. Carole Durussel and Ben Boteler (IASS) presented the progress of the STRONG High Seas project to date as well as the next steps planned under the project. The STRONG High Seas focuses on six specific areas, namely on the development of scientific assessments, the facilitation of dialogue and expert workshops, the organisation of capacity building workshops, ensuring knowledge sharing and the transfer of lessons learnt, as well as the creation of a stakeholder platform. Scientific assessments under the project are co-designed with the Secretariat of the CPPS and its member States with contributions from other stakeholders attending the various dialogue and expert workshops. They are furthermore reviewed by external expert reviewers as well as by members of the STRONG High Seas Advisory Board. So far, a total of seven scientific reports have been published under the project (see Annex 3), and several others are in the process of being developed. The STRONG High Seas project also hosted two webinars to disseminate information in the Southeast Pacific region and provide expert information on topics of relevance to the region (see Annex 3). STRONG High Seas also hosted and facilitated numerous expert, dialogue, and capacity building workshops in the Southeast Pacific region, at the BBNJ negotiations in New York as well as in other locations to ensure knowledge sharing between relevant stakeholders. The project is also in the process of developing a stakeholder platform for the Southeast Pacific region.

Mr. Boteler presented the ongoing work of the STRONG High Seas project with regard to capacity building, which notably focuses on the development of government capacity to participate in the BBNJ negotiations and in the development of their capacity to implement conservation and management measures in ABNJ. He emphasised that the STRONG High Seas project aims to support both individual and institutional capacities, considering a wide spectrum of potential capacity building measures ranging from 'awareness raising' to the organisation of 'specialised workshops'. These measures and the capacity building workshops are based on identified needs within the region. There

are several opportunities for the project to support capacity building in the region, including through its expert, dialogue and capacity building workshops, but also through webinars, the stakeholder platform or targeted policy and technical briefs. Mr. Boteler reiterated that the STRONG High Seas project welcomes any feedback and requests on key issues or topics on which the project should focus in the coming years as well as indication as to which formats might be most useful for exchange in the region.

Plenary Discussion on the next steps under the STRONG High Seas Project

After the successful organisation by Peru of its National Dialogue on 25 February 2020, a recommendation was made for STRONG High Seas to support CPPS member States through expertise with the organisation of their national dialogues. These could be organised back-to-back with the STRONG High Seas Dialogue Workshops. The involvement of more universities from each of the CPPS member States in the activities of the STRONG High Seas project was encouraged. Further topics for capacity building were proposed, including on the management of big data, the link between marine genetic resources and intellectual property rights, and the importance of the ocean management and conservation for coastal States. There is furthermore a need to understand the ecosystem services and the regulatory functions of the ocean better, particularly from a socio-economic perspective.

The work and outputs of the STRONG High Seas project were highlighted as an important contribution to the CPPS, its member States and the region as a whole. Particularly, the Dialogue Workshops were underlined as being important for information and exchange within the region.

Closing of the Workshop and Acknowledgements

The workshop 'Enhancing the Knowledge Base for Cross-Sectoral Management and Ocean Governance in ABNJ of the Southeast Pacific' was closed on 27 February 2020 by Ambassador Méntor Villagómez, General Secretary of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS), Minister Counselor Andrés Garrido, Director of Maritime Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru, and Dr. Carole Durussel, Co-lead STRONG High Seas project. The Dialogue Workshop convened numerous decision-makers and stakeholders to share expertise, experiences and knowledge and to discuss topics of key importance regarding marine biodiversity in ABNJ in the Southeast Pacific. The workshop organisers wish to thank all participants for their active engagement and contribution to this event and look forward to continuing the collaboration over the coming years.

Carole Durussel and Andrés Garrido at the closing of the Dialogue Workshop.
Photo by STRONG High Seas project

