

# BUSAN OUTCOME

THIRD MEETING OF THE SUSTAINABLE OCEAN INITIATIVE (SOI)  
GLOBAL DIALOGUE WITH REGIONAL SEAS ORGANIZATIONS  
(RSOs) AND REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES (RFBs)

*25 - 28 October 2022, Busan, Republic of Korea*



## Table of Contents

I. Co-chairs' Summary of the Meeting .....	3
II. Regional Roadmaps on Advancing Collaboration and Coordination Between RSOs and RFBs .....	9
III. Summary of Presentations and Plenary Discussions.....	27
IV. Synthesis of Breakout Group Sessions .....	40

# **Busan Outcome**

## **“Forging a new era of regional leadership”**

Outcome of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fishery Bodies

### **I. CO-CHAIRS’ SUMMARY OF THE MEETING**

#### **A. Background on the Meeting**

1. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fishery Bodies was convened in Busan, Republic of Korea, from 25 to 28 October 2022. Financial support was provided by the Government of the Republic of Korea (through the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries), the Government of Japan (through the Japan Biodiversity Fund), and the Government of France (through the French Biodiversity Agency). The meeting was convened by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), with the organizational support of the National Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea (MABIK).
2. Participants comprised representatives of regional seas organizations (RSOs), regional fishery bodies (RFBs), other global and regional organizations and initiatives, national governments and non-governmental organizations.

#### **B. Meeting Approach**

3. The meeting focused on the core objectives of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue, namely (i) sharing experiences on the respective work of RSOs and RFBs, (ii) sharing experiences on coordination and collaboration between RSOs and RFBs in regions where this is occurring, (iii) identifying opportunities and approaches for coordination and collaboration between RSOs and RFBs, and (iv) identifying the roles of, and opportunities for, RSOs and RFBs in facilitating and monitoring progress towards global goals and targets for the ocean.
4. The meeting focused on specific timely issues of relevance, including other effective area-based conservation measures, as well as issues related to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, an international legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, and an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment, all of which were still under development in their respective processes and not yet finalized at the time of the meeting. The meeting also considered these issues in the context of the four thematic areas of focus of the SOI Global Dialogue: (i) ecosystem approach/ecosystem-based management, (ii) area-based management tools, (iii) reducing and mitigating the impacts of pollution, and (iv) monitoring, assessment and information-sharing.

#### **C. Evolving Global Ocean Policy-Scape for the Ocean**

5. Updates were provided on developments in various intergovernmental processes, in particular the post-2020 global biodiversity framework being developed under the CBD, negotiations on an international legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on marine biological diversity of ABNJ, the development of a global agreement on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment, under

the UN Environment Assembly, the FAO Committee on Fisheries, the World Ocean Assessment and the 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects, the development of regulations for deep-sea mining and regional environmental management planning under the International Seabed Authority.

#### **D. Progress and Developments in Regional Coordination and Collaboration**

6. Participants reviewed and discussed ongoing progress made on enhancing regional coordination and collaboration.
7. Participants were presented with the results of an online survey conducted with RSOs and RFBs<sup>1</sup> focused on the status of regional coordination and collaboration, which showed, among other findings, that:
  - a. Responding organizations reported a generally high prevalence of alignment and complementarity of the goals, targets, and/or strategies of RSOs and RFBs operating in the same general region;
  - b. Responding organizations reported a generally high level of regular communication and/or dialogue between RSOs and RFBs operating in the same general region;
  - c. With respect to joint or collaborative activities between RSOs and RFBs, these take place in 88% of responding organizations in the area of research, 79% of respondents in the area of monitoring and assessment, and 79% of respondents in the area of management;
  - d. Most responding organizations indicated that increased levels of regional collaboration and coordination has had a clear positive impact on the respective work of RSOs and RFBs;
  - e. Responding organizations reported the lack of financial and human resources, lack of understanding/political will on the need for regional collaboration and coordination, and excessive workload as some of the primary factors hindering regional collaboration and coordination, among others.
8. Updates were also provided directly by representatives of RSOs and RFBs, through regionally-coordinated presentations, addressing developments in regional collaboration and coordination in the following organizations:
  - a. Nairobi Convention, Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC), Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) and Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)
  - b. Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP), Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM), Caribbean & North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CLME+) and Organization for Central American Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector (OSPESCA-SICA)
  - c. Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) and Interamerican Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)
  - d. Abidjan Convention, Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF), Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation Among African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean (COMHAFAT-ATLAFCO), Benguela Current Commission (BCC) and International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/0979/7675/c20489a2df23c288decb0078/soi-gd-survey-update-2022-en.pdf>

- e. General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP), Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (SPA/RAC), Black Sea Commission and Tehran Convention
  - f. Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP), North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) and North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES)
  - g. Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC), Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), Coordinating Body on the Seas of East Asia (COBSEA), Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-governmental Organization (BOBP) and South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)
  - h. Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA), Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) and Regional Commission for Fisheries (RECOFI)
  - i. North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR), International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) and Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)
9. These updates brought forth various insights on a range of issues related to regional collaboration and coordination, including the following:
- a. The scale and prevalence of regional coordination and collaboration has increased significantly since the beginning of the SOI Global Dialogue in 2016, facilitated by increased awareness among stakeholders of the value of such collaboration and enhanced global-level discussions on these issues, including through the SOI Global Dialogue;
  - b. A wide range of approaches for cooperation and coordination are being used, spanning from improved informal and formal communication among regional organizations in a given region to establishing formal cooperation mechanisms and joint projects;
  - c. While there are many experiences and lessons-learned that are relevant and applicable to various regions, there are few one-size-fits-all approaches, as regions vary greatly in their political, economic, geographic, social and environmental characteristics;
  - d. Strengthening and formalizing cooperation is valuable for identifying common interests and objectives, enhancing mutual understanding of organizational mandates, and supporting accountability and transparency;
  - e. Developments in various global intergovernmental processes are contributing to the impetus and necessity for increasing the scale and scope of regional coordination and collaboration on issues of common interest.
10. Participants also considered relevant ongoing work and opportunities to support regional organizations and regional collaboration and coordination, in particular through the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats' Network (RSN), a body coordinated by FAO to facilitate information exchange and coordination among RFB Secretariats, the UNEP Regional Seas Programme, which provides various types of support to Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (RSCAPs), and the Global Environment Facility, in particular through its International Waters Focal Area, as a source of funding that can support regional governance, coordination and cooperation.

### **E. Thematic Issues of Relevance to Regional Coordination and Cooperation**

11. Participants were provided with briefings on thematic issues of relevance to regional coordination and cooperation, specifically on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs), ongoing negotiations on an international legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on marine

biological diversity of ABNJ, and forthcoming negotiations on an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment. Participants then discussed, in inter-regional breakout groups, the relevance of these issues to RSOs and RFBs, respectively, and to regional coordination and collaboration, and considered the following:

- a. Alignments of these issues with the mandates, strategies and areas of work of RSOs and RFBs;
  - b. Means and opportunities to scale up work on these issues in the context of RSOs and RFBs and collaboration and coordination among them;
  - c. Enabling factors and capacities needed to adequately address these issues under RSOs and RFBs and through regional collaboration and coordination;
  - d. Key challenges in addressing these issues through RSOs and RFBs and through regional collaboration and coordination
12. Various insights were drawn through these discussions, which are shown in section IV and include the following:
- a. **With respect to Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs):**
    - i. This is a strong potential area of focus for collaboration between RSOs and RFBs, in view of the major focus of many RSOs on area-based conservation and the existing mandates and competencies of many RFBs with respect to area-based fisheries management;
    - ii. There are a range of existing tools with potential for designation as OECMs, including measures set at the regional level (such as vulnerable marine ecosystems), as well as national-level measures coordinated through regional processes;
    - iii. A new global target on area-based conservation under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will likely catalyze increased attention on the opportunity presented by OECMs;
    - iv. There is a need to enhance understanding of the OECM concept and approach among regional organizations, which can be accomplished through tailored guidance on OECMs in the marine fishery sector and joint activities and working groups among RSOs and RFBs. This can help to clearly illustrate the respective roles of RSOs and RFBs with respect to the implementation, monitoring and assessment of OECMs, considering the management competence of RFBs on fisheries management and the experience and competence of RSOs in assessing the status of biodiversity and ecosystems in various regions.
  - b. **With respect to a new international legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on marine biological diversity of ABNJ:**
    - i. This new instrument could be an opportunity to strengthen regional governance and catalyze increased regional coordination and collaboration, although the role of RSOs and RFBs are not yet clear as the deliberations were not finalized at the time of the meeting;
    - ii. There have been different levels of awareness and engagement in this issue among various RSOs and RFBs, which partially reflects the differing mandates of various regional organizations, with some regional organizations not having a geographic scope/competence in ABNJ;
    - iii. There is a need to better understand how the new instrument will impact the work of regional organizations.
  - c. **With respect to a new international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment:**



- i. The issue of pollution has been a major area of focus of RSOs, but RFB work in this topic is less prominent and focuses primarily on issues such as abandoned, lost and discarded fishing gear and fish aggregating devices;
- ii. As the negotiations on this new instrument had begun at the time of the meeting, it was unclear what implications and opportunities this will entail for regional organizations and regional collaboration and coordination.

## **F. Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and Roles of, and Opportunities for Regional Coordination and Cooperation**

*Discussions focused on the draft version of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework that was available at the time of the meeting. A revised version of the framework was later adopted at the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP 15) in December 2022 and given the formal title of the “Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework”*

- 13. Under this item, participants were provided with presentations on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, describing the process to develop the framework, the overall structure and approach of the framework, its goals and targets and considerations of potential relevance to RSOs and RFBs as well as collaboration and coordination between them. Participants then discussed, in regional breakout groups, the relevance of the draft goals and targets of the post-2020 framework to RSOs and RFBs, respectively, and to regional coordination and collaboration.
- 14. Breakout discussions first addressed the draft goals of the post-2020 framework, highlighting numerous issues and insights, which are provided in more detail in section IV, and include the following:
  - a. The central focus of the post-2020 framework on balancing sustainable use and conservation provides a valuable framework for collaboration and coordination between RSOs and RFBs, reflecting an improved understanding of the close interlinkages and mutually supportive nature of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use;
  - b. There is a need to clearly acknowledge and enhance understanding on the role of RSOs and RFBs, and the importance of regional collaboration and coordination, in the context of the post-2020 framework;
  - c. Draft goal A on biodiversity being conserved and the connectivity and integrity of all ecosystems being enhanced aligns very closely with mandates and areas of work of RSOs, and there is also an increasing focus on the role of RFBs with respect to biodiversity conservation in the context of the ecosystem approach to fisheries management, which often includes a focus on conservation-related issues such as bycatch mitigation and habitat protection;
  - d. Draft goal B on sustainable use and management of biodiversity aligns very closely with mandates and areas of work of RFBs, and there is also an increased focus on the role of RSOs in biodiversity assessment and monitoring in the context of sustainable use;
  - e. Draft goal C on equitable benefit sharing with respect to genetic resources was seen as less relevant overall to the work of RSOs and RFBs;
  - f. There are various areas of ongoing work under both RSOs and RFBs that can help facilitate achievement of draft goal D on adequate means of implementation;
  - g. Collaboration and coordination between RSOs and RFBs will be important in monitoring progress towards these goals, and work on indicators for the post-2020 framework provides an important opportunity to scale up collaboration and better inform overall assessment of progress towards global goals and targets.

15. Breakout discussions then addressed the draft targets of the post-2020 framework, highlighting numerous issues and insights, which are provided in more detail in section IV, and include the following:
  - a. There is significant ongoing work in both RSOs and RFBs with respect to issues addressed in draft targets 1-4, as well as expanding areas of coordination and collaboration between them, with many opportunities to scale this up, where appropriate and relevant, which can facilitate progress towards these targets;
  - b. There is significant ongoing work in many RSOs with respect to issues addressed in draft targets 6-8, but comparatively less work and focus on these issues in RFBs, indicating a potential need to consider where this could be scaled up, where appropriate and relevant, including through coordination and collaboration;
  - c. There is significant ongoing work in many RFBs with respect to issues addressed in draft targets 5, 9 and 10, but comparatively less work and focus on these issues in RSOs, indicating a potential need to consider where this could be scaled up, where appropriate and relevant, including through coordination and collaboration;
  - d. There is also work under RSOs and RFBs relevant to other draft targets, including 11, 14, 15, and 19.

#### **G. Implementation and Follow-up through Regional Roadmaps or Priority Actions on Advancing Collaboration and Coordination Between RSOs and RFBs**

16. Building on the discussions throughout the meeting, participants, organized into regional groupings, worked on regional roadmaps or priority actions on advancing collaboration and coordination between RSOs and RFBs. Regional groups either developed new regional roadmaps or revised/updated previous regional roadmaps that were developed at the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue. The following regions either developed new regional roadmaps or revised/updated previous regional roadmaps, which are contained in section II:
  - a. Western Indian Ocean and Adjacent Areas;
  - b. North Atlantic, Baltic and Mediterranean;
  - c. Wider Caribbean;
  - d. Pacific Basin;
  - e. East Atlantic African Region;
  - f. South and Southeast Asia.

#### **H. Enhancing the Impact of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with RSOs and RFBs**

17. It was recognized that, since its inception in 2016, the SOI Global Dialogue has become an important regular forum for facilitating inter-regional and cross-regional dialogue, which has contributed to the overall advancement of coordination and collaboration of RSOs and RFBs at both the global and regional levels.
18. Participants noted that progress under the SOI Global Dialogue has been presented at various global fora, increasing awareness on the important role played by regional organizations in facilitating progress towards global goals and targets for the ocean.
19. It was also recognized that the robust engagement of RSOs and RFBs has driven the evolution of discussions under the SOI Global Dialogue, leading to the identification of increasingly practical



actions and opportunities to facilitate improved regional coordination and collaboration, which are elaborated further in sections II-IV.

20. It was also emphasized that many of the issues and action items discussed at the meeting would need to be further elaborated through continued regional coordination, and that the discussions and outcomes of the meeting provides the basis for continued dialogue at the regional level that is necessary to bring these actions and opportunities to fruition in each respective region.
  21. Building on the discussions throughout the meeting, and on progress under the SOI Global Dialogue since its inception, participants considered ways in which to enhance the impact of the SOI Global Dialogue with RSOs and RFBs. Through this discussion, participants highlighted the following:
    - a. The importance of continuing the SOI Global Dialogue on a regular basis, and potentially expanding this work by convening intersessional work, sessions on the margins of major international meetings and engagement in regional-level work
    - b. The importance of RSO and RFB Secretariats engaged in the SOI Global Dialogue to become “ambassadors” for this work, including by highlighting the value of this process to their respective of Parties / Member States
    - c. Need to better engage other entities / organizations that support regional governance and cooperation / collaboration.
    - d. Value of engaging Parties / Member States of various RSOs and RFBs in the SOI Global Dialogue, but the need to do so in a strategic manner
    - e. SOI Global Dialogue has expanded the awareness of RSO and RFB work in major global processes
    - f. Potential for the SOI Global Dialogue to facilitate discussions and coordination at the regional-level, including on specific thematic issues of interest (e.g., OECMs)
    - g. Potential to expand the range of topics/issues discussed under the SOI Global Dialogue, but need to do so strategically, focused on the niche and strengths of SOI, and to ensure the strong engagement and focus on RSOs and RFBs
- 

## **II. REGIONAL ROADMAPS ON ADVANCING COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN RSOs AND RFBs**

### **A. Western Indian Ocean & Adjacent Areas**

*Developed by experts from the Nairobi Convention, RECOFI, SWIOFC, ISA, UN-DOALOS, and Heriot-Watt University*

#### **1. Common vision**

Regional cooperation towards a healthy, productive and resilient ocean for the well-being of all.

#### **2. Major milestones**

- Identification and shared understanding of existing relevant bodies, and their competencies, mandates (i.e., RSOs & RFBs; collaboration with LMEs; support from CBD, FAO, UNEP, IMO, UNESCO-IOC, and other competent intergovernmental organizations);

- Enhanced framework for collaboration for strengthening cooperation at the regional level (i.e., RSOs & RFBs; collaboration with LMEs; supported by CBD, FAO, UNEP, IMO, UNESCO-IOC, and other competent intergovernmental organizations);
  - Identified areas of common interest and opportunities for collaboration and information exchange; and
  - Established mechanisms for coordination, engagement and collaboration in areas of common interest.
3. **Thematic issues and common interests (i.e., areas where the work RSOs and RFBs can be complementary within the frameworks of GBF, 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, BBNJ, and INC on plastic pollution)**
- Ecosystem Approach;
  - Marine and coastal spatial planning;
  - Area-based management tools (ABMTs), such as marine protected areas (MPAs), other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) and other spatial management measures;
  - Management, conservation and restoration of critical habitats, including essential fish habitats;
  - Recovery and conservation of threatened species;
  - Invasive alien species;
  - Pollution including marine litter in relation to international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment;
  - Climate change impacts and adaptation;
  - Aquaculture;
  - Sustainable and resilient livelihoods development;
  - Small-scale fisheries and aquaculture representation in inter-sectoral ocean governance policy and planning processes;
  - Integrated assessments, covering environmental, social and economic aspects;
  - Ocean literacy; and
  - Community based management and co-management.
4. **Key actors**
- **RSOs and RFBs:** serve as platform for regional intergovernmental collaboration on coastal and marine environment and fisheries management (including Nairobi Convention, PERSGA, RECOFI, SWIOFC, IOTC, SIOFA).
  - **RECs:** interlocutors between RFBs and RSOs with the AU (IOC, SADC, IGAD, EAC, COMESA).
  - **IGOs:** platform for harmonization of policies, coordinating donors, technical advice, supporting capacity building, linkages with governments (CBD, UNEP, FAO, IOC-UNESCO, AU, UN/DOALOS, IMO, CITES, IUCN, etc.).
  - **Civil Society:** advocacy, improving transparency, community mobilization, raising the profile of issues and ongoing efforts, improving knowledge, developing political will, funding mobilization, technical implementation and research (WWF, Birdlife, TNC, local NGOs, CBOs, etc.).
  - **Scientific Community:** technical advice and research (governmental and non-governmental research institutions).

- **Private Sector:** stakeholder in policy processes, technical advice, information, practical transitioning to sustainable practices, funding (EARFISH, SANSIFA, individual companies, industrial associations, organizations representing economic sector interests, etc.).
- **Donors:** financial support and technical support (international financial institutions, donor agencies, private trust, etc.).

#### 5. Possible collaborative activities

- Information exchange, coordination, standardization;
- Policy coordination;
- Coordination to ensure synergies and complementarity of activities and initiatives;
- Collaboration on resource mobilization;
- Joint development of integrated assessments, guidelines and tools for policy implementation;
- Coordination on events and stakeholder engagement; and
- Joint or coordinated capacity-building activities.

#### 6. Possible modalities

- Attending each other's meetings and technical workshop, as appropriate;
- Regularly communicating with each other, including through meetings or correspondence groups, to exchange information;
- Sharing outcomes of meetings, events and projects, as well as work plans;
- Creating joint task-forces, as appropriate, on thematic issues and for the design, implementation and review of relevant projects and resources appeals; and
- Developing joint or linked digital platforms for information sharing.

#### 7. Short-term priority actions (3 years)

- Identifying priority areas of shared concern and mechanisms for collaboration and information exchange;
- Developing information and knowledge exchange sharing strategies and mechanisms;
- Developing plans for cooperation in selected priority areas of common interest;
- Identifying possible sources of financing to support collaboration and joint initiatives;
- Organizing meetings of RSO and RFB secretariats; and
- Collaborating in contributing to the next assessment(s) under the UN Regular Process

#### 8. Overarching/general issues/cross-cutting issues

- Gender mainstreaming;
- Regional cooperation for discussing/coordinating work toward various international agendas (including GBF, SDGs and MEAs);
- Contributing towards sustainable ocean-based economy strategies;
- Promotion and implementation of an ecosystem approach and integrated ocean governance;
- Science-policy interface and cross-sectoral stakeholder engagement in policy processes;
- Youth engagement; and
- Capacity building.

## B. North Atlantic, Baltic & Mediterranean

*Developed by experts from NAFO, NEAFC, OSPAR, HELCOM, ICES, SPA/RAC, Egypt, Iceland, IUCN-FEG and GOBI*

### 1. Common vision/long-term outcome among different regional organizations (ideally reflecting existing long-term strategies of your organizations)

- Discussion among NAFO, ICES, NEAFC, OSPAR, HELCOM, UNEP/MAP-SPA/RAC, GOBI and Egypt showed similarities on visions and long-term strategies for the present decade which target marine and coastal conservation and the sustainable use of fisheries and other marine resources.
- Marine and coastal biodiversity and fisheries resources are highlighted within the different visions using different wording but similar and/or complementary description of the objectives such as: long term conservation, marine resources conservation, sustainable use, protection of marine environment, good environmental status, marine science-based, restoration, ecosystem services, ecosystem-based conservation management, fisheries resources conservation, etc.

### 2. Major milestones towards common vision/long-term outcome

- Marine ecosystems and fisheries resources conservation and its sustainable use were identified as a major milestone.
- Conservation and sustainability shall be implemented through ecosystem-based approach which may be supported by an ecosystem approach strategy or roadmap. The inclusion of the precautionary approach is required for regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs). For this milestone, the collaboration and communication between RSOs and RFBs shall be maintained and reinforced, and results promoted through CBD and in particular via SOI.
- Some gaps in terms of communication could be addressed between CBD and RFBs, for instance via national coordination, to ensure that both organizations are well informed about the objectives and goals set for both biodiversity and fisheries and allowing increased efficiency of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).
- An example of a gap was also highlighted: BBNJ is not mentioned within the GBF.
- Involvement of states through RFBs and RSOs shall also consider better communication and additional harmonization at the national level, between fisheries and marine environment stakeholders and in particular the decision makers.

### 3. Thematic issues of common interest that need to be addressed

- 3 thematic of common interest can be addressed
  - a) OECMs and Area Based Management Tools
  - b) Ecosystem Based Management
  - c) Bycatch
- Several topics can be included through these milestones

Potentially negative impacts of fisheries	OECMs and ABMT	EBM	Bycatch
	X	X	X

Cumulative impacts	X	X	
Conflicts between different users	X	X	
Endangered species	X	X	X
Pollution (including plastic and nutrients)	X	X	X
NIS		X	X
VMEs	X	X	X

#### Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures (OECMs)

- OECMs are of major interest in all the regions but progress so far has varied. In the Mediterranean, a Post-2020 Regional Strategy for MCPAs and OECMs in the Mediterranean has been adopted by the Contracting Parties of the Barcelona Convention and GFCM is also well advanced in terms of discussing the criteria and the means of implementation. NEAFC/NAFO, ICES, OSPAR, and HELCOM have started setting baselines (internal consultation, working group, reporting, etc.) for criteria of OECMs and identifying potential sites and rapid progress is expected.
- Collaboration among RFBs and RSOs and sharing experiences of the most advanced processes is highly recommended.
- Proposed OECMs can be e.g., protected cultural areas, military zones (territorial waters) and could be expanded into the open seas through Fisheries Restricted Areas (FRAs) and candidate areas in Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VME), Particularly Sea Sensitive Areas (PSSAs of IMO) while favoring their setting within Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs listed in the CBD repository).
- It is important to distinguish between potential OECMs that already benefit from measures in place e.g., FRAs or VME closures and potential OECMs with new measures considering particular criteria (ex: cetacean area, VME area, etc.).
- Indeed, the key actors and their role in consultation on the OECM may differ accordingly but may also depend on the OECM coverage and geographic position (internal waters/High Seas)
- In the Mediterranean, UNEP/MAP-SPA/RAC and GFCM have recently increased their collaboration regarding OECMs.

#### Ecosystem Based Management

- Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) is a way of making decisions in order to manage human activities sustainably. It recognizes that human activities both affect the ecosystem and depend on it. Thus, it aims to improve the way human activities are managed considering both the protection of the marine environment and the sustainable use of the natural resources.
- RFBs in North Atlantic and Baltic Sea have several tools in place. Different examples were provided:
  - NAFO bases its ecosystem approach on an Ecosystem Roadmap which includes an assessment of a particular ecosystem, single fish stock assessments, predator/prey assessment, total Catch Index (i.e., an 'ecosystem' reference point), productivity indexes, multispecies interactions, etc. which are used to provide advice to fishery managers.
  - ICES has used FAO guidance to reform its advice process including stakeholder engagement and data principles. Its approach consists of the use of the priority pressures under its ecosystem approach: Ecosystem wellbeing, predator prey

interactions, bycatch, seabed impacts, mixed fisheries advice for fleets, etc. This allows to proceed with a single species management plan in response to productivity

- OSPAR – practical approach to EBM is part of a wider objective of the Ministerial Strategy; it recognizes other stakeholders such as ICES that are working on this. Pilot project based on a workshop resulting in a checklist of components with e.g., food web, pelagic and benthic habitat indicators. Creating a basis for EBM focusing on a region in EEZ.
- HELCOM: EA and EBM important for HELCOM, but there are challenges on the management side, especially related to the mandate for fisheries management. Ecosystem Approach and Ecosystem Based Management are key topics for HELCOM. They are also part of the Baltic Sea Action Plan which, *inter alia*, includes an action to operationalize a set of indicators for the assessment of fish population health. HELCOM may need to involve ICES. HELCOM is also cooperating with other stakeholders.
- NEAFC acknowledges that it will consider the NAFO approach during its future discussions at PECMAS.
- In the Mediterranean, The Ecosystem Approach is the guiding principle to all policy implementation and development undertaken under the auspices of UNEP/MAP Barcelona Convention. 11 ecological objectives have been defined through an intensive process of consultation led by the UNEP/MAP Secretariat fully owned by the Contracting Parties and with participation of the Mediterranean Action Plan partners such as GFCM, ACCOBAMS, IUCN, etc. and technical experts. Ecological objective 3, namely “Harvest of Commercially exploited fish and shellfish”, is closely monitored and assessed thanks to the close collaboration with GFCM. In 2023, UNEP/MAP will provide the 2023 Quality Status Report (Med QSR 2023) which will be based on the data collected through national Ecosystem monitoring and assessments programmes implemented by the Barcelona Convention's Contracting Parties. GFCM, whose mandate includes the management of the fisheries in the Mediterranean and Black Sea, is providing support regarding fisheries indicators assessment and Med QSR 2023.

## Bycatch

- In the Mediterranean, Onboard observer programmes are allowing accurate data collection while at port questionnaires can be complementing the data. Self-reporting bycatch seems not enough mature and efficient while in the N-Atlantic, Baltic region at port questionnaires seem to be providing the most accurate data
- A regional bycatch protocol was adopted in the Mediterranean and its implementation starts in 5 countries. The protocol allows data collection on bycatch (other non-targeted commercial species, non-commercial species, endangered species (both Barcelona Convention Annex II and III and IUCN red list) as well as marine litter). GFCM is hosting a bycatch database. SPA/RAC, GFCM, ACCOBAMS, IUCN Med, BirdLife Europe and Central Asia, WWF and MEDASSET are closely collaborating at regional level to support countries to implement national bycatch monitoring programmes and also to test mitigation measures and set bycatch mitigation regulations and strategies. A review on the bycatch status in the Mediterranean was also produced. Bycatch mitigation objectives and targets were set in both post-2020 SAPBIO and GFCM 2030 Strategy.
- NAFO requires 100% onboard observer coverage. One of the duties of these observers is to record bycatch: fish species, sharks, VME indicator species, are included. Bycatch must also be accurately recorded by the vessel masters.



- NEAFC highlighted that observer coverage was considered to be high cost with low effectiveness. Thus, it may need to proceed to bycatch monitoring in specific fisheries via qualitative risk assessment.
- Bird and Marine bycatch data are generally considered poor in some regions.
- Iceland did a qualitative assessment which may be useful to be shared and used.
- ICES - Inventory of monitoring across EU; does not allow for usable data on incidental catch
- OSPAR, ICES and HELCOM have a joint group working on bycatch including indicators.

#### 4. Key actors and their roles (e.g., IGOs, NGOs, private sector) at the regional scale

- States are the main actors to declare OECMs in organizations like NAFO, NEAFC and OSPAR.
- RFBs and RSOs may play an important role in high seas.
- Other key actors may have an important role in each region to identify important areas for cetaceans, birds, etc. which can be relevant to be considered for new OECMs.
- Example ACCOBAMS, IMO, IUCN, WWF, MedPAN, ICES, OCEANA, etc. can be key actors in some regions.

#### 5. Possible coordination/collaboration work to address priority thematic issues of common interest (e.g., engage political commitment, science support, on-ground implementation, monitoring and assessment, etc.)

- See 3 and 4
- Informal discussion identified some key follow-up activities between the organizations, such as under the collective arrangement and under existing MOUs.

#### 6. Possible modalities for involving various players in the region (e.g., regional dialogue, capacity building activities, on-line platform for sharing experiences, etc.)

- The use of the existing channels and mechanisms in place as well as the existing collaboration at both regional and national level in terms of data exchange, capacity building, joint monitoring programmes, joint strategies are important opportunities to both maintain and reinforce.

#### 7. Links:

##### Strategies

- ICES strategy with vision <https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.7460>
- POST 2020 SAPBIO: [https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/31705/19ig24\\_22\\_2407\\_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/31705/19ig24_22_2407_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- GFCM 2030 strategy: <https://www.fao.org/gfcm/publications/brochures/gfcm2030strategy/en/>

##### Bycatch

- Inventory of methods for monitoring bycatch in EU <https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.advice.20208068>
- ICES Bycatch roadmap including list of species of bycatch relevance by region <https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.advice.19657167>

- Mediterranean and Black Sea Bycatch protocol: <https://www.fao.org/gfcm/publications/series/technical-paper/640/en/>
- Overview of mitigation measures to reduce the incidental catch of vulnerable species in fisheries: <https://www.fao.org/gfcm/publications/studies-reviews/100/en/>

### Ecosystem approach

- ICES document on ecosystem based management <https://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.5466>
- UNEP/MAP EcAp: <https://www.unep.org/unepmap/what-we-do/monitoring-and-assessments>
- Koen-Alonso, M. et al., 2019. The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization Roadmap for the development and implementation of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries: structure, state of development, and challenges -- [https://www.nafo.int/Portals/0/PDFs/science/Koen-Alonso et al-2019-NAFO Roadmap-Marine Policy 100-342.pdf](https://www.nafo.int/Portals/0/PDFs/science/Koen-Alonso%20et%20al-2019-NAFO%20Roadmap-Marine%20Policy%20100-342.pdf).

## C. Wider Caribbean<sup>2</sup>

*Developed by experts from CEP, CLME+, CRFM, OSPESCA, WECAFC, French Biodiversity Agency (OFB), and UNEP*

### 1. Common vision/long-term outcome among different regional organisations

- Long-term (20-years) CLME+/Wider Caribbean vision: “a healthy marine environment that supports the well-being and the livelihoods of the people of the region”, which was jointly elaborated by regional intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) including RSOs and RFBs, and endorsed by countries of the region, as the basis for the 10-year CLME+ Strategic Action Programme (SAP). The elaborated version of the vision statement is: “healthy marine ecosystems that are adequately valued and protected through robust, integrative and inclusive governance arrangements at regional, sub-regional, national and local levels, which in turn effectively enable adaptive management that maximizes, in a sustainable manner, the provision of goods and services in support of enhanced livelihoods and human well-being”.
- Gulf of Mexico (GOM) LME vision, from the Gulf of Mexico LME SAP: “a healthy and resilient Gulf of Mexico where coastal communities enjoy high standards of quality of life and the region's socio-economic activities are competitive and sustainable. Likewise, the region's natural resources, biophysical structure and landscape quality provide environmental services that halt threats and reduce vulnerability of the population and infrastructure”
- Within the framework of the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem (PACA), which includes southern Mexico to the Gulf of Guayaquil, the project “Towards a Joint Integrated, Ecosystem-based Management of the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem” was approved and is beginning its implementation, with the support of the GEF, and the participation of national authorities, international and regional organizations representing the environment and fisheries. In this regard, the inclusion of organizations representing the Pacific side of Central America in the next meetings of the SOI is recommended, given the importance of a joint and collaborative approach.

<sup>2</sup> The Wider Caribbean Region (WCR) consists of the insular and coastal states and overseas territories with coastlines on the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico as well as the adjacent waters of the Atlantic Ocean (UNEP CEP 2020).

## 2. Major milestones towards common vision/long-term outcome

- Strengthened regional ocean governance framework
- Advance implementation of ecosystem-based management (EBM) and the ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF)
- Expanded network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) complemented by Other Effective area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs)
- Promote Area-based Management Tools such as Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and Marine Spatial Planning (MSP).
- More integrated and coordination action across broad thematic areas of Biodiversity, Habitats, Pollution, Fisheries and Climate Change
- Sustainable development of the ocean for socio-economic prosperity, human well-being and food security

## 3. Thematic issues of common interest that need to be addressed

### Thematic areas:

- Habitats and biodiversity
- Sustainable fisheries
- Pollution
- Cross-cutting issues, such as the impact on the marine environment and associated socio-economics of climate and societal change

### Specific areas of particular focus and common interest:

- Sargassum
- Ocean acidification
- Invasive species
- Disaster risk reduction and resilience
- Blue economy

### Root causes:

- Weak governance, financial capacity, technical capacity, awareness, access to data and information; climate change

### Involvement in Global Agendas:

- UN 2030 Agenda, Post-2020 GBF (OECMs, MSP, EBM/EAF), BBNJ, and Global Plastics Treaty

## 4. Key actors to be involved and their roles

- Governmental:
  1. RSOs and RFBs: UNEP Cartagena Convention, CRFM, OSPESCA, FAO represented by WECAFC
- CLME+/Wider Caribbean:
  2. IGOs: ACS, CARICOM, CCAD, OECS, IOC-UNESCO, UNDP, UNCLAC,
  3. 26 countries and 18 overseas territories (*1,2 and 3 are listed in Annex 1 of the Draft MoU for the establishment of a Coordination Mechanism to Support Integrated Ocean Governance*)
- Additional IGOs with an oceans-relevant mandate such as IMO, ICCAT etc.

- Financial Institutions, Donors and Development Partners (FA and TA) such as GEF, GCF, CDB, CAF, EU, SIDA, JICA, GIZ etc.
- NGOs, Philanthropic Organisations and Conservation Funds such as IUCN, WWF, TNC, CANARI, GCFI Oceana, CBF, MAR Fund, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation etc.
- CSOs such as CNFO, CONFEPESCA, OECAP etc.
- Academia such as UWI, FIU, INVEMAR etc.
- Private Sector such as CPSO, Caribbean Hotel and Tourism Association, CC-SICA etc.

## 5. Possible coordination/collaboration work to address priority thematic issues of common interest

See coordinated action listed under 7.

## 6. Possible modalities for involving various players in the region (non-exhaustive)

- Regular meetings of the individual constituents of the OCM.
  - Interim Fisheries Coordination Mechanism
  - CLME+ SAP ICM and its successor the OCM
  - Collaborative SAP and SOME E Development process
  - Collaborative development and implementation of marine data infrastructure blueprint
  - CAMPAM Network and Forum (once reactivated)
  - Donor Forums
  - Online Platforms and Tools
- Expand & strengthen collaborative actions under existing partnership agreements such as the CRFM-CEP MoU
- Continue and strengthen joint working groups processes (meetings, management plans development, endorsement, implementation and monitoring) e.g. spiny lobster, queen conch

## 7. Short-term (3 year) priority actions to advance towards long-term milestones, identified above

- Enhanced knowledge management and sharing as well as joint training and capacity building
- Operationalize the Ocean Coordination Mechanism (OCM) in the pursuit of enhanced synergies among the RSOs and RFBs
- Advance the implementation of the MoU for the OCM
- Develop and adopt through the OCM a Blueprint for the regional data and information landscape or infrastructure and advance its implementation
- Promote greater integration of data bases and infrastructure on fisheries, biodiversity, habitats and pollution building on existing initiatives
- Develop a State of Marine Environment and associated Economies (SOME E) reporting mechanism (science-policy interface).
- Produce the next iteration of the regional 10-year Strategic Action Programme
- Advance MSP, MPA, OECMs, fisheries traceability, blue carbon, marine component of 2025 NDCs
- Consolidate knowledge on connectivity in the context of the establishment of network of MPAs OECMs
- Develop research strategies to support EBM/EAF/ICZM/MSP in the Wider Caribbean
- Joint identification and evaluation of marine species for listing under SPAW Protocol (from the CRFM-CEP MoU)
- Conduct Blue Economy assessment and scoping and develop subsequent strategies and plans

- Promoting sustainable fisheries and aquaculture
- Strengthening the small-scale fisheries contribution to food security and livelihoods
- Prepare and/or update Fisheries Management Plans for key species such as Queen Conch, Spiny Lobster etc. including the implementation of plans to combat IUU
- Implementation of the Regional Plan of Action to combat IUU
- Develop and expand blue carbon actions including linking blue carbon to NDCs
- Expand collaborative research and actions to manage and utilize Sargassum to mitigate negative impacts on ecosystems, economic activities (fisheries & tourism) and coastal communities
- Mainstreaming gender equity and equality in regional & national policies, strategies & plans in ocean sector

---

## D. Pacific Ocean Basins

*Developed by experts from CPPS, IATTC, NOWPAP, SPREP, and UNEP*

### 1. Common vision / long term outcomes

**To promote holistic, cross-sectoral ecosystem-based management of the Pacific Ocean Basins, based upon a common recognition of:**

- The need to ensure the conservation of biodiversity and a healthy marine environment in the Pacific Ocean for the prosperity and food security of present and future generations.
- The essential role of the institutional and legal framework at the regional level and subregional to ensure the implementation of global commitments and mandates.
- A shared commitment to implement and to facilitate implementation of all relevant global instruments, whilst respecting fully their different mandates
- The need to further and promote cooperation and collaboration between all relevant actors and stakeholders, such as IGOs including all UN bodies, regional and subregional IGOs, States and the competent national authorities, NGOs (international and national), civil society including the private sector, as well as to facilitate and encourage coordination as appropriate of all these actors at regional, sub-regional, national levels
- The need to encourage and promote the filling of institutional gaps. (e.g. establishing an RSO in Eastern Pacific High Seas).
- The essential role of awareness raising and capacity building, which would include strengthening of national and local entities, governmental and otherwise.
- The need to facilitate resource mobilization to implement global, regional and subregional agreements and commitments.
- The need to ensure the implementation of all agreed policies and measures to guarantee the realization of the Common Vision on the medium and long-term.

### 2. Major Milestones

- Convening of a regional meeting between RFB and other relevant competent regional bodies in the Pacific Ocean Basins with a view at their more efficient coordination and collaboration (early 2024).

- Development and signing of Memorandums of Understanding or other appropriate instruments between relevant partners

### 3. Thematic areas

A number of thematic areas of common interest may be identified, such as, among others:

- Addressing marine pollution, particularly land-sourced pollution and marine litter and plastics, including abandoned, lost and discarded fishing gear.
- Monitoring forecasting and adaptation to climate change impacts, particularly on fisheries and fishing fleet contribution to mitigation, as appropriate.
- Addressing marine invasive species sourced from, *inter alia*, ballast water, biofouling, aquacultures and drifting FADs.
- Promoting ecosystem-based management approaches including minimizing ecological impacts of human activities on the marine environment and promoting ecosystem restoration.
- Ensuring the conservation and sustainable use of marine living resources, emphasizing threatened and migratory species.
- Participating actively in the development and implementation of the legally binding instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction.
- Encouraging and facilitating cooperation for Marine spatial planning, Strategic environmental assessments and Area Based Management tools, including MPAs or OECMs.

### 4. Key Actors

#### RFMOs and RSOs

e.g. WCPFC, SPRFMO, IATTC, CCSBT, CCAMLR, ACAP, ISA, SPREP, SPC, FFA, PNA, PIFS/OPOC, CPPS, USP, IAC, OSPESCA, PICES, ICES, NOWPAP, [NPFC, NPAFC

#### IGOs

e.g. FAO, CBD, UNEP, UNESCO, IOC, UNDP, World Bank, ADB, CAF, IMO, IWC.

#### Countries and territories

All Pacific coastal States and members of the relevant RFMOs and RSOs

#### NSAs

#### International Environmental NGOs

e.g. Birdlife International, WWF, IUCN, TNC, Conservation International, Pew, Greenpeace, Oceana, WCS, HSA, GGGI

#### International Donors

e.g. ROK, JICA, EU, GIZ, UK, AUST, NZ, USA, Sweden, France, to list a just a few.

#### International private sector associations

e.g. TunaCons, AGAC, Waite Foundation, ISSF, MCS ...

### 5. Possible coordination / collaboration work 2022-2025

- Fostering political awareness on key regional issues
- Knowledge building and sharing (including science and traditional knowledge)
- Collaborative research and data exchange



- Sharing relevant funding opportunities, in particular to explore the possibility of joint applications for funding
- Communication, awareness raising and capacity building
- Implementation, monitoring and assessment
- Building bridges between science and policy
- Cooperation on INC on Plastics Treaty process and other relevant processes at the global level.

## 6. Possible modalities

- Identification and awareness of respective organizations mandates and work through establishment of clear lines of communications
- Defining areas and topics for the development of joint work plans
- Collaboration for identifying and obtaining financial resources for common interests
- Identification of appropriate forums for cross regional dialogue. E.g. WCPFC, IATTC or SPRFMO Advisory Science Committees, meetings, conferences, workshops et cetera
- Providing an opportunity to all stakeholders for participation
- Identifying joint activities for capacity building

## 7. Short-term (3 year) priority actions

- Disseminate results of the SOI meeting and roadmap within respective membership and stakeholders and beyond through appropriate media.
- Establish communication with different relevant organizations and stakeholders and explore collaboration possibilities
- Develop mechanisms to implement the roadmap e.g., MOUs, joint working groups, joint steering committees
- Coordinate with FAO and other relevant organizations on convening of pan-regional meeting to coordinate IFB and other relevant bodies.

## E. East Atlantic African Region

*Developed by experts from Abidjan Convention, BCC, COMHAFAT-ATLAFCO, ICCAT, UNEP-WCMC and GOBI*

### 1. Common vision

- Regional cooperation towards a productive and resilient ocean for the well-being of all.

### 2. Major milestones

- Identification of existing relevant bodies, and their competencies, mandates and gaps (i.e., RSOs & RFBs; collaboration with LMEs, CBD, FAO, IMO, UNEP, UNESCO-IOC, etc.).
- Establishment of a regional/sub-regional framework for collaboration (i.e., RSOs & RFBs; collaboration with LMEs; support by CBD, FAO, IMO, UNEP, UNESCO-IOC, etc.).
- Opportunities to be explored for SOI or other mechanisms as potential frameworks for collaboration (i.e., regular meetings)

- Agreement on a strategy for communication and ongoing cooperation (i.e., shared responsibility -coherence and complementary actions) – development of a shared understanding of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework with details to be determined within the future regional framework.
- Development of shared scenarios and target priorities – responsibility to be determined within a future regional framework.
- Expanding involvement of broader bodies, including regional economic communities (RECs), with LMEs, CBD, FAO, IMO, UNEP, UNESCO-IOC, BCC, ATLAFCO, Abidjan Convention etc.
- Monitoring & evaluation of cooperation among regional bodies, reviewing and adapting strategies.

### 3. Thematic issues and common interests (i.e., areas where the work RSOs and RFBs can be complementary)

- Critical habitats (healthy fish stocks and ecosystems) – Common understanding on the sustainable use of existing resources using the ecosystem approach to fisheries
- Pollution – Collaboration with IMO to implement MARPOL annexes and relevant conventions.
- Shared/transboundary ecosystems, resources and migratory species - Common monitoring and assessment.
- Artisanal fisheries - Promotion of training and awareness raising among coastal communities.
- Interactions with other types of fishing categories (adapting FAO Guidelines and management measures for the area of competencies)
- Regional cooperation for discussing/coordinating work toward various international agendas
- Strategy for maximizing benefits of environmental and ecological current interests in the ocean/region
- Blue economy approach
- Marine spatial planning (Maritime clusters, panel of experts for sharing of expertise and lessons learned)
- Equitable distribution of ocean resources/benefits
- Ocean literacy (Knowledge sharing and capacity building among stakeholders: Artisanal fishermen, decision makers, local communities, and gender mainstreaming)

### 4. Key actors

- Actors for thematic issues vary from those for general cooperation.
- There is a need to identify and understand the dynamics between different actors – both within industries/stocks and between sectors – for a win-win scenario across sectors.
- **Thematic issues**
  - Each thematic issue has its established network of institutions, which has already been identified. However, some of the issues lack a leading institution that can bring together different organizations and stakeholders.
- **General actors for cooperation**

- UN Economic Commissions; RECs; sub-regional bodies of FAO, ATLAFCO, BCC, Abidjan Convention, ICCAT, CECAF, etc.; Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement; Indian Ocean Commission; UN/DOALOS.
  - These actors provide a direct link to Member States and stakeholders.
- Their roles include harmonizing policy, coordinating donors and input, and supporting capacity building.
- **Civil Society**
  - The distinction between international and local NGOs is noted:
    - International NGOs can raise awareness regionally and internationally, e.g., International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Birdlife, the Nature Conservancy (TNC), etc.
    - Local NGOs play key roles at the national level in advocacy, strengthening civil society, improving transparency, and raising the profile of issues and ongoing efforts.
  - Their roles include filling in data gaps, improving knowledge, strengthening civil society, improving transparency, and raising the profile of issues and ongoing efforts. Local NGOs play key roles at the national level in advocacy, developing political will, among others.
- **Scientific Community**
- **Private Sector**
  - “Impact Investors”
  - Actors in sectors of interest (e.g., shipping, ecotourism, aquaculture, green energy etc., for developing blue economy)
- **Donors**
  - Regional donors, including African development banks, GEF, UNDP, FAO, AUIBAR etc.
- **International actors**
  - International actors must consider regional situations and be coordinated and ensure that funds are being allocated where they are needed, addressing regionally identified thematic areas.

## 5. Possible collaborative activities

- **Science**
  - Coordinate and centralize sources of scientific information through twining of research institutes
    - E.g., coordinating involvement in regional monitoring efforts, such as the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Birdlife, the Nature Conservancy (TNC), GFCM etc.
  - Develop frameworks to support science and regional science-to-policy platform, aligning regional science policies with national and local realities, practices and needs (workshops, webinars, etc.)
- **Political will**

- Build political will through cooperation via secretariats (ATLAFCO, BCC, Abidjan Convention), advocacy by coordinating at the regional level and sharing national experiences and making political commitments on thematic issues.
- **On-ground implementation**
  - Implement concrete projects beyond creating new policies, strategies, and roadmaps:
    - Pilot projects targeted to specific areas.
    - Cross-cutting projects for tools to support overall strategy and cooperation among stakeholders.
    - Projects to support science and technology transfer
    - Projects on marine spatial planning (National and transboundary approach)
    - Projects to promote well-developed tools that are currently not implemented (e.g., Habitat mapping).
- **Sharing experiences and lessons learned**
  - Facilitate exchange of information within the region and between regions on pressing issues, including tools for fighting IUU, adhere to FAO PSMA and identification of critical habitats and PSSAs

## 6. Possible modalities

- **Ongoing projects, initiatives and programs**
  - It is recommended to collaborate with existing projects, initiatives and programs, where possible (ATLAFCO Training modules on fisheries inspection and observers, Coastal Fisheries Initiative WA, hybrid meetings)
  - Webinars and online meetings are useful for mid-term review/sharing, and SOI could facilitate such interim meetings and exchanges of experience.
- **Existing networks**
  - Existing networks can be extended and strengthened, which will help ensure stakeholder participation in initiatives for enhanced cross-sectoral collaboration.
- **Portals/platforms**
  - Portals and platforms can be created and strengthened to bring together information from different regions (i.e. virtual knowledge center).
- **Regional dialogue**
  - An overall framework to provide the means for ongoing dialogue can be established.
  - Periodic meetings are needed to bring actors together to facilitate the dialogue and ensure effective communication:
    - Dialogues organized on specific thematic issues;
    - Regional meetings between Secretariats to bring together RSOs/RFBs (e.g., a “mini-SOI dialogue”); meetings among Secretariats, States, a broader group of actors for coordination, where there is a mandate.
- **Capacity Building**
  - Rather than a general capacity building project, all projects and their activities should have capacity building components.

## 7. Short-term priority actions (3 years)

- Fully establish the overall framework for a regional dialogue, facilitated by the SOI process.
- Identify possible sources of financing as well as existing activities that can contribute without additional funding.
- Resume regular meetings of RSO and RFB Secretariats prior to the next meeting of the SOI Global Dialogue.
- Identify capacity needs for each thematic area.
- Promote knowledge improvement, science & technology platform.
- Identify data gaps and translate existing data into useful and practical knowledge.
- Collaborate to implement the post-2022 GBF

## 8. Overarching/general issues

- Gender mainstreaming and equity.
  - Regional cooperation and institutions' support for national efforts to meet SDGs.
- 

## F. South & Southeast Asia

*Developed by experts from APFIC (+FAO-RAP), BOBP, COBSEA, SACEP, SEAFDEC, and FAO*

### 1. Common Vision

- **Achieving** healthy marine and freshwater ecosystems in South and South Asian Region.
- **Sustainable utilization** of fisheries resources through ecosystem approach to fisheries and aquaculture by:
  - Forging collaboration among RSOs, RFBs, Member Countries, and stakeholders &
  - Enhancing capacity and knowledge sharing.

### 2. Major Milestones

- **Mainstreaming** GBF's targets in the work plans of regional organizations (RFBs & RSOs) by 2025.
- **Formulating** Regional Action Plan on Marine Litter and Plastics by 2025.
- **Building** regional capacity and **implementing** national pilots for ecosystem approaches to fisheries management (EAFM) and coastal ecosystem by 2028.
- **Developing** Regional Plans for Blue Economy and Marine and Coastal Ecosystem Conservation Framework by 2030.
- **Implementing** ASEAN Resolution and Plan of Action on Food Security in SEA region by 2030.

### 3. Thematic Issues

- **Conservation** of aquatic habitats and biodiversity.
- **Combating** marine pollution
- **Restoring** fisheries stocks and **curbing** IUU fishing.

- **Adaptation and mitigation** of climate change impacts on coastal habitats and fisheries.
- **Preparation** of coastal and marine spatial plans (CMSP) and conservation of marine protected areas (MPAs).
- **Exploring** and responsible management of mariculture development.

#### 4. Key Actors

- **Global Actors:**
  - CBD, FAO, IMO, INFOFISH, IUCN, UNEP, WorldFish, WWF, etc.
- **Regional Actors**
  - RFBs & RSOs: APFIC, BOBP, COBSEA, SACEP, SEAFDEC,
  - Others: ASEAN, NACA, PEMSEA, SAS.
- **Funding Agencies (Global)**
  - ADB, GEF, GIZ, JICA, KOICA, NORAD, SIDA, DFID, USAID, World Bank, etc.
- **NGO/Private sector**
  - ICSF, Thai Union, CP, etc.,
- **Academic and Research Institutes** related to Fisheries and Environment:
  - AIT (Regional), ICAR (India), NARA (Sri Lanka), BFRI (Bangladesh), Kasetsart University, Chulalongkorn University, NUS, Nha Trang University, etc. (List is only indicative and not exhaustive).

#### 5. Coordination on Thematic Issues

Thematic areas	Areas of Collaboration and Cooperation	Cooperating organizations
<b>Sustainable Fisheries Management</b>	Capacity development and knowledge sharing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stock assessment.</li> <li>• Fisheries management (EAFM, IUU fishing, etc.)</li> <li>• Improvements in the design of fishing craft (vessel) and gear to minimize the impact on biodiversity and environment.</li> </ul>	APFIC, BOBP, FAO/RAP & SEAFDEC
<b>Coastal &amp; Marine Ecosystem Management and Conservation</b>	Capacity development and knowledge sharing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blue economy</li> <li>• Marine Protected Areas (MPA),</li> <li>• Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP)</li> <li>• Monitoring of coral reefs health</li> <li>• Conservation of priority areas/ hotspots/species.</li> </ul>	ACB, BOBP, COBSEA, SACEP, SAS, SEAFDEC.
<b>Marine Pollution</b>	Capacity development and knowledge sharing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine litters, oil spills, nutrients run off, etc.</li> <li>• Ghost gears, fishing gear marking, etc.</li> </ul>	COBSEA, SACEP, SAS, BOBP & SEAFDEC (On



		ghost gears and gear marking)
<b>Aquaculture</b>	Capacity development and knowledge sharing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible management of aquaculture including seaweed mariculture.</li> <li>• Conservation aquaculture and sea ranching.</li> <li>• Developing codes for sustainable aquaculture.</li> </ul>	APFIC, FAO/RAP, SEAFDEC & BOBP

**6. Modalities for Involvement**

- **Conduct of Webinar Series** in order to share information and exchange views on topical issues and global developments having relevance to the region like GBF (goals and targets), Marine Pollution, ABNJ, BBNJ, OECMs, etc. (all RSOs and RFBs, together in close coordination with CBD, FAO and other agencies).
- **Establishment of** data sharing platforms like Clearing House Mechanism (SACEP with the support of CBD).
- **Development of** joint project proposals/projects for resource mobilization (RSOs and RFBs in the region).
- **Organization of** annual regional online meetings between RSOs and RFBs for reviewing and aligning organizational activities in tune with the regional and global commitments.

**7. Actions**

Short-term (2023-2025)	Long-term Milestones (by 2030)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Initiate Joint Webinar Series by 2023.</li> <li>○ Annual Regional Dialogues (2023, 2024, 2025)</li> <li>○ Development of joint regional projects (2024) on stock assessment; cooperative assessment of shared fish stocks; habitat assessment, etc.</li> <li>○ Development of regional data sharing platforms and clearing house mechanism (2025).</li> <li>○ Development of methodological and framework for near-real-time stock assessment / appraisal for evidence-based fisheries management (BOBP, FAO by 2024).</li> <li>○ Sub-regional and regional policy frameworks for livelihood insurance for marine fisheries sector (2025 - BOBP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 10 EAFM pilots</li> <li>○ 3 Blue Economy Policies</li> <li>○ Regional clearing house and database (By SACEP with the support of CBD).</li> <li>○ Regional capacity development on real-time stock assessment and fisheries appraisal (BOBP in partnership with other agencies).</li> </ul>

**III. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS AND PLENARY DISCUSSIONS**

**A. Opening of the Meeting**

8. **Mr. Myeong-dal Song**, Deputy Minister in the Marine Policy Office of the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea, gave opening remarks. Mr. Song noted the various increasing threats to the ocean, including climate change, ocean acidification, IUU fishing, and pollution. He reminded the participants of the first and second SOI Global Dialogues, which have led to strengthened regional ocean governance, and urged the participants to further explore practical action plans.
9. **Mr. Joseph Appiott**, Coordinator for Marine, Coastal and Island Biodiversity delivered an opening statement on behalf of Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Mr. Appiott gave sincere thanks for the support of the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea, the Government of Japan, the Government of France, the National Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea, as well as the meeting co-chairs. Reminding the participants of the need to break down siloes and enhance cooperation in order to implement the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, he urged everyone to build connections across regions during the meeting and consider the critical roles of their governments and organizations in realizing sustainable future for the ocean.
10. **Mr. Wan-hyun Choi**, President of the National Marine Biodiversity Institute of Korea (MABIK), welcomed the participants on behalf of MABIK. He referred to the ocean as a “treasure chest” of essential resources and noted the increasing risk of loss. He further emphasized the role of SOI as a model for integrated governance and cooperation and called for enhancing the role of regional organizations in the context of the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD, and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
11. **Mr. Dixon Waruinge**, Coordinator of the Nairobi Convention Secretariat delivered an opening statement on behalf of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Mr. Waruinge emphasized the triple planetary crisis, including the increasing pressure of plastic pollution in the ocean, highlighting the international legally binding agreement addressing the full cycle of plastics, as well as the impacts on those that depend on the ocean for their livelihoods. He noted that RSOs are committed to support the negotiations on this global agreement through science and research, and that further collaboration between RSOs and RFBs will be crucial in this decade for the ocean.
12. **Mr. Piero Mannini**, Senior Liaison Officer and Secretary of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats' Network (RSN), provided an opening statement on behalf of Mr. Manuel Barange, Director of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Division of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO). Mr. Mannini stressed the ever-increasing fish consumption and demand for fisheries and aquaculture, with equally rising need for regional cooperation in order to increase the efficiency of fisheries management processes. He noted the need to develop cooperative partnerships that build on synergies at the centre of the fisheries management and environment-related organizations, stating that cooperation is an absolute necessity.

## B. Meeting Objectives and Expected Outcomes

13. **Mr. Joseph Appiott (CBD Secretariat)** introduced the meeting objectives and expected outcomes. Mr. Appiott stressed the critical role of the regional organizations in achieving global goals, particularly in reporting on progress and challenges, and implementation. He noted the previous SOI Global Dialogue meetings in 2016 and 2018, including the [Seoul Outcome](#), and [Seoul Outcome +2](#), and the intersessional working groups and a virtual workshop. He highlighted the main focus of the SOI Global Dialogue to identify where and how improved cooperation and coordination can help RSOs and RFBs to better fulfill their mandates and support the achievement of global, regional and national objectives, focusing on practical, actionable and achievable steps, and learning lessons and establishing formal cooperation mechanisms and joint projects. He also stressed the need to soften

the silos in addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss, to ensure informed policymaking and benefit from complementary capacities and joint measures. He reminded the participants that the outcome of this meeting will be informal and can be adapted to their respective regions and their Member States as they see fit. Mr. Appiott also asked the participants in a live polling session to choose their top priorities for this meeting, with the majority of the respondents selecting identifying tangible opportunities for improved coordination across RSOs and RFBs.

### C. Evolving Global Ocean Policy-Scape for the Ocean

14. **Mr. Joseph Appiott (CBD Secretariat)** delivered a presentation on SOI and the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework linkages. Mr. Appiott explained that, despite progress, only some elements of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were achieved, and the main drivers of biodiversity loss have not been addressed. He noted that a new set of global goals and targets on biodiversity is being negotiated under the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), which is expected to be adopted at the 15<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP 15) in December in Montreal, Canada. The Post-2020 GBF is highly broad reaching and ambitious, applicable to all biomes, and while there are no specific ocean targets, nearly all aspects of the framework are relevant to the ocean. Mr. Appiott added that this meeting can inform the development and implementation of the GBF, including the work on indicators, the revision of the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), as well as help clarify the roles of the regional organizations to implement the framework. He also mentioned that subject to the COP 15 mandate, the CBD programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity will be updated. He concluded with the reminder that the Post-2020 GBF is a major opportunity to “bend the curve” and put us on track to a sustainable future, but a whole-of-society approach is needed for successful implementation.
15. **Ms. Nancy Soi (UNEP)** followed with a presentation on the support through the Regional Seas Programme and cooperative agreements between RSOs and other intergovernmental organizations. Ms. Soi provided an overview of regional cooperation in ocean governance, between international and regional organizations, Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and other relevant stakeholders. She noted that the last twenty to thirty years have seen a surge in fostering cooperation across intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) with a mandate to govern oceans, including RSOs, RFs, and Regional Economic Communities (RECs). Ms. Soi introduced a UNEP review intended to find out the status and progress of formal cooperation between Regional Seas and intergovernmental organizations and noted that 21 of the 32 legal agreements that exist were established in the last decade. She added that multi-sector partnerships have been emerging, and regional organizations are eager on improving existing regional ocean governance frameworks to address environmental issues. She concluded that a factor for success in cooperation is having clear and mutually agreed objectives, e.g., on area-based management, ecosystem approach, and that global processes, such as BBNJ, SDGs, and the draft target 3 (30x30) of the GBF call for multisectoral collaborations and require collective efforts from IGOs and MEAs.
16. **Mr. Piero Mannini (FAO)**, in turn, presented on the FAO support for Regional Fishery Bodies. Mr. Mannini introduced the RFB Secretariats’ Network (RSN) as a unique tool for regional and global cooperation, providing a forum for discussion on critical issues and needed strategies, and allowing for sharing knowledge and good practices. He noted that the 34<sup>th</sup> Committee on Fisheries (COFI) underscored the central role of RFMOs and RFABs in issues such as combatting IUU fishing and supporting fisheries science and management and encouraged for increased cooperation. Mr. Mannini further provided updates on the Regional Consultation on the Development of a Coordination Framework among RFBs in the Indian Ocean (Mozambique, June 2022), which identified areas for improved coordination and cooperation among RFBs and other regional and international organizations in the Western Indian Ocean region. He also reminded the participants

of the Regional Consultation on the Development of a Coordination Framework among RFBs in the Eastern Central Atlantic Ocean, 30 November – 2 December 2022, in Accra, Ghana.

17. Following that, **Mr. Bingzhuo Li (Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea [DOALOS])** provided updates on the international legally binding instrument for marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Mr. Li explained the BBNJ process and recent developments under the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) on BBNJ. In this context, Mr. Li noted that the relationship between the BBNJ instrument and other instruments, frameworks and bodies is significantly relevant to discussions on area-based management tools (e.g., MPAs), and on environmental impact assessments, with different views favoring a regional/sectoral approach, or a global approach. At this moment, dates are yet to be determined for the resumed fifth session of IGC, after the session was suspended in August 2022 due to delegations requiring more time to finalize the agreement. Mr. Li also reported on the World Ocean Assessments, which are the main outputs of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects, and which aim to regularly review the state of the world's ocean. He informed the participants of the current third cycle of the Regular Process, launched for the years of 2021-2025, and a number of upcoming regional workshops on capacity-building and to support the implementation of the third cycle, and invited the participants to contribute to the Regular Process.
18. Lastly, **Mr. Jose Dallo (International Seabed Authority [ISA])**, provided information on Regional Environmental Management Planning (REMP) for deep-sea mining. Mr. Dallo introduced the development of the Mining Code, which includes recommendations, draft standards and guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment and baseline data collection. He then described the process for developing REMPs and outlined some important experiences and lessons, including drawing on experiences from other organizations, REMPs being an instrument to facilitate collaboration, and the need for investment on research and monitoring. He highlighted the need for complementarity and collaboration, including exchange of data, knowledge and experience in spatial planning exercises. He concluded with noting future REMP workshops in the Indian and Northwest Pacific Oceans and highlighting the ISA Marine Scientific Research Action Plan and ISA Capacity Development Fund.
19. Following this series of presentations, participants had the opportunity to engage in a discussion. Some participants stressed that since the SOI is a capacity-building platform, there is a need to think about how it will support the implementation of the post-2020 GBF and ensure that no one is left behind, calling for a transformative change. Others highlighted that, despite challenges, there has been good progress in some regions, but there is a need to accelerate the efforts to tackle the current challenges and ensure long-term sustainable use.

#### **D. Progress and Developments in Regional Coordination and Collaboration**

20. Under this agenda item, **Ms. Marketa Zackova (CBD Secretariat)** presented the updated results of the SOI survey on regional cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination between RSOs and RFBs, which had first been presented at the Virtual Intersessional Workshop with RSOs and RFBs in September 2021, and they now include new and updated responses to the survey up until 4 October 2022. Ms. Zackova demonstrated that all the responding organizations regularly communicate with other regional organizations (esp. informally), and their goals, targets, and/or strategies align with, or complement, those of other regional organizations, with respect to marine resources and the environment. She showcased the high rates of regional collaboration in research (88%), monitoring and assessment (79%), and management (79%), particularly in area-based management. She emphasized the positive impact that these efforts have had on the organizations' work, such as

improved networking or better access to funding. Ms. Zackova listed some of the main challenges and gaps in regional coordination and collaboration, especially lack of financial and human resources, and excessive workload. She concluded with emphasizing the need to reduce duplication of efforts, overcome silos, for stronger financial support, and greater political will, as per the responses, and noted the views of the respondents with respect to the SOI Global Dialogue continuing to be a platform for communication, data sharing and knowledge exchange, and providing capacity development and scientific and technical guidance. She added that full results of the survey have been published in a [booklet](#).

21. The above presentation was followed by a series of coordinated presentations from regional groups providing updates on cross-sectoral cooperation at the regional scale. **Ms. Ulrika Gunnartz (SWIOFC)** started with a presentation on cross-sectoral cooperation on behalf of the *Western Indian Ocean region*. Ms. Gunnartz highlighted cross-sectoral collaborations of IOTC, including their formal collaborative agreements with other organizations in the Indian Ocean, and of SIOFA, including their activities related to data exchange, science, and monitoring. She highlighted the SWIOFC-Nairobi Convention Partnership Project, which works to increase the resilience of livelihoods by enhancing marine and coastal ecosystems, to ensure the sustainable management of coastal fisheries by using the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), and to enhance cooperation and coordination between fisheries and environmental management institutions. She noted their first dialogue meeting on the fisheries-environment nexus was held in Mombasa in September 2022, which identified priority issues that need further collaboration and discussed how to link policy makers and key stakeholders from the fisheries and environment sectors.
22. **Mr. Patrick Debels (CLME+)** followed with updates on behalf of the *Wider Caribbean region*. Mr. Debels introduced the 1<sup>st</sup> CLME+ Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for 2015-2025, noting the three pillars of the SAP being (i) environment, (ii) fisheries, and (iii) inter-sectoral coordination. Under (iii), he highlighted the UNDP/GEF PROCARIBE+ Project (2023-2027) which aims to protect and restore the natural coastal and marine capital in the region to catalyze investments in a climate-resilient, sustainable blue economy, through regional coordination and collaboration, and partnerships. He further noted some examples of results from regional cooperation, e.g., approval of Regional Fisheries