



Intersessional Workshop for the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fishery Bodies

29 September - 1 October 2021

INTRODUCTION

1. The SOI Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations (RSOs) and Regional Fishery Bodies (RFBs) was developed, in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), to facilitate dialogue between regional organizations, to share lessons and experiences in regional collaboration and to identify opportunities to improve cross-sectoral collaboration, in order to address issues related to fisheries management and conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity, and to progress on global goals and commitments for the oceans. The first meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue was convened from 26 to 29 September 2016, and the second meeting was convened from 10 to 13 April 2018, both in Seoul, Republic of Korea. These meetings have enabled valuable discussions, exchanges of information and identified the means and opportunities for regional organizations to improve cross-sectoral collaboration in marine conservation and sustainable use and fisheries management.

2. While the third meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue was planned to be convened in 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic it has been postponed to the spring of 2022 (dates to be determined). With a view to moving the discussion on timely issues forward in the lead up to the UN Biodiversity Conference (COP15) and the third meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue in 2022, the CBD Secretariat convened the Virtual Intersessional Workshop for the Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations (RSOs) and Regional Fishery Bodies (RFBs), in collaboration with FAO and UNEP, and with financial support from the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea. The workshop was held from 29 September to 1 October 2021, online from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. EDT, via the Interactio platform.

3. This workshop had the following objectives:

- (a) Provide updates on the status of regional collaboration and coordination, following up on the outcomes of the SOI Global Dialogue in 2018;
- (b) Sharing views and experiences on the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on regional collaboration, and to identify lessons learned to enhance collaboration under these circumstances;
- (c) Discuss the role of, and opportunities for, regional organizations and regional collaboration in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, being negotiated under the CBD.

4. A number of background materials were made available to inform the workshop discussions. Prior to the workshop, a survey was sent to RFBs and RSOs to find out more information on the status and progress on regional-scale collaboration and coordination between these organizations, and to gain an insight into the role of SOI Global Dialogue in supporting improved dialogue. The results were compiled into a booklet which can be found at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a90d/a208/ade08d0d6db62c6063ad91ea/booklet-soi-gd-survey-en.pdf>. The Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI) prepared a background document for the workshop, the Briefing Note for Agenda Item 5.3: Opportunities for regional collaboration in the targets of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. This briefing note as well as other background documents can be found at the workshop webpage at: <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/SOI-WS-2021-01>.

5. The workshop was organized in plenary with two breakout group sessions, and included panel presentations from individual regions, thematic presentations with question and answer sessions, moderated plenary discussions, and breakout group discussions. The full list of participants is provided in annex II.

6. The workshop was co-chaired by Mr. Dixon Waruinge, Coordinator of the Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention, and Mr. Stefán Ásmundsson, Director-General of the Department of the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Industries and Innovation of the Government of Iceland and former Secretary of the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

7. Mr. Dixon Waruinge and Mr. Stefán Ásmundsson, the co-chairs of the workshop, provided brief opening remarks to welcome all participants to the workshop and to set the context for the meeting.

8. Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), delivered opening remarks to welcome all participants to the workshop. She expressed her thanks to the Republic of Korea's Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries for providing financial resources to be able to convene this meeting, as well as for their enormous support, which, she mentioned, has been a key factor to the success of SOI. She noted that the Parties to the CBD are currently in the process of drafting the post-2020 global biodiversity framework which will be submitted for adoption at the forthcoming COP 15. She stressed that this meeting presents a great opportunity to examine the role of regional collaboration in monitoring and implementing the framework, noting potential synergies at the national level as well as with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). She expressed her hopes to see everyone in person next year at the third meeting of SOI Global Dialogue in the Republic of Korea.

9. Mr. Sang Keun Song, Deputy Minister of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea, delivered an opening statement in a video message. He stressed that as life in the Republic of Korea is highly connected to the ocean, SOI has been one of their most important missions. He added that the government of the Republic of Korea believes that a holistic and integrated approach is key to successful conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity. In this regard, the SOI Global Dialogue with RSOs and RFBs has contributed to the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries' mission and objectives. He emphasized his appreciation for the continued leadership of SOI in catalyzing and harnessing the collective wisdom in working toward sustainable oceans. On behalf of the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries, he expressed their continued support and engagement for the third meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue.

ITEM 2. WORKSHOP BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

10. Mr. Joseph Appiott (CBD Secretariat) briefed the participants on the workshop background, scope and objectives. He noted that this is an informal on-going discussion which will lead into and inform the third meeting of SOI Global Dialogue, as well as the upcoming CBD meetings. A summary of this presentation is provided in annex III.

ITEM 3. UPDATES ON THE STATUS OF REGIONAL-SCALE COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION

11. Under this agenda item, Ms. Marketa Zackova (CBD Secretariat) presented the results of the 2021 survey on regional collaboration and coordination, as noted in paragraph 4.

12. Next, participants from RFBs and RSOs from various regions were invited to coordinate among themselves and give a brief update on the status of cross-sectoral regional collaboration in their respective regions:

- (a) Ms. Sonia Gautreau (CLME+) delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral collaboration in the Wider Caribbean and CLME+ region, highlighting their long-term vision, Strategic Action Programme, and a number of short-term priority actions.
- (b) Mr. Khalil Attia (SPA/RAC) delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral collaboration in the Mediterranean and Black Sea, underlining their key regional partnerships and cooperative activities.
- (c) Mr. Maher Amer (PERSGA) delivered a presentation on regional collaboration and coordination for the preparation of the 2nd State of Marine Environment Report of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (SOMERSGA 2020).
- (d) Mr. Yugraj Yadava (BOBP-IGO) delivered a presentation on regional cooperation between BOBP-IGO/BOBLME and SASP/SACEP, towards a productive and resilient ocean for the well-being of all in the Bay of Bengal region.
- (e) Mr. Darius Campbell (NEAFC) delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral cooperation and collaboration in the North Atlantic region, highlighting regional action plans and particular cooperative activities.
- (f) Mr. Yegor Volovik (NOWPAP) delivered a presentation on behalf of NOWPAP, PICES, and NPAFC cross-sectoral collaboration and partnerships in the North Pacific region, showcasing their joint efforts and cooperative activities.
- (g) Ms. Ulrika Gunnartz (SWIOFC/Nairobi Convention) delivered a presentation on behalf of Mr. Vasco Schmidt (SWIOFC) to provide updates on the cooperation and collaboration in the Western Indian Ocean region.
- (h) Mr. Méntor Villagómez (CPPS) delivered a brief intervention communicating the updates on collaboration and coordination in the Southeast Pacific region.

13. Summaries of the above presentations are provided in annex III.

ITEM 4. IMPACTS OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON REGIONAL-SCALE COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION

14. Under this agenda item, a series of theme presentations briefed the participants on the wide range of impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on regional ocean governance:

- (a) Mr. Piero Mannini (FAO) delivered a presentation on the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of RFBs.
 - (b) Ms. Kerstin Stendahl (UNEP) delivered a presentation on the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of Regional Seas Programmes, with focus on SIDS in the wider Caribbean and the western Indian Ocean regions.
 - (c) Ms. Klaudija Cremers (IDDRI) delivered a presentation on the results of the Marine Regions Forum Online Workshop on Ocean Governance and COVID-19.
- 15.** Summaries of the above presentations are provided in annex III.
- 16.** Participants were invited to share their experiences and perspectives of the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on regional collaboration, in a plenary discussion facilitated by Mr. Sebastian Unger (IASS). The participants were posed with the following questions:
- (a) How has COVID-19 impacted the collaboration and coordination at the regional scale?
 - (b) What tools and approaches have been used to overcome these impacts?
 - (c) What approaches should be used in a post-COVID world to improve regional coordination and collaboration?
- 17.** During the discussion, a number of key points emerged, in particular:
- (a) Virtual meetings have enabled the engagement of wider range of stakeholders and more cost-efficient discussions, which is especially valuable for scientific meetings.
 - (b) However, virtual meetings still deal with many challenges and may not be able to address all matters, such as trainings and sharing of technical skills.
 - (c) In-person meetings are particularly needed for decision-making processes, especially those that deal with complex issues and areas of high disagreement.
 - (d) Moving ahead, there is a need to better utilize both in-person and virtual meetings strategically, depending on the issue at hand and objectives.

ITEM 5. ROLES OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND REGIONAL COLLABORATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

- 18.** Under this agenda time, Mr. Basile van Havre, Co-chair of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework gave an overview of the process to develop the post-2020 framework and the current draft version of the framework, with a focus on the goals and targets.
- 19.** This presentation was followed by a live Q&A with Mr. van Havre, which further addressed the importance of engagement in the post-2020 process, expressing their views and insights on ocean-related issues within the post-2020 framework's goals and targets, and working towards raising awareness at the national level as well.

- 20.** Then, Mr. David Johnson (GOBI) delivered a presentation on the key messages from the UNEP report on Regional Seas Biodiversity under the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
- 21.** This presentation was immediately followed by a short Q&A session which further emphasized the need to focus on enhancing collaboration between RFBs and RSOs, as well as potential collaboration with region-based bodies that focus on other matters, such as socio-economic, energy or land-based waste and pollution issues.
- 22.** Next, a series of panel presentations provided further updates on other major developments in the global ocean frameworks and potential synergies for regional collaboration, considering the Post-2020 Framework in the broader global context:
- (a)** Ms. Charlotte Salpin and Mr. Michele Ameri (UNDOALOS) delivered a presentation updating the participants on the Intergovernmental Conference on an international legally binding instrument under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) and on fisheries processes at the United Nations.
 - (b)** Ms. Xin Feng (UNDESA) presented brief updates on the postponement of the UN Ocean Conference to 2022.
 - (c)** Ms. Marie Bourrel-McKinnon and Ms. Wanfei Qiu (ISA) delivered a presentation on the ISA deliberations on deep-sea mining exploitation regulations and regional environmental management plans (REMPs).
- 23.** Summaries of all the above presentations are provided in annex III.
- 24.** Next, Ms. Maria Adelaide Ferreira (GOBI) introduced the participants to a briefing note on opportunities for regional collaboration between RSOs and RFBs in implementing the post-2020 targets. Summary of this presentation is also provided in annex III.
- 25.** Based on this presentation, participants had the opportunity to further discuss such opportunities for regional collaboration in a moderated plenary discussion, facilitated by Mr. David Johnson (GOBI) and Ms. Maria Adelaide Ferreira (GOBI), particularly focusing on identifying targets that are of most interest and relevance to regional bodies to collaborate on.
- 26.** During the discussion, the following points were raised:
- (a)** The need to leverage linkages between the issues of oceans, biodiversity and climate change, in order to tap into financial resources to address these crises in a coherent manner.
 - (b)** Draft target 1 (biodiversity – inclusive spatial planning) provides a great opportunity for regional organizations to work together towards marine spatial planning, and target 3 (area-based conservation) as an incentive for not only marine protected areas (MPAs), but also Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs).
 - (c)** Many noted that while the targets in the Global Biodiversity Framework are global, assessment and reporting could be done regionally as some ocean-related issues are best addressed on a regional scale.

- (d) Challenges associated with being able to track all the activities that regional organizations are conducting that are relevant to the post-2020 framework, highlighting the need to continue to improve dialogue and coordination between the regional bodies and organizations.

27. This exercise was followed by a breakout group discussion where participants could identify specific initiatives and resources of direct relevance to specific draft targets of the post-2020 framework.

28. Next, Mr. Nic Bax (CSIRO) provided a presentation on regional monitoring for the post-2020 framework, introducing the report on Marine Input to Headline Indicators of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. A summary of this presentation is provided in annex III.

29. Mr. Bax's presentation served as the basis for the second round of breakout group discussions during which participants had an opportunity to express their ideas on regional collaboration in relation to marine indicators. This session built on the first round of breakout groups (noted in paragraph 27) and the results of both discussions are reported together in annex IV.

30. The facilitators of both breakout group sessions proceeded to present the results and outputs of the breakout group discussions in the plenary.

ITEM 6. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

31. Under this agenda item, Mr. Joseph Appiott (CBD Secretariat) expressed his thanks to all participants for their engagement in the discussions, and outlined the next steps following this meeting. He noted that the CBD Secretariat will produce a workshop report, after distributing a draft version of the report to the participants inviting them to submit their inputs and to ensure that all their points were accurately captured. The final report will then be made available as an information document to inform the next meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in January 2022 as well as the third meeting of SOI Global Dialogue. He emphasized his appreciation for the participants' engagement in the SOI processes and encouraged everyone to further engage in the post-2020 discussions and negotiations. He expressed his thanks to the co-chairs of the workshop, the interpreters, and gave a special acknowledgement to the CBD Secretariat's staff that helped organize this workshop.

32. Brief closing statements were given by the workshop co-chairs.

ITEM 7. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

33. The workshop closed at 10 a.m. EDT on Friday, 1 October 2021.

Annex I

PROGRAMME

Wednesday, 29 September (Day 1)

Time (EDT)	Meeting Programme
6:30 – 7:00am	<i>Participants log-on to meeting</i>
7:00 – 7:10am	Agenda Item 1. Opening of the meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Welcome from co-chairs- Opening statements<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, Executive Secretary, Convention on Biological Diversityo Mr. Sang Keun Song, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea
7:10 – 7:20am	Agenda Item 2. Workshop background, objectives, and expected outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation on workshop background, objectives, and approach<ul style="list-style-type: none">o By Joe Appiott, CBD Secretariat
7:20 – 8:30am	Agenda item 3. Updates on the status of regional-scale coordination and collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation on the results of the 2021 survey on regional collaboration and coordination<ul style="list-style-type: none">o By Marketa Zackova, CBD Secretariat Panel of presentations from regions <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Nairobi Convention-IOTC-SWIOFC-WIOMSA-SIOFA- CEP-WECAFC-CRFM-CLME-COPPESAALC- SPREP-SPRFMO-CPPS-IATTC-PIFS- Abidjan Convention- SEAFO- CECAF-FCWC-COMHAFAT-BCC- MAP- BSC-Tehran Convention- NOWPAP-NPAFC-PICES-NEP-COBSEA-APFIC- ROPME-PERSGA-SACEP-BOBLME- NEAFC-OSPAR-ICES-HELCOM-NAFO
8:30 – 8:40am	<i>Break</i>
8:40 – 9:30am	Agenda Item 4. Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on regional-scale coordination and collaboration 4.1 Theme presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Presentation on the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of RFBs<ul style="list-style-type: none">o By Piero Mannini, FAO- Presentation on the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of Regional Seas in SIDS regions<ul style="list-style-type: none">o By Kerstin Stendahl, UNEP

- Presentation on the results of the Marine Regions Forum Online Workshop on Ocean Governance and COVID-19
 - o By Klaudia Cremers, IDDRI
- Q&A

9:30 – 10:00am **4.2 Plenary discussion: Sharing experiences on the impacts of COVID-19 on regional collaboration** (*moderated by Sebastian Unger, IASS*)

Thursday, 30 September (Day 2)

Time	Meeting Programme
6:30 – 7:00am	<i>Participants log-on to meeting</i>
7:00 – 7:10am	Co-chairs' review of previous day's discussion and introduction to day 2
	Agenda Item 5. Roles of, and opportunities for, regional organizations and regional collaboration in the development and implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
7:10 – 8:00am	5.1 Theme presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By Francis Ogwal and Basile Van Havre, Co-chairs of the Post-2020 Working Group (<i>video presentation</i>) - Key messages from the UNEP report on Regional Seas Biodiversity under the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By David Johnson and Maria Adelaide Ferreira, GOBI - Q&A
8:00 – 8:10am	<i>Break</i>
	5.2 Post-2020 Framework in the broader global context—Updates on other major developments in the global ocean framework and potential synergies for regional collaboration
8:10 – 8:45am	Panel presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intergovernmental Conference on an international legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction and fisheries processes at the United Nations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By Charlotte Salpin and Michele Ameri, UNDOALOS - UN Ocean Conference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By UNDESA

- International Seabed Authority deliberations on deep-sea mining exploitation regulations and regional environmental management plans (REMPs)
 - o By Marie Bourrel-Mckinnon and Wanfei Qiu, International Sea Authority
- Q&A

5.3 Opportunities for regional collaboration in the Post-2020 targets

8:45 - 9:00am

Theme presentation

- Introduction to the briefing note on opportunities for RSO-RFB collaboration in the Post-2020 targets
 - o Maria Adelaide Ferreira and David Johnson (GOBI)

9:00 – 10:00am

5.3 (continued) Moderated plenary discussion on opportunities for RSO-RFB collaboration in the Post-2020 targets (*moderated by David Johnson and Maria Adelaide Ferreira*)

- *Identify which targets are of most interest and relevance to regional bodies*

Friday, 1 October (Day 3)

Time (EDT)	Meeting Programme
6:30 – 7:00am	<i>Participants log-on to meeting</i>
7:00 – 7:10am	Co-chairs' review of previous day's discussion and introduction to day 3
7:10 – 7:30am	Question and Answer session with Post-2020 Co-chairs
7:30 – 8:20am	5.3 Breakout group discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Specific regional initiatives and resources of direct relevance to GBF targets</i>
8:20 – 8:30am	<i>Break</i>
8:30 – 8:45am	5.4 Regional monitoring for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of the report on Marine Input to Headline Indicators of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By Nic Bax, CSIRO
8:45 – 9:35am	5.5 Breakout group discussion

9:35 – 9:55am **Plenary session**
Presentation of the results of breakout groups

9:55 – 10:00am **Agenda item 6 and 7. Conclusions and next steps; and closure of the meeting**

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

REGIONAL SEAS ORGANIZATIONS

Abidjan Convention (Convention for the Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region)

1. Mr. Yacoub Issola
Abidjan Convention
Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire
E-mail: yacoub.issola@un.org

Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM)

2. Mr. Markus Helavuori
Professional Secretary
HELCOM
Helsinki, Finland
E-mail: Markus.Helavuori@helcom.fi

Barcelona Convention (Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution)

3. Mr. Khalil Attia
Director
Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC)
Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution (Barcelona Convention)
Tunis, Tunisia
E-mail: director@spa-rac.org

Black Sea Commission (Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against pollution (BSC))

4. Ms. Iryna Makarenko
PMA Officer
Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea against pollution
Istanbul, Turkey
E-mail: irina.makarenko@blacksea-commission.org

Cartagena Convention (the Caribbean Programme (CEP) Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (CAR-RCU))

5. Dr. Lorna Innis
Coordinator
CEP CAR-RCU
Kingston, Jamaica
E-mail: lorna.inniss@un.org

6. Ms. Ileana Lopez
Biodiversity Programme Officer
SPAW Programme Manager
CEP CAR-RCU
Kingston, Jamaica
E-mail: ileana.lopez@un.org

Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)

7. Mr. Mentor Villagomez Merino
Ambassador/Secretary General
CPPS
Guayaquil, Ecuador
E-mail: mvillagomez@cpps-int.org

Nairobi Convention

8. Mr. Dixon Waruinge
Head of the Nairobi Convention
Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: Dixon.waruinge@un.org
9. Mr. Jared Bosire
Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: jared.bosire@un.org
10. Mr. Mwangi Theuri
Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: theuri.mwangi@un.org
11. Mr. Timothy Andrew
Secretariat of the Nairobi Convention
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: timothy.andrew@un.org

Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP)

12. Mr. Yegor Volovik
Coordinator
NOWPAP
Toyama, Japan
E-mail: yegor.volovik@un.org
13. Mr. Ning Liu

Programme Officer
NOWPAP
Busan, Republic of Korea
E-mail: ning.liu@un.org

Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA)

14. Mr. Maher Abdelaziz Amer
Regional Coordinator of Biodiversity & MPAs Program
PERSGA
Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
E-mail: maher.amer@persga.org

South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)

15. Mr. Zammath Khaleel
Senior Programme Officer (Regional)
South Asian Seas Programme (SASP) of SACEP
Colombo, Sri Lanka
E-mail: spor_sasp@sacep.org

REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES

Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC)

16. Mr. Simon Funge-Smith
Secretary
APFIC
Bangkok, Thailand
E-mail: simon.fungesmith@fao.org

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)

17. Mr. Chris O'Brien
Executive Secretary
IOTC
Victoria, Seychelles
E-mail: chris.obrien@fao.org

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

18. Mr. Fred Kingston
Executive Secretary
NAFO
Dartmouth, Canada
E-mail: fkingston@nafo.int

North East Atlantic Fishery Commission (NEAFC)

19. Mr. Darius Campbell
Secretary
NEAFC
London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: darius@neafc.org

North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC)

20. Mr. Vladimir Radchenko
Executive Director
NPAFC
Vancouver, Canada
E-mail: vrad@npafc.org

North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES)

21. Ms. Sonia Batten
Executive Secretary
PICES
Sidney, Canada
E-mail: sonia.batten@pices.int

South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO)

22. Mr. Craig Loveridge
Executive Secretary
SPRFMO
Wellington, New Zealand
E-mail: cloveridge@sprfmo.int

South East Atlantic Fisheries Organisation (SEAFO)

23. Dr. Lizette Voges
Executive Secretary
SEAFO
Swakopmund, Namibia
E-mail: lvoges@seafo.org

Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA)

24. Mr. Thierry Clot
Executive Secretary
SIOFA
Saint-Denis, La Réunion
E-mail: thierry.clot@siofa.org

Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission Secretariat (SWIOFC)

25. Ms. Ulrika Gunnartz
Regional Coordinator
SWIOFC
Maputo, Mozambique
E-mail: ulrika.gunnartz@fao.org
26. Mr. Erudito Malate
National Coordinator for Mozambique
SWIOFC
Maputo, Mozambique
E-mail: erudito.malate@fao.org

Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC)

27. Ms. Yvette Diei Ouadi
Executive Secretary
WECAFC
Christ Church, Barbados
E-mail: yvette.dieiouadi@fao.org

OTHER REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS / INITIATIVES

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)

28. Ms. Christine Bogle
Executive Secretary
ACAP
Hobart, Tasmania, Australia
E-mail: Christine.bogle@acap.aq

Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-Governmental Organisation (BOBP-IGO)

29. Mr. Yugraj Singh Yadava
Director
BOBP-IGO
Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: Yugraj.yadava@bobpigo.org

Benguela Current Commission

30. Ms. Thandiwe Gxaba
Acting Executive Secretary
Benguela Current Commission

Swakopmund, Namibia
E-mail: thandiwe@benguelacc.org

- 31.** Mr. Kumbi Kilongo Nsingi
Ecosystem Coordinator
Benguela Current Commission
Swakopmund, Namibia
E-mail: kumbi@benguelacc.org

Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems Project (CLME+)

United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)

- 32.** Ms. Sonia Gautreau
Senior Technical Specialist
CLME
Cartagena, Colombia
E-mail: soniag@unops.org

Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)

- 33.** Dr. David Agnew
Executive Secretary
CCAMLR
Hobart, Tasmania, Australia
E-mail: david.agnew@ccamlr.org

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

- 34.** Dr. Wojciech Wawrzynski
Head of Science Support
ICES
Copenhagen, Denmark
E-mail: Wojciech@ices.dk

Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas Managers Network (MedPAN)

- 35.** Ms. Purificació Canals
President and coordination team the TransAtlantic MPA network and EU Ocean governance project
MedPAN
Marseille, France
E-mail: pcanals@tinet.org

Sargasso Sea Commission (SSC)

- 36.** Mr. David Freestone
Executive Secretary
SSC

Washington D.C., United States of America
E-mail: dfreestone@sargassoseacommission.org

- 37.** Ms. Fae Sapsford
Marine Research Fellow
Sargasso Sea Commission
Washington D.C., United States of America
E-mail: fsapsford@sargassoseacommission.org

Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA)

- 38.** Dr. Arthur Tuda
Executive Secretary
WIOMSA
Zanzibar, Tanzania
E-mail: tuda@wiomsa.org

GOVERNMENTS

Australia

- 39.** Mr. Nicholas Bax
Director
NESP Marine Biodiversity Hub
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO)
Hobart, Australia
E-mail: nic.bax@csiro.au

Cameroon

- 40.** Ms. Prudence Tangham Galega
Technical Advisor
Ministry of Environment
Yaounde, Cameroon
E-mail: galegapru@yahoo.com

France

- 41.** Ms. Phénia Marras-Aït Razouk
Cooperation Project Manager
International Affairs
AFB
Brest, France
E-mail: phenia.marras@ofb.gouv.fr

Iceland

42. Mr. Stefan Asmundsson
Director of International Affairs
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Reykjavik, Iceland
E-mail: stefan.asmundsson@anr.is
43. Mr. Sigurdur Thrainsson
Head of Division
Ministry for the Environment and Natural Resources
Reykjavik, Iceland
E-mail: sigurdur.thrainsson@uar.is

Republic of Korea

44. Dr. Changyoul Lee
Principal Researcher
Ocean Policy Institute
Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology (KIOST)
Busan, Republic of Korea
E-mail: winkstone@kiost.ac.kr
45. Dr. Young Nam Kim
Marine Ecosystem Management Team
Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation (KOEM)
Seoul, Republic of Korea
E-mail: ynkim@koem.or.kr
46. Mr. Bo-Hye Nam
Senior Researcher
Biotechnology Research Division
National Institute of Fisheries Science (NIFS)
Busan, Republic of Korea
E-mail: nambohye@korea.kr
47. Mr. Youngdawng Moh
Senior Researcher
CBD Focal Point for Marine, Coastal, and Island Biodiversity
National Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea (MABIK)
Seochoeon, Republic of Korea
E-mail: ydmoh@mabik.re.kr

Norway

48. Mr. Gunnstein Bakke
Senior Legal Advisor

Directorate of Fisheries
Bergen, Norway
E-mail: gunnstein.bakke@fiskeridir.no

United Kingdom

- 49.** Mr. Dan Edwards
Senior Fisheries Advisor
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: Dan.Edwards@jncc.gov.uk

GLOBAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

- 50.** Mr. Piero Mannini
Senior Liaison Officer and RSN Secretary
Fisheries and Aquaculture Division.
Rome, Italy
E-mail: piero.mannini@fao.org

International Whaling Commission (IWC)

- 51.** Dr. Rebecca Lent
Executive Secretary
IWC
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: Rebecca.lent@iwc.int

International Seabed Authority (ISA)

- 52.** Ms. Jihyun Lee
Director of Office of Environmental Management and Mineral Resources
ISA
Kingston, Jamaica
E-mail: jlee@isa.org.jm

- 53.** Ms. Marie Bourrel-Mckinnon
Senior Policy Officer
ISA
Kingston, Jamaica
Email : mbourrel@isa.org.jm

- 54.** Ms. Wanfei Qiu
Programme Manager

ISA
Kingston, Jamaica
E-mail: wqiu@isa.org.jm

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA)

55. Ms. Xin Feng
Sustainable Development Officer
Division for Sustainable Development
DESA
New York, United States of America
E-mail: xin.feng@un.org

United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UN DOALOS)

56. Ms. Charlotte Salpin
Legal Officer
DOALOS
New York, United States of America
E-mail: salpin@un.org

57. Mr. Michele Ameri
Legal Officer
DOALOS
New York, United States of America
E-mail: amerim@un.org

58. Ms. Valentina Germani
Senior Legal Officer
DOALOS
New York, United States of America
E-mail: germani@un.org

59. Mr. Michael Shewchuk
Legal Officer
DOALOS
New York, United States of America
E-mail: shewchuk@un.org

UN Environment

60. Mr. Takehiro Nakamura
Chief Marine and Coastal Unit
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: Takehiro.nakamura@un.org

61. Ms. Nancy Soi
Programme Management Officer
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: Nancy.soi@un.org

62. Ms. Kerstin Stendahl
Head of Ecosystems Integration Branch
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail: Kerstin.stendahl@un.org

UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)

63. Ms. Rachael Scrimgeour
Programme Officer
UNEP-WCMC
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: rachael.scrimgeour@unep-wcmc.org

64. Ms. Ruth Fletcher
Senior Marine Programme Officer
UNEP-WCMC
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Email: ruth.fletcher@unep-wcmc.org

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

65. Mr. Andrew Hudson
Head
Water and Ocean Governance Programme
UNDP
New York, United States of America
E-mail: Andrew.hudson@undp.org

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

BirdLife International

66. Ms. Carolina Hazin
Global Marine Policy Coordinator
BirdLife International
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: Carolina.hazin@birdlife.org

Duke University

67. Mr. Patrick Halpin

Professor
Co-Chair, Coastal Environmental Management Program
Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab
Durham, United States of America
E-mail: phalpin@duke.edu

Fisheries Expert Group of the IUCN Commission of Ecosystem Management / European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD)

- 68.** Ms. Despina Symons
Coordinator
EBCD
Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: despina.symons@ebcd.org
- 69.** Mr. Jacopo Pasquero
International Affairs Advisor
EBCD
Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: jacopo.pasquero@ebcd.org
- 70.** Mr. Serge Garcia
Chair (IUCN-CEM-FEG)
EBCD
Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: grcsgm@gmail.com
- 71.** Mr. Jake Rice
Chief Scientist Emeritus
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Ottawa, Canada
E-mail: jake.rice@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI)

- 72.** Mr. David Johnson
Director
GOBI
Romsey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: david.johnson@seascapeconsultants.co.uk
- 73.** Ms. Maria Adelaide Ferreira
GOBI
Romsey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: maferreira@fc.ul.pt

International Coalition of Fisheries Association (ICFA)

- 74.** Mr. Javier Garat Perez
President
ICFA
Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: javiergarat@cepesca.es

Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies

- 75.** Mr. Sebastian Unger
Head of Ocean Governance
IASS
Potsdam, Germany
E-mail: Sebastian.Unger@iass-potsdam.de

- 76.** Dr. Carole Durussel
Co-Lead, STRONG High Seas
IASS
Potsdam, Germany
E-mail: Carole.Durussel@iass-potsdam.de

- 77.** Mr. Ben Boteler
Co-Lead, STRONG High Seas
IASS
Potsdam, Germany
E-mail: ben.boteler@iass-potsdam.de

Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI)

- 78.** Ms. Klaudija Cremers
Research Fellow, International Ocean Governance
IDDRI
Paris, France
E-mail: klaudija.cremers@sciencespo.fr

The Lyell Centre

- 79.** Ms. Daniela Diz
Associate Professor
The Lyell Centre
Edinburgh, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: d.diz@hw.ac.uk

Pew Charitable Trusts

- 80.** Mr. Julian Jackson
Senior Officer, Protecting Ocean Life on the High Seas

Pew Charitable Trusts
Philadelphia, United States of America
E-mail: jjackson2@pewtrusts.org

- 81.** Mr. Sebastian Nicholls
Associate
Pew Charitable Trusts
Philadelphia, United States of America
E-mail: snicholls@pewtrusts.org

The University of Queensland

- 82.** Mr. Daniel Dunn
Director
Centre for Biodiversity and Conservation Science
University of Queensland
Brisbane, Australia
E-mail: daniel.dunn@uq.edu.au

The University of Tokyo, Graduate School of Agricultural and Life Sciences

- 83.** Mr. Nobuyuki Yagi
Professor
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan
E-mail: yagi@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

World Wide Fund for Nature

- 84.** Mr. Alistair Graham
Ocean Policy Advisor
WWF
Tasmania, Australia
E-mail: alistairgraham1@bigpond.com

CO-CHAIRS OF THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

- 85.** Mr. Francis Ogwal
E-mail: osabinofrancis@yahoo.com
- 86.** Mr. Basile van Havre
E-mail: basile.vanhavre@canada.ca

SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

- 87.** Ms. Elizabeth Mrema
Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: elizabeth.mrema@un.org
- 88.** Mr. Joseph Appiott
Programme Management Officer
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: joseph.appiott@un.org
- 89.** Mr. Kyungman Ko
Expert on mission
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: Kyungman.ko@un.org
- 90.** Ms. Jacqueline Grekin
Programme Assistant
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: jacqueline.grekin@un.org
- 91.** Ms. Johany Martinez Quinto
Programme Assistant
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: Johany.martinez@un.org
- 92.** Ms. Marketa Zackova
Individual Contractor
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Email: marketa.zackova@un.org

Annex III

SUMMARIES OF PRESENTATIONS

Agenda Item 2

Workshop background, objectives, and expected outputs

Joseph Appiott, CBD Secretariat

Mr. Appiott briefed the participants on the workshop background, scope and objectives. He stressed the importance of regional organizations in translating global commitments to the national and subnational levels, facilitating implementation, as well as reporting on progress, challenges and gaps, which, he noted, are crucial to both CBD processes as well as SOI. He recalled the roots and developments of SOI over the years, emphasizing its valuable role in sharing experiences and lessons learned in regional collaboration, and identifying new opportunities to scale-up regional cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation. He noted that the focus of this informal process has been on RFBs and RSOs, other types of regional initiatives, UN agencies, global organizations, NGOs, and governments. He recalled the previous SOI meetings, first SOI Global Dialogue in 2016 and second in 2018, noting the Seoul Outcomes and expressing his thanks to the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea for their support. He noted that the third meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue should be convened in person, and therefore is currently tentatively planned for 2022. However, he stressed that due to expanding regional collaboration, impacts of COVID-19, and the development of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, there is a timely need for this intersessional workshop to share experiences and provide updates on these issues at this moment. He added that this is an informal on-going discussion which will lead into and inform the third meeting of SOI Global Dialogue, as well as the upcoming CBD meetings. He also advised the participants on how to use the online platform Interactio and informed them of interpretation being available for English, French, Spanish, and Korean.

Agenda Item 3

Results of the 2021 survey on regional collaboration and coordination

Marketa Zackova, CBD Secretariat

Ms. Zackova presented the results of the 2021 survey on regional collaboration and coordination which was sent to RFBs and RSOs earlier in 2021. She explained that the survey aimed to better understand the state and the progress on regional-scale collaboration and coordination between RFBs and RSOs. She demonstrated the results of the survey on regional alignment of organizations' goals and strategies, regional communication and collaborative activities, challenges and gaps in regional-scale coordination and collaboration, progress on the implementation of 'Regional Roadmaps', and organizations' ideas on how SOI Global Dialogue can best improve regional dialogue as part of strengthening regional ocean governance. She emphasized that there are increasing trends in both formal arrangements (e.g., MoU) and collaborative initiatives, and that organizations regularly communicate (especially informally) and participate in each other's meetings. She noted that the main challenges concerning regional collaboration are lack of financial resources and excessive workload, as per the responses. She added that there is still a need for resources to implement and increase political understanding and buy-in of respective Member States, for enhanced collaboration between RFBs and RSOs within their regions, and for reducing duplication of efforts. She informed the participants that the full results of the survey can be found in a booklet on the CBD meeting website

(<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a90d/a208/ade08d0d6db62c6063ad91ea/booklet-soi-gd-survey-en.pdf>).

She added that the CBD Secretariat would be happy to revise the booklet with additional responses to the survey from organizations that had not had a chance to respond, prior to the next SOI meeting.

Cross-sectoral collaboration in the Wider Caribbean and CLME+ region

Sonia Gautreau, CLME+

Ms. Gautreau delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral collaboration in the Wider Caribbean and CLME+ region, on behalf of the regional intergovernmental organizations that are members to the CLME+ Interim Coordination Mechanism (ICM). She recalled the Long-term Vision for their region, adopted in 2013, “a healthy marine environment that supports the wellbeing and the livelihoods of the people of the region”, which led to the development of a ten-year Strategic Action Programme (SAP, 2015-2024) in the region. She explained that the SAP calls for enhanced regional fisheries governance to promote sustainable fisheries, and an establishment of a regional policy coordination mechanism for ocean governance. She further provided updates to the status of some of the key short-term priority actions that were put forward by the region at the second SOI Global Dialogue. She invited the participants to visit the ICM’s online collaborative Knowledge Management Hub (www.clmeplus.org) to learn more on the coordination mechanisms and on the activities being conducted. She highlighted specific coordination mechanisms that have been created: The CLME+ SAP Interim Coordination Mechanism and the Interim Fisheries Coordination Mechanism (IFCM). She further described the proposed and currently negotiated Ocean Governance Coordination Mechanism (CM) that aims to support “regional collaboration towards a coordinated approach to the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal ecosystems and their goods and services”. She concluded that the region supports the continued improvement of cross-sectoral cooperation through the new UNDP/GEF PROCARIBE+ Project as well as other GEF-funded CLME+ SAP projects.

Cross-sectoral collaboration in the Mediterranean and Black Sea

Khalil Attia, SPA/RAC

Mr. Attia delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral collaboration in the Mediterranean and Black Sea. He described the key UNEP/MAP regional partnerships and cooperation, particularly with GFCM and Black Sea Commission, having signed MoUs with both. He explained that there are on-going prospects of tripartite cooperation with Black Sea and Caspian Sea, with discussions for a potential flagship project under the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration. He emphasized further collaboration between GFCM, UNEP/MAP, ACCOBAMS and IUCN for spatial management synergy beyond 2021, to identify potential priority areas for enhanced protection and effective and sustainably managed conservation areas in the Mediterranean. He highlighted the collaborative project of UNEP/MAP and GFCM: the draft Post-2020 SAPBIO (2022-2030+) for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture in the Mediterranean, focusing on bycatch as a priority issue. In this regard, he also emphasized the new 2030 GFCM Strategy which considers bycatch as a priority issue for the Mediterranean countries as well. He noted that some Mediterranean countries have started bycatch data collection programmes. He further reported on cooperation in the region between the Black Sea Commission and Barcelona Convention Secretariat through an MoU, annual bilateral meetings, exchange of experience, their Joint Work program and a number of different collaborative activities. He added that there have been first steps made under the Common Maritime Agenda for the Black Sea and the Bucharest Declaration on the Black Sea Research and Innovation Agenda. He concluded that they work together on dedicated regional projects, such as EMBLAS+, ANEMONE, CENOBS, and others.

Regional collaboration and coordination in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden region

Maher Amer, PERSGA

Mr. Amer delivered a presentation on regional collaboration and coordination for the preparation of the 2nd State of Marine Environment Report of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (SOMERSGA 2020). He noted that PERSGA has worked and coordinated with its Member States, other regional and international bodies, NGOs, research centres and universities, to prepare the SOMERSGA 2020 report. He explained the key objectives of this report and noted the 41 indicators selected for the report which relate to socio-economic issues, pollution, habitat, species, and management effectiveness. He further highlighted the criteria for the selection of objective indicators for the report. He described the status and trends of some of the evaluated indicators, with the overall trend of environmental improvement of approximately 3.25% of the possible total. He concluded that this should not be viewed with complacency as many SOMERSGA indicators still lack information on their status.

Regional cooperation in the Bay of Bengal region

Yugraj Yadava, BOBP-IGO

Mr. Yadava delivered a presentation on regional cooperation between BOBP-IGO/BOBLME and SASP/SACEP in the Bay of Bengal region. He introduced the BOBLME Project, a regional/sub-regional framework for collaboration that has been established in the region, focusing on capacity building, management of shared stocks and MPAs, knowledge management, critical habitat, pollution and livelihoods. He reported on a couple of shared scenarios and targets: (i) the development of a Regional Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing in the Bay of Bengal, and (ii) the development of Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Strategy for the South Asian Seas Region: Living in Harmony with our Oceans and Coasts. He highlighted the collaborative regional activities and projects of SASP/SACEP on pollution, particularly on nutrient loading (nitrogen), IAS, oil and chemical spills, and plastics. He noted the expanding involvement of broader bodies, including regional economic communities (RECs), whereby the BOBP-IGO is in dialogue with the Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA) to identify issues impacting the Indian Ocean region, how to address them, and how to promote blue economy. He concluded with highlighting the thematic issues they have been working on within the region, the specific location or scope, the work-plan and the associated partner agency.

Cross-sectoral cooperation and collaboration in the North Atlantic region

Darius Campbell, NEAFC

Mr. Campbell delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral cooperation and collaboration in the North Atlantic region. He introduced the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP) which should be updated at the Ministerial Meeting in October this year, in order to enhance and formalize cooperation with RFBs, such as on minimizing bycatch and restoring eel populations. He added that the draft plan should also include MPA coverage to 30% and OECSMs. He reported on behalf of HELCOM that their cooperation with BALTFISH and BSAC has increased during recent years, particularly in sharing information and in participation and interaction in workshops and meetings. He introduced ICES and them providing scientific input to NEAFC, HELCOM, OSPAR, and others, noting that the cooperation and coordination with ICES is integral. He further reported on the on-going collaboration between NEAFC and OSPAR, incl. on area-based management measures. He recalled ICES has provided great scientific advice to both organizations, which has particularly helped OSPAR to establish its high-seas MPAs, and both

organizations to think about how to conserve deep-sea sharks. He highlighted that NEAFC is at the first stage of developing cooperation with the International Agreement to Prevent Unregulated High Seas Fisheries in the Central Arctic Ocean, and they have also recently agreed on an MoU with GFCM in the Mediterranean. He further described the cooperative activities between NAFO and other regional organizations: NEAFC, ICES, and other regional bodies (e.g., ICCAT, NASCO, WECAFC), as well as a possible MoU with Sargasso Sea Commission on scientific research. He concluded with highlighting the OECMs as an area of opportunity for further regional collaboration and coordination, noting several workshops on OECMs in the region.

Cross-sectoral collaboration in the North Pacific region

Yegor Volovik, NOWPAP

Mr. Volovik delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral collaboration and partnerships in the North Pacific region. He introduced the North Pacific Partnership which includes the scientific PICES, fisheries NPAFC and seas programme NOWPAP. He noted that PICES has MoUs or Collaborative Framework agreements with RFMOs and other organizations in the region: IOC, NPAFC, IPHC, NOWPAP, ISC and NPFC, with agreements with APN and PSC being currently prepared. He highlighted the ICES-PICES Program on Sustainability of Marine Ecosystems through global knowledge networks (SMARTNET) which aims to include new partners from other geographic areas such as the central and south Pacific. He added that this program will address the topics of (i) climate change, (ii) fisheries and ecosystem-based management, (iii) social, ecological and environmental dynamics of marine systems, (iv) coastal communities and human dimensions, and (v) communication and capacity development. He reported on NPAFC having formal MoUs with PICES, WCPFC and NPFC, and that it has started developing MoU with ICES this year. He further described a number of joint activities between NPAFC and PICES, and also between NPAFC and NPFC. He highlighted the International Year of the Salmon (IYS, 2016-2022), a programme governed by NASCO and NPAFC, engaging more than 40 partners from academia, NGOs and indigenous peoples' organizations in NPAFC member countries. He further emphasized the NOWPAP Mid-Term Strategy 2018-2023 and the five associated priority areas. He concluded with specific highlights on ocean governance in the North Pacific, incl. strengthening of regional and inter-regional cooperation and science-policy dialogue, engagement in global environmental agenda and participation in global networks as regional hubs.

Cross-sectoral cooperation and collaboration in the Western Indian Ocean region

Ulrika Gunnartz, SWIOFC/Nairobi Convention & Vasco Schmidt, SWIOFC

Ms. Gunnartz delivered a presentation on behalf of Mr. Schmidt to provide updates on the cooperation and collaboration in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO) region. She noted that there are a number of regional bodies active in the fisheries and environmental management that collaborate with one another, incl. the Nairobi Convention, IOTC, SWIOFC, SIOFA, WIOMSA, and a number of Regional Economic Communities and IGOs. She highlighted the SWIOFC-Nairobi Convention Partnership for Marine and Coastal Governance and Fisheries Management for Sustainable Blue Growth and its three components of (i) enhanced resilience of livelihoods based on WIO marine and coastal ecosystems and habitats, (ii) coastal fisheries being sustainably managed using the ecosystem approach to fisheries, and (iii) cooperation and coordination between fisheries and environmental management institutions. She added that the project aims to strengthen collaboration between fisheries and environmental management and includes both regional and national implementation. In this regard, she noted that the project includes three pilot sites at the national/local levels, in Tanzania, Mozambique and Madagascar,

which will provide lessons learned for the regional level. She further described a number of other collaborations linked to Nairobi Convention, WIOMSA, and SWIOFC, noting formal and informal collaborations as well as multi-institutional networks.

Collaboration and coordination in the Southeast Pacific region

Méntor Villagómez, CPPS

Mr. Villagómez delivered a brief intervention communicating the updates on collaboration and coordination in the Southeast Pacific region. He noted that CPPS has started a review and update of its strategic plan for the next decade of 2022-2030. He added that there is a unique opportunity to align CPPS with the UN Decade of Oceans Science for Sustainable Development, and to identify the roadmap elements for the region to collaborate on. He highlighted that CPPS has established exchanges of data in relation to the UN Ocean Decade, designing a web portal called “Regional Sea Level Network Web Portal”, which shows tide gauges data for the region. He added that this portal could include additional environmental variables in the future, such as sea surface temperature (SST) and meteorological variables. He further described the work plan with IATTC which seeks to improve the skills and capacities of researchers in the region in order to generate scientific information and management, to achieve the sustainability of shark fisheries. He explained that the workplan will focus on capacity building in the assessment of the shark population, conceptual modeling for delimitation of shark population units, and the use of technological platforms. He added that via the STRONG High Seas Project, CPPS has shared good practices with the Abidjan Convention in several areas.

Agenda Item 4

Impacts of COVID-19 on the work of RFBs

Piero Mannini, FAO

Mr. Mannini delivered a presentation on the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of RFBs. He introduced two FAO reports on the Impact of COVID-19 on fisheries and aquaculture: A global assessment from the perspective of regional fishery bodies, initial assessment from May 2020 and second assessment from November 2020. He presented the results of the surveys from these assessments, describing the responses of Regional Fishery Management Organizations (RFMOs) and Regional Fishery Advisory Bodies (RFABs) to COVID-19 impacts on management of shared fishery stocks, on the monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) of fishing activities, and on the research on fish stocks. He noted that 41% of RFMOs and 61% of RFABs found the impacts of COVID-19 to be greater than expected. He highlighted the negative impacts on trade, modelling, administration, and staff, and positive impacts on conducting meetings and on electronic monitoring. He concluded that as per the results of both assessments, the RFBs have demonstrated the capacity to react to the impacts and issues that they have faced as a result of COVID-19. He added that this showcases how important the regional organizations are to build back better, to ensure resilient fisheries and aquaculture sectors, and to protect livelihoods, food security and nutrition for fishery-dependent populations.

Impacts of COVID-19 on the work of Regional Seas in SIDS region

Kerstin Stendahl, UNEP

Ms. Stendahl delivered a presentation on the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of Regional Seas Programmes (RSPs), with focus on SIDS in the wider Caribbean and the western Indian Ocean regions. She introduced a desk review of published literature and a survey that they conducted with key

informants to learn more on the impacts of COVID-19 on economy, livelihoods, poverty, gender and culture in SIDS, and to further recommend how to mitigate the impacts and build back better, bearing in mind the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the 2030 Agenda for ocean-related SDGs. She stressed that the COVID-19 measures severely impacted the sectors of tourism, fisheries, aquaculture, ports and shipping, which SIDS are particularly dependent on. She proceeded to describe specific COVID-19 impacts on SIDS, in relation to economy (e.g., drop of some SIDS from middle income to lower income), livelihoods (e.g., job loss), poverty, gender (e.g., increase in domestic violence), environmental impacts (e.g., delayed negotiations), and project implementation in both Caribbean and the western Indian Ocean. Examples of impacts on projects include delays in their implementation, lack of access to non-local expertise due to travel restrictions, or difficulties of conducting in-person capacity-building and stakeholder engagement. She highlighted the mitigation actions to enhance resilience by (i) building back better (increase resilience, equality, and inclusivity), (ii) enhancing capacities, (iii) mainstreaming the issues of environment, and (iv) transitioning to new models, for example, circular economy, blue economy, or payments for ecosystem services. She concluded with emphasizing major actions and support for effective implementation of Global Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), particularly (i) legislative frameworks, (ii) sustainable financing mechanisms, (iv) partnerships, (v) capacity engagements, (vi) data and information, (vii) dialogue and communication, and (viii) long-term phased programmes to support planning through implementation.

Results of the Marine Regions Forum Online Workshop on Ocean Governance and COVID-19

Klaudija Cremers, IDDRI

Ms. Cremers delivered a presentation on the results of the Marine Regions Forum Online Workshop on Ocean Governance and COVID-19 organized in January 2021 by IDDRI, IASS Potsdam and TMG-Think Tank for Sustainability with support from the Swedish Government. She noted that they conducted a survey of regional organizations and governments prior to this workshop, to gain more information on the impacts of COVID-19. She proceeded to describe the environmental and socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 in marine regions. She explained that for the former, the impacts are largely unknown due to lack of data, however, there has been an increase of plastic pollution (incl. medical waste) and monitoring, control and surveillance operations were affected. As for the latter, she emphasized that small-scale fisheries have been more impacted than industrial fishing because they are more dependent on supply chains, and that gender inequality increased in the fisheries sector and seafood industry. She added that small tourism enterprises handle the impacts better than large tourism chains, for example in the coastal areas of the Mediterranean region. She highlighted options for immediate responses as well as longer-term recovery and noted some impacts on regional cooperation and possible consequences for ocean governance. In this regard, she emphasized that the different sectors of ocean use have been impacted in various ways and the impacts vary between and within specific regions. She added that there is a need for leveraging new and existing partnerships for innovative ways for recovery financing, for regional organizations to support recovery efforts, and for integrated efforts of donors within regions. The regional level should play a key role in addressing the direct consequences of the pandemic, transitioning from a state of emergency to recovery, and improving long-term resilience of affected livelihoods at ecosystem scale.

Agenda Item 5

Introduction to the First Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Basil van Havre & Francis Ogwal, Open-Ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Mr. van Havre delivered a video presentation updating the participants on the first draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF). He introduced the current structure of the framework, including the rationale for the goals, milestones and targets. He explained the post-2020 process since COP14 in 2018, recalling a number of thematic and regional consultations, working groups, SBSTTA, SBI, and the OEWG3 that took place in late August 2021. He added that upcoming negotiations on the draft will take place in Geneva in January 2022 which will lead to the final negotiations at the second part of COP15 in April/May 2022. He proceeded to describe the specific 2050 goals, 2030 milestones, and the associated targets. He explained that targets 1-8 focus on reducing threats to biodiversity in relation to land/sea use change, climate change, pollution, over exploitation, and invasive species, noting the particularly relevant areas to ocean-related issues. He further presented targets 9-13 and their focus on meeting people's needs through sustainable use and benefit-sharing, and targets 14-21 focusing on the tools and solutions for implementation and mainstreaming. He stressed the importance of addressing and engaging with all the targets, not just some of them. He noted the remaining sections of the framework: H. Implementation support mechanisms, I. Enabling conditions, J. Responsibility and transparency, and G. Outreach, awareness and uptake. Under I., he emphasized the need for synergies and good coordination and cooperation between the various instruments. He noted the importance of cooperation in the high seas, too. He further explained the monitoring framework which includes performance indicators, and which can be either headline indicators (used by all, reported based on an agreed schedule) or component indicators (reflect national circumstances).

Key messages from the UNEP report on Regional Seas Biodiversity under the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

David Johnson, GOBI

Mr. Johnson delivered a presentation on the key messages from the UNEP report on Regional Seas Biodiversity under the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), particularly focusing on the opportunities for regional collaboration on the targets of the post-2020 GBF. He explained the methodology of the report and added that it identified ways to enhance compatibility between the zero draft of the post-2020 GBF and UNEP's Regional Seas Programme (RSP) and Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (RSCAPs). He noted that there are some geographical gaps in terms of RSCAPs coverage, as well as in the capacity of individual regions and in areas beyond national jurisdictions. He explained that the post-2020 GBF targets will build upon the Aichi Biodiversity Targets which have been adopted with varying degrees by the RSCAPs. He described that there are different interpretations of integrating the GBF into RSCAPs, especially in the areas of recognizing the GBF, integration with policy, mandates, regional partnerships, data collection and analysis, and communication and coordination between focal points. He noted that there have been significant efforts in integrating the first group of targets (1-8) of GBF into the RSCAPs policies and highlighted a number of associated case studies of OSPAR Commission, Nairobi Convention and SPREP. He further highlighted a variety of capacity building elements and tools in order to help RSCAPs to meet and implement the GBF. He stressed that RSOs are a diverse group, but they coordinate the implementation at the national level which could apply to the GBF building on Parties' NBSAPs, and which could support regional-scale reporting on progress,

challenges and gaps. He emphasized the opportunities to work with other regional organizations, especially RFBs, and the need for capacity building and to complete geographic coverage and visibility of regional organizations. He concluded with calling for discussions on how regional organizations can feed into the GBF targets.

Updates on the Intergovernmental Conference on BBNJ conservation and sustainable use

Charlotte Salpin & Michele Ameri, UNDOALOS

Ms. Salpin delivered a presentation updating the participants on the Intergovernmental Conference on an international legally binding instrument under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ). She noted that the Conference is currently developing the draft text of such an instrument, which considers a package of issues, namely the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, in particular together and as a whole: (i) marine genetic resources, including questions on the sharing of benefits, (ii) area-based management tools, including MPAs, (iii) environmental impact assessments, and (iv) capacity building and transfer of marine technology. She noted that the General Assembly had recognized that this process and its result shall not undermine existing relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional and sectoral bodies. She noted that the Conference has had three sessions so far, with the fourth session having been postponed to 2022 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, with tentative dates of 7-18 March. The fourth session will consider the revised draft text of an agreement. She highlighted that the President had undertaken intersessional work to keep the momentum on these issues going. She noted that international cooperation, including at the regional level, had been at the heart of the discussions, particularly in relation to (ii) area-based management tools and (iii) environmental impact assessments. In this regard, she described the range of approaches under discussions.

Mr. Ameri proceeded to give updates on current fisheries processes, noting that there are some important fisheries meetings tentatively scheduled in 2022. He highlighted the 15th round of Informal Consultations on the Fish Stocks Agreement, which will focus on the implementation of ecosystem approach to fisheries management and the review of actions that states and RFMOs have taken to reduce the impacts of bottom fishing on VMEs and the sustainability of deep-sea fish stocks. He added that these meetings are particularly relevant to regional cooperation between RFMOs and RSPs.

Updates on the 2022 UN Ocean Conference

Xin Feng, UNDESA

Ms. Feng presented brief updates on the UN Ocean Conference. She noted that the overarching theme of this Conference will be scaling up ocean action based on science and innovation for the implementation of SDG 14, partnerships and solutions. She added that the UN General Assembly has adopted a draft decision to convene the UN Ocean Conference in 2022, from 27 June to 1 July in Lisbon, Portugal, whereby the governments of Portugal and Kenya will remain the co-hosts. She explained that the substantive and logistical preparations for the Conference have been resumed, including the (i) intergovernmental negotiations on the draft resolution, (ii) informal preparatory working groups, (iii) panelists and moderators for the interactive dialogues, (iv) interdepartmental task force on logistical arrangements, (v) accreditation, and (vi) advisory committee meeting. She added that it is not certain when exactly these aforementioned processes will be fully resumed but everyone will be informed in due time. She encouraged the participants to regularly check the Conference website where they can

find more information: www.un.org/conferences/ocean2022. She noted that the ocean-biodiversity-climate change nexus approach has increasingly become a part of global actions to address the triple planetary crisis, adding that UNDESA has been actively emphasizing the linkages and synergies. She concluded that the latest version of the draft outcome document of the Conference stressed that the “ocean is an important source of the planet’s biodiversity and plays a vital role in the climate system and water cycle”. She added that they look forward to collaborating with partners on how to build on the synergies between the outcomes of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the UN Ocean Conference.

Latest updates on the ISA regulatory frameworks & REMPs

Marie Bourrel-McKinnon & Wanfei Qiu, ISA

Ms. Bourrel-McKinnon and Ms. Qiu delivered a presentation on the ISA deliberations on deep-sea mining exploitation regulations and regional environmental management plans (REMPs). They noted that ISA is in the middle of developing the mining code which relates to the adoption of draft regulations on exploitation of mineral resources. They added that the members of ISA have decided for these regulations to be supplemented with Standards & Guidelines which will be developed in three phases. They noted that they expect some of these Standards & Guidelines, if not all, to be approved by the Legal and Technical Commission (LTC) and submitted for consideration by the Council for its meeting in 2022. They explained that ISA needs to adopt robust and holistic regulatory framework by July 2023 due to a June 2021 notification from Nauru that they intend to apply for exploitation rights by July 2023. They noted that ISA has developed a detailed roadmap for 2022-2023 which will be considered at the Council’s meeting in December this year. Furthermore, they described one of the key measures of ISA to ensure effective protection of marine environment, the REMPs. They highlighted the REMP for the Clarion-Clipperton Zone (reviewed this year) which currently includes 9 Areas of Particular Environmental Interest (APEIs), fully protected from future mining activities, with additional 4 APEIs being recommended to the Council by the LTC. They added that the Council has recommended the REMPs to be developed in other priority regions where exploration activities are being undertaken, including in the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, Indian Ocean, North-West Pacific, and South-West Atlantic.

Briefing note: Opportunities for regional collaboration in the Post-2020 targets

Maria Adelaide Ferreira, GOBI

Ms. Ferreira presented a briefing note on opportunities for regional collaboration between RSOs and RFBs in implementing the post-2020 targets. She noted that it is now crucial to realign our efforts to meet the new targets and requirements of the still evolving post-2020 GBF. She explained that the GBF was recently discussed at the Third Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) meeting where the wording of the goals and targets was discussed, including other proposals to simplify and clarify the language. She clarified that it is already possible and beneficial to use the current version of the GBF to explore potential synergies between RSOs and RFBs, toward achieving the targets in marine and coastal zones. She briefly described the targets 1-8 where, she noted, there may be more opportunities for collaboration, however ideally all the targets should be covered. Under each target, she explained the areas of potential target modifications that were discussed at the OEWG meeting, stressing that the lack of explicit mention of the role of indigenous peoples and local communities was a frequent concern of many Parties. Within the targets 9-13, she highlighted target 11 (ecosystem services), noting that some Parties suggested that nature-based solutions are outside of the CBD scope which she considered as an interesting point up for debate. Within the targets 14-21, she highlighted target 20 (knowledge sharing,

incl. traditional knowledge) where regional organizations could have a key role. She informed the participants that this briefing note can be found on the CBD meeting webpage: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/dc92/0918/ff1dcd81f3aed825f1623616/briefing-note-soi-2021-01-en.pdf>.

Regional monitoring for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Nic Bax, CSIRO

Mr. Bax introduced the report on Marine Input to Headline Indicators of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. He stated that there are over 500 multilateral environmental agreements that concern transboundary environmental issues, with vast number of experts and reporting happening on ocean indicators. However, he explained that not many organizations deal with data collection, highlighting FAO as the major organization reporting on the fisheries and aquaculture sectors, UNEP that helps countries and RSOs to develop indicators and link them to SDGs, UNEP-WCMC that holds many world databases on protected areas and thematic databases, IOC-UNESCO that supports scientific data on ocean biodiversity and global reporting, and also MBON and IUCN. He proceeded to evaluate the indicators that are currently available in the post-2020 GBF. He identified the categories of indicators adequately developed, and indicators where there are systems in place that require global and thematic expansion. He pointed out that many developing countries that face the greatest threats often have less of scientific observing systems in place, but frequently supported by research scientists. He noted that many existing indicators are reported as part of national statistics, so marine issues will be reported alongside terrestrial issues, e.g., through the UN system of environmental and economic accounting, or the CBD reporting system. He added that some indicators do require more thought and therefore present an opportunity for the marine community to influence the language of such indicators and targets. This way, he stressed, the profile of marine issues could be raised to the broader community. He added that there are existing marine and coastal monitoring frameworks for most of the headline indicators, but there is a need for increased geographic and thematic coverage, and regional cooperation. In this regard, he emphasized that effectively engaging with the indigenous peoples and local communities would extend coverage of many remote areas on which we lack information. He noted that there will be a need for regional assessments as migratory marine species often cross several national jurisdictions. He concluded that in view of the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development, there is a timely opportunity to prioritize the GBF goals and targets for ocean issues.

Annex IV

OUTPUTS OF BREAKOUT GROUPS

Under agenda items 5.3 and 5.5, two breakout group sessions took place and addressed the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework targets and the potential for synergy and suggestions for aspects where regional organizations could cooperate to address the targets. Participants were divided into four breakout groups (with breakout group compositions generally seeking to bring participants from the same/adjacent regions), and the composition of the groups remained the same for both sessions.

In the first breakout group session (agenda item 5.3), participants were invited to discuss how regional collaboration and cooperation in implementing the post-2020 targets could be improved, and to identify specific initiatives and resources of direct relevance to the targets. In the second breakout group session (agenda item 5.5), participants were invited to discuss the opportunities for regional collaboration in monitoring and reporting, including against indicators, for the draft post-2020 targets.

Table 1 below showcases the outputs of all four breakout groups and of both breakout group sessions, with the first column corresponding to the first session’s discussions and the second column to the second session’s discussions. In some cases, participants discussed general ideas not pertaining to specific targets, and those are included separately in Table 2.

The information in the below tables is the result of informal discussions under a limited timeframe and, therefore, should not be considered as a comprehensive and definitive review of initiatives and efforts underway that are relevant to the targets and indicators for the post-2020 framework. Further discussion is needed on this topic, including at the 3rd meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue in 2022.

Furthermore, the points expressed by the participants from the secretariats of various organizations cannot be taken as representing the positions of their organizations or of the respective Parties/Members of those organizations.

Table 1. Synthesis of breakout group discussion from the first session on the potential for RSO/RFB input to achieving GBF targets and recent resources, and second session on indicators, overall organized by specific targets of the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Draft Post-2020 Target	Potential for RSO/RFB to contribute to achieving target	Potential for RSO/RFB to contribute to indicators and monitoring
<p>1. Biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avenue for cross-sectoral planning; more attention from RFBs and building on ICZM work underway • Relevant to biodiversity/ecosystem-based MSP/ICZM • <u>SPA/RAC</u>: many integrated coastal management areas exist and trying to expand the protection areas now. Under discussion about adopting new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two types—Improvement of legal frameworks to enable and implement; Dimensions of space they are applied in. • Issue of scale in spatial planning: Performance indicators are dealt with on a national level, but spatial planning is scale dependent. RSO and RFB cooperation is particularly critical to conserving migratory species, as spatial planning for migratory species in one region is pretty much pointless, it needs to be on a larger scale.

	<p>frameworks in relation to improvement of integrated coastal and ocean governance. Challenging to manage multiple streams of work in consistent ways, harmonizing diverse interests of stakeholders.</p>	<p>Regional orgs should work together better in this area. There needs to be an emphasis on connectivity in the goals, and we need communication across regions, not just within regions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline studies to inform sustainable management of large areas (e.g. southern convergence zone in the Sargasso Sea)
<h2>2. Ecosystem restoration</h2>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of work already happening on the restoration of certain types of ecosystems for the benefit of fish stocks and habitat • Excellent examples for in-situ restoration for mangroves and coral reefs; collaboration with CLME+ to identify hotspots in need of restoration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring extent of quality habitat(s) based on integrity of ecosystem function • There is a lot of gaps in the existing knowledge on ecosystem restoration indicators and the data can help in this process at national level • An interest in working with IPBES, which is very closely related to the convention at global level, but its data is not always useful at national level and this is a challenge for indicators.
<h2>3. Protected areas</h2>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>OSPAR</u>: Example of process of engagement going on between RSO/RFB: OSPAR has a large MPA in ABNJ under consideration (to be approved 1 Oct); OSPAR consulted NEAFC and ICCAT on the proposal; OSPAR initiated this process with NEAFC in the context of their ongoing relationships (MoU, many different interactions). • <u>NEAFC</u> asked to get scientific advice from ICES, that led to OSPAR going to ICES themselves to ask for advice too. ICES provided information that improved the whole scientific background for the MPA that is to be adopted 1 Oct at the ministerial meeting. This increased the scientific credibility of the MPA case that OSPAR makes --> common science issues enable this kind of collaboration. • <u>BSC</u>: managing the MPAs network, getting more expertise from UNEP/MAP to get their experience on MPA network <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ getting transboundary MPA between Bulgaria and Turkey – it's at preparatory stage ○ A wide network on MPAs in the Black Sea ○ Work underway to set up more formal arrangements with other organizations when it comes to achieving the targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of stakeholder engagement • Area protected; but qualitative aspects are as, if not more, important • At regional level, networks of MPAs/OECMs are important, and whether they are representative and connected. Establish joint indicators to assess this. Good information is coming on how to measure connectivity – very relevant to regional considerations. • Passive hydrodynamic connectivity (e.g. larval studies) and migratory connectivity of highly mobile species (e.g. MiCO). Measuring integrity/fragmentation of habitat may be useful here • Utilizing existing monitoring and input to World Database on Protected Areas (both MPAs and OECMs) and adding effectiveness elements • Issue with protected area indicators: Lack of data in most countries and how the regional institutions can help countries use this basic data. The standardization of this indicators is crucial in the process specially to have assessment at regional level. There was the example of ISA using the data of OBIS to dealing with technical data of standardization that allow them to make available the data collected in the past 20 years in a most standardized manner, this is something that requires the commitment of different institutions but it is feasible. To have standardized data we have to put the institutions to work together to create the system to work together.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries-related OECMs; regional networks of MPAs should integrate OECMs/fisheries area-based measures • MPAs that have specific traits for species of interest • Cross-region networks of MPAs; • Management effectiveness assessments; How species from one MPA affects others (e.g., recruitment) • OECMs is a high relevant tool for RFMOs: how to enhance collaboration to promote that the OECMs is applied in the contexts of the regional fisheries organizations; this is more relevant now as the current Aichi Target disappeared and now there is nothing specific for fisheries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 kinds of indicators: (i) the process to establish MPAs to manage all organizational and governance indicators and (ii) a package of biodiversity and ecosystems that require the inputs of all the scientific world
4. Species recovery and conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bycatch of turtles, sharks and seabirds • Species nominated for protection; regular assessment to see if species meet certain criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibility of measuring by-catch and impact of mitigation measures – needs further thought and build on CLME+ efforts. • Regional reflection of IUCN Red Lists and population trends of key species. Also CITES species? • Should we also be considering keystone species as well as those that are threatened and/or endangered?
5. Sustainable harvest, trade and use of wild species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NAFO/ICES</u> on ecosystem approach to fisheries management • Coordination mechanism in Caribbean among fisheries bodies already • Minimizing and eliminating IUU fishing • National-level capacities and policies for different groups of species • What happens in biodiversity community it also seeps to fisheries directly, and it also seeps into sustainable use issues – OSPAR / NEAFC dialogue has made the issue of sustainable use to feed into the fisheries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective and accurate data collected and used • Better use existing information; RFBs collect significant amount of data (catch, strandings, bycatch, etc.) • Percentage of stocks at biologically sustainable levels
6. Invasive alien species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important issue for Caribbean; Pieces of infrastructure already present in many cases; • Critical for pollution and climate change targets also 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NOWPAP</u>—doing assessment of invasive alien species
7. Pollution reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>HELCOM</u>: Issues in runoff from land to sea – they have several working groups that engage in these issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrients and plastics using SDG14.1 indicators (NB. Complicated, thus simpler indicators being considered)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major area of discussion under regional coordination mechanism • State of pollution report; Regional strategies and action plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrients coming from aquaculture and litter associated with fishing industry – potential for joint monitoring by RSOs and RFBs • Light and noise pollution aspects also require integrated monitoring approaches
8. Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature-based solution = ecosystem-based adaptation, including blue carbon 	
9. Sustainable management of wild species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting countries to develop management plans • Regional management plans for sharks • RSOs and RFBs should share the targets in relation to management of commercial fisheries, in particular. 	
10. Sustainable aquaculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing interest in the region; Need to ensure aquatic health and minimize disease spread while advancing this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we measure the health of the environment where aquaculture is taking place?
11. Maintain/enhance ecosystem services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many regions already doing ecosystem services valuation 	
12. Benefits from green and blue spaces		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPBES sustainable use assessment is a good resource to look at for indicators • Indicators should either be standardized or individually clear enough in terms of methodology, to be able to scale them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ but this is difficult for small-scale livelihood-based uses of nature (collecting, gathering etc.) ○ indicators related to well-being of fishery-dependent communities are good surrogates for the status of biodiversity, i.e., the state of community determines the state of biodiversity as well ○ This argument is also marketable because you are talking about the well-being of people – so of interest to policy-makers
13. Fair and equitable access/sharing of genetic resources		
14. Biodiversity values integrated in policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce existing infrastructure to use existing capacities to generate knowledge; avoid creation of new mechanisms where there are existing resources and capacities; rather, focus on new targets with 	

	<p>existing mechanisms; Utilize OBIS and IODE; Opportunity presented by UN Ocean Decade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many regions already doing ecosystem services valuation 	
15. Business and biodiversity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Australia and New Zealand, indigenous and local communities are engaged in marine tourism activities along with fisheries monitoring, and CSIRO actively collaborates with them
16. Responsible choices/ consumption		
17. Adverse impacts of biotechnology		
18. Eliminate incentives harmful for biodiversity		
19. Increase financial resources		
20. Knowledge and information sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>ICES and PICES</u> as non-partisan facilitators of information exchange and integration in conservation/sustainable use and protection • Potential of ICES to support integration; it is a source of scientific advice, which does integration of conservation, sustainable use, so they can put together a diverse group of experts • Encouraging ICES AND PICES to become more active body to provide the information base which is objective/non-partisan, both are well positioned to facilitate coordinating action to provide advice to the relevant agencies • Lots of collaboration between ICES and other experts in different regions already happening; those can be models for how to do this globally rather than in just North Atlantic --> SOI could be a forum to promote examples or ways how things have been done in ICES • <u>NAFO</u> scientific council follows similar issues as ICES, also lots of collaboration with ICES, trying to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a development of increased cooperation since the beginning of SOI, but it is difficult to keep track of this development. We should develop an interactive map of the organizations, and have different projects to pop up when hovering over them

	develop their own framework in ecosystem-based fisheries management	
21. Participation in decision-making		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective engagement of IPLCs; Trust building of stakeholders in decision-making processes; looks different for different socio-cultural contexts • <u>IWC</u>: Actively engaging with indigenous groups in managing sustainable Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling, including participation in decision-making processes related to establishment of catch quotas.

Table 2. Synthesis of breakout group discussion from the first and second sessions, concerning general ideas, views, experiences and suggestions with regards to regional collaboration in the targets and indicators of the draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

First session – General inputs on draft targets	Second session – General inputs on draft indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NAFO</u>: There is no RSO in North-West Atlantic, only example of possible collaboration could be in the North-East Atlantic, NAFO has been asked by OSPAR to comment on proposed MPA that would border NAFO zone. Potential collaboration with Sargasso Sea Commission as southern part of NAFO area overlaps with Sargasso. NAFO has been active in protecting ecosystems despite not having RSOs to cooperate with. • <u>BSC</u>: Bilateral MoUs with GFCM and ACCOBAMS, and UNEP/MAP, it would be nice to have a formal agreement with CBD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SOI Global Dialogue is a good mechanism to unite the RSO/RFB efforts, and outcomes of SOI should call for this cooperation so the orgs can discuss it with their countries ○ SOI can be the facilitator to increase the number of formal arrangements, by bringing forward good experiences • <u>HELCOM</u>: Has been looking at the GBF targets, comparing them with the Baltic Sea Action Plan (just adopted). There are actions focusing on increased and more formalized cooperation with RFMOs in the Baltic Sea, progress made but need to be more formalized. • <u>SPA/RAC</u>: In relation to ABNJ management, they are operating special conservation areas along with adjacent states under the framework of Barcelona Convention, in the Mediterranean Sea, also covering high seas • <u>IWC</u>: Undertaking global Bycatch Mitigation Initiative to monitor and mitigate cetacean bycatch. As part of this effort, conducting scientific and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>BSC</u>: Importance of Global Group on Indicators, their work has already started regarding the GBF indicators, they shared common indicators between the global seas. Good example is the Danube Commission: BSC established joint working group with them, they will now be reporting to each other using a harmonized approach, coming up with their list of indicators within regional seas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With GFCM and ACCOBAMS, they established common indicators as well, and the countries are not in burden to report different things to different organizations (it's more synchronized) ○ SOI is a great platform to discuss indicators • <u>NAFO</u>: RFMOs have several indicators that NAFO uses, e.g., fish stock assessments using precautionary approach, fishing mortality (level of biomass) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protection of VMEs – NAFO develops indicators to apply FAO guidelines, lots of work in their scientific council ○ Development of ecosystem approach to fisheries management – NAFO looks at indicators that could increase effectiveness of a specific fishing region, e.g., plankton blooms – assessing how productive an area would be, and as a result indicate what kind of total commercial catch would be that would be sustainable ○ ICES is also using the fish stock indicator

technical cooperation with relevant RFMOs in the Indian Ocean and Western and Pacific Ocean.

- SOI should promote more formal agreements in the relevant organizations in the Arctic, as it is the future area of marine development and conservation due to climate change. Active measures for conservation and sustainable use are currently in the early stages in the Arctic.
- Lack of engagement from Contracting Parties with the Secretariats
- GBF targets flow into the work of Contracting Parties and all organizations
- Caution about increasing levels of reporting to different processes; Importance of coherence of reporting
- Matrices for regions to see if/how targets are reflected
- Reduction of by catch is a critical issue. But it is hard to reduce bycatch related to commercial fishing operations like mackerel, considering numerous species are involved. To be worse, there is no effective quota system for bycatch reduction in place in South-East Asia Pacific.
- The importance of sustainable management in ABNJ
- Two kinds of questions when we talk about collaboration in the region: How to initiate the collaboration and what would be the mechanism of support for this collaboration so we can enhance this cooperation? The frameworks of cooperation exist in different organizations, but the question is whether the Global Biodiversity Framework will provide the means to really enhance and go deep into this collaboration and hope it will not just limit it to RFBOs and Regional Seas Conventions as most of the debates we are having here require the involvement of the scientific communities.
- Collaboration between regional organizations and national governments: Governments would like the regional bodies to help them put in place the reforms and national frameworks that have to be applied at national level, this could help them in the identification of priorities. This could be in the context of MPAs, and other issues. In the end, MPAs are established at a national level, so how can this cooperation happen from a regional to a national level, especially with the challenge of management? Hopefully governments can create structures to help them manage them properly and hopefully the regional institutions can support the governments with that.

- NEAFC: They have fisheries indicators, often through FAO, there is often national reporting happening, rather than regional, and reporting to FAO. Lots of work is also done in regional orgs.
 - Need to look at biodiversity indicators to report better on OECMs – this is a good potential role for SOI
 - Indicators often look at land-based agriculture, but we also have sustainable low carbon fisheries. If we manage to produce fish sustainably through a balanced collaborative approach, it has a potential to reduce pressure on biodiversity and land globally.
- SPA/RAC: In process of preparing an enhanced evaluation and monitoring system, along with developing relevant indicators under the Barcelona convention
- Many activities take place in the high seas, but CBD reporting system does not accept reports from regional orgs, just the countries. It would be a good idea to encourage reports from regional orgs as some areas cannot be managed by national jurisdictions (sometimes regional, or even local), this is an opportunity for RSOs/RFBs to work on such reporting, and for SOI to encourage that, as the orgs often have great knowledge of all things happening in the area.
- A concern that each indicator is in a vacuum, so its true meaning can often not be understood. We should encourage mapping related indicators (in terms of messages they main contain together) across the different parts of the GBF, e.g. status of biodiversity + status of uses of biodiversity + contributions to conserving it. Indicators that need to be interpreted together should be mapped, and viewed more in tandem, rather than individually
- Need to explicitly define spatial and temporal resolutions
- Outcome indicator vs process indicator