Annex 1: List of Participants

Name	Organisation
Jaime Aburto	Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN), Chile
David Alejandro Alonso Carvajal	Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras (INVEMAR), Colombia
Galo Ricardo Andrade Daza	Directorate General of Maritime Interests of the Navy, Ecuador
Gustavo Arévalo Castro	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)
Eloy Aroni Sulca	Global Fishing Watch
Ben Boteler	Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS)
Paula Bueno	WWF Colombia
Abbe Brown	University of Aberdeen
Bolívar Ángel Cañizales Castañedas	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Panama
Emilio Cobo	IUCN
Joaquín Correa Muñiz	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
César Correa Zuñiga	Ministry of Production, Peru
Klaudija Cremers	Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI)
Martin Cryer	Fisheries New Zealand
Paúl Fernando Duclós Parodi	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Carole Durussel	Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS)
Jana Fasheh	Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS)
Mauricio Eugenio Gálvez Larach	Independent consultant, Chile
Andrés Garrido Sánchez	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Javier Alfonso Gaviola Tejada	Instituto del Mar del Perú (IMARPE)
Sonia Carolina González Arévalo	Comisión Colombiana del Océano, Colombia
Ana María González Delgadillo	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Colombia
Angel Horna	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Cristian Laborda Mora	Pew Charitable Trusts
Jaime Andrés Letelier Pino	Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP), Chile
Jesús Antonio Menacho Piérola	Directorate General of Captains and Coast Guards, Peru
Francisco Javier Mendoza Rodríguez	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ecuador
Alfonso Miranda	Nacional Society of Industry (SNI), Peru
Carmen Eliana Morales Van de Wyngard	Instituto Milenio de Oceanografía, Universidad de Concepción, Chile
Julieta Javiera Muñoz Siemsen	Undersecretariat for Fisheries and Aquaculture, Chile
Juan José Nieto Lopez	Centro Internacional para la Investigación del Fenómeno de El Niño (CIIFEN), Ecuador
Sergio Marcelo Nilo Gatica	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)
Nery Yanet Oblitas Sánchez	Ministry of Production, Peru
Marcelo Olivares Arenas	Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN), Chile
Juan Luis Orellana Caces	Ministry of Environment, Chile
Rita Orozco Moreyra	Instituto del Mar del Perú (IMARPE)
Salvador Peraltilla	National Fisheries Society (SNP), Peru
Diandra Piedra Torres	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Panama
Jianphier Pletickosich López	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Diana María Quintana Saavedra	General Maritime Directorate (DIMAR), Colombia

Sara Quinteros	Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual (INDECOPI), Peru
Fernando Ramírez Gastón	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Osvaldo Rosas	Ministry of Environment, Panama
Xavier Mauricio Santillán Lara	Undersecretary of Marine and Coastal Management, Ecuador
Michael Scott	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)
Rodrigo Luis Sfeir Yazigi	Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN), Chile
Francisco Tenya Hasegawa	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Mariano Valverde	Ministry of Environment, Peru
Salvador Vega Telias	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Chile
Silvia Irene Velásquez Silva	Ministry of Production, Peru
Méntor Villagómez	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)
Piero Villegas Apaza	Instituto del Mar del Peru (IMARPE)
César Viteri Mejía	Charles Darwin Foundation, Ecuador
Hubert Wieland	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Beatriz Yannicelli	Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN), Chile and Universidad de la República (UdelaR), Uruguay
Luis Zapata	WWF Colombia
Silvia Zapata	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Peru
Shuang Zhu	UN Environment

Annex 2: Workshop Agenda

Day 1 – 26 February 2020	
8:30 – 9:00	**Registration**
9:00 – 9:30	**Welcome on behalf of the CPPS Secretariat, the STRONG High Seas Project, and the host country Peru & Objectives of the Workshop**
9:30 – 10:00	**Session 1: BBNJ Negotiations** **Importance of BBNJ and the ongoing BBNJ Negotiations** *Presentation on the importance of conserving and sustainably using marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) for the Southeast Pacific region and the ongoing BBNJ negotiations at the United Nations* Dr. Gustavo Arévalo, CPPS Followed by Q&A
10:00 – 10:30	**Draft BBNJ Negotiations Text** *Presentation on the revised draft BBNJ negotiations text, its implications for the upcoming 4th round of BBNJ negotiations, and the role of regional organisations in supporting the implementation of the BBNJ Agreement* Klaudija Cremers, IDDRI Followed by Q&A
10:30 – 11:00	**BBNJ Elements: Break out groups** *Discussion in break-out groups to discuss BBNJ Elements Area-based Management Tools (ABMTs) and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs)*
11:00 – 11:30	**Coffee Break**
11:30 – 12:00	**BBNJ Element: Benefit-sharing of marine genetic resources and intellectual property rights** *Presentation on intellectual property rights related to the benefit-sharing of marine genetic resources* Prof. Abbe Brown, University of Aberdeen Followed by Q&A
12:00 – 13:00	**Plenary Discussion** *Discussion in plenary on BBNJ Elements*
13:00 – 14:30	**Lunch Break**
14:30 – 14:50	**Session 2: Engagement related to ABNJ and BBNJ** **UN Environment's ongoing work related to ABNJ and BBNJ** *Presentation on UN Environment's ongoing work related to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ, including work done by the regional seas programme* Shuang Zhu, UN Environment Followed by Q&A
14:50 – 15:10	**SPRFMO's ongoing work related to ABNJ and BBNJ** *Presentation on SPRFMO's ongoing work related to the conservation and*

	sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ Dr. Martin Cryer, SPRFMO Followed by Q&A
15:10 – 15:30	**State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ at the National Level** *Presentations on ongoing work in Peru with regard to marine issues, with a focus on BBNJ* IMARPE Followed by Q&A
15:30 – 15:50	**CPPS Presentation on State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ** *Presentation on ongoing work under the CPPS with regard to marine issues, with a focus on BBNJ* Dr. Marcelo Nilo, CPPS Followed by Q&A
15:50 – 16:00	**Discussion** *Discussion in plenary on engagement related to ABNJ and BBNJ*
16:00 – 16:30	**Coffee Break**
16:30 – 17:00	**State Presentations: State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ at the National Level** *Presentations on ongoing work by Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Panama with regard to marine issues, with a focus on BBNJ* Followed by Q&A
17:00 – 18:00	**Panel Discussion: State of Play related to ABNJ and BBNJ at the National Level** *Panel Discussion on ongoing work by Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Panama with regard to marine issues, with a focus on BBNJ*

Day 2 – 27 February 2020	
9:00 – 9:10	**Welcome and Summary of Day 1**
9:10 – 9:30	**Session 3: Project State of Play** **STRONG High Seas Project: State of Play** *Overview of the state of play in the STRONG High Seas project* Dr. Carole Durussel, IASS Followed by Q&A
9:30 – 9:45	**Session 4: Socio-Economic Assessment** **High Seas Ecosystem Services and their Valuation** *Presentation on ways to assess socio-economic factors* Dr. Rodrigo Sfeir, UCN Followed by Q&A

9:45 – 10:00	**A Preliminary Assessment of High Seas Ecosystem Services in the Southeast Pacific** *Presentation of preliminary results and methodological challenges* Marcelo Olivares, UCN Followed by Q&A
10:00 – 11:00	**Discussion** *Open discussion on the socio-economic aspects with audience interaction*
11:00 – 11:30	**Coffee Break**
11:30 – 12:00	**Discussion** *Discussion on the report and coming work under the STRONG High Seas project* Moderated by Dr. Rodrigo Sfeir and Marcelo Olivares, UCN
12:00 – 12:20	**Session 5: Monitoring, Control and Surveillance of Human Activities in ABNJ** **Activity progress on Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) of Human Activities in ABNJ** *Presentation of current findings under the STRONG High Seas Project on MCS* Klaudija Cremers, IDDRI Followed by Q&A
12:20 – 12:40	**Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS): Work done under the Global Fishing Watch** *Presentation of the work done under the Global Fishing Watch on monitoring, control and surveillance* Eloy Aroni, Global Fishing Watch Followed by Q&A
12:40 – 13:00	**Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS): Work done under IATTC** *Presentation of the work done under IATTC on monitoring, control and surveillance* Dr. Michael Scott, IATTC Followed by Q&A
13:00 – 14:30	**Lunch Break**
14:30 – 15:15	**Break-out groups on MCS** *Discussion on the MCS work under the STRONG High Seas project*
15:15 – 16:00	**Plenary Discussion on MCS**
16:00 – 16:30	**Coffee Break**
16:30 – 17:00	**Session 6: Stakeholder platform** **Presentation on the Development of a Stakeholder Platform** *Presentation of the beta version of the stakeholder platform, and links to discussions and inputs previous dialogue workshops* Dr. Jaime Aburto, UCN

	Followed by Q&A
17:00 – 17:45	**Session 7: Next steps** **STRONG High Seas Project next steps** *Presentation and discussion on upcoming work under the STRONG High Seas project* Ben Boteler, IASS
17:45 – 18:00	**Closing of the Workshop by the CPPS Secretariat, the STRONG High Seas Project, and the host country Peru**

Annex 3: List of webinars and scientific reports published under the STRONG High Seas project to date

STRONG High Seas Reports

- Durussel, C., Wright, G., Wienrich, N., Boteler, B., Unger, S., Rochette, J., 'Strengthening Regional Ocean Governance for the High Seas: Opportunities and Challenges to Improve the Legal and Institutional Framework of the Southeast Atlantic and Southeast Pacific', STRONG High Seas Project, 2018, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Online_IASS_Report_190227.pdf
    - Summary for Decision-Makers, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Online_IASS_Summary_EN_190227.pdf
    - Resumen para tomadores de decisiones, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Online_IASS_Summary_ES_190227.pdf

- Wright, G. and Rochette, J., 'Regional Ocean Governance of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction: Lessons Learnt and Ways Forward', STRONG High Seas Project, 2019, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/STRONG-HS_Lessons-Learnt-Report.pdf
    - Summary for Decision-Makers, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/STRONG-HS_Lessons-Learnt-Report-Sum_EN.pdf
    - Resumen para tomadores de decisiones, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/STRONG-HS_Lessons-Learnt-Report-Sum_ES.pdf

- Boteler, B., Wanless, R., Dias, M., Packeiser, T., Awad, A., Yannicelli, B., Zapata Padilla, L.A., Aburto, J., Seeger, I., Hampton, S., Jackson,L., Wienrich,N., Ajagbe, A., Hazin, C., Castellanos Galindo, G.A., Naranjo, L.G., Suárez, C.F., Prussmann, J., Valenzuela, S., Gomez Giraldo, L.S., Higgins, M.L., Contreras, C., Luna, G., Luna, N., Munizaga, M., Sellanes, J., Tapia, C., Thiel, M.,'Ecological Baselines for the Southeast Atlantic and Southeast Pacific:Status of Marine Biodiversity and Anthropogenic Pressures in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction',STRONG High Seas Project, 2019, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/STRONG-HS_Ecological-Baselines-Report.pdf

- Cremers, K., Wright, G., Rochette, J., "Strengthening Monitoring, Control and Surveillance in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction", STRONG High Seas Project, 2020, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Cremers-Wright-and-Rochette-2019.-Strengthening-Monitoring-Control-and-Surveillance-in-Areas-Beyond-National-Jurisdiction-1.pdf

STRONG High Seas Policy Briefs

- Gjerde, K., Boteler, B., Durussel, C., Rochette, J., Unger, S., Wright, G., 'Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biodiversity in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction: Options for Underpinning a Strong Global BBNJ Agreement through Regional and Sectoral Governance', STRONG High Seas Project, 2018, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/STRONG-High-Seas-Policy-Brief_Options-for-underpinning-BBNJ-agreement.pdf

- Klaudija Cremers, Glen Wright, Julien Rochette, 'Keeping an Eye on the High Seas: Strengthening Monitoring, Control and Surveillance through a New Marine Biodiversity Treaty', STRONG High Seas Project, 2019, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Cremers-et-al-2019-Keeping-an-Eye-on-the-High-Seas.pdf

- Gjerde, K. and Wright, G., "Towards Ecosystem-based Management of the Global Ocean: Strengthening Regional Cooperation through a New Agreement for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biodiversity in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction", STRONG High Seas Project, 2019, https://www.prog-ocean.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/PB_Ecosystem-based-management_191213.pdf

STRONG High Seas Webinars

- STRONG High Seas Webinar – Marine Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction in the Southeast Pacific and Southeast Atlantic (08/2018)
- STRONG High Seas Webinar – Marine Genetic Resources: Building Capacities for Ocean Governance (11/2019)

About the STRONG High Seas Project

The STRONG High Seas project is a five-year project that aims to strengthen regional ocean governance for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction. It is coordinated by the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS) and implemented together with the Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI), BirdLife International, the International Ocean Institute (IOI) – Southern Africa, the Universidad Católica del Norte (UCN), WWF Colombia, and WWF Germany. Working with the Secretariat of the Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (CPPS; Permanent Commission for the South Pacific) and the Secretariat of the West and Central Africa Regional Seas Programme (Abidjan Convention), the project will develop and propose targeted measures to support the coordinated development of integrated and ecosystem-based management approaches for ocean governance in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

The STRONG High Seas project has the following overarching objectives:

1. Facilitate the development of improved management approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction in the Southeast Pacific and Southeast Atlantic regions;
2. Identify best practices and provide support to regional institutions and national authorities for implementing existing regional instruments;
3. Develop options for regional governance in a future international instrument under UNCLOS and transfer regional lessons learned to the global level to promote ocean governance.

For more information about the STRONG High Seas project, please visit: https://www.prog-ocean.org/our-work/strong-high-seas/ or contact: stronghighseas@iass-potsdam.de.

Partners of the STRONG High Seas project

Supported by:

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

based on a decision of the German Bundestag

The STRONG High Seas project is part of the International Climate Initiative (IKI; http://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/). The Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) supports this initiative on the basis of a decision adopted by the German Bundestag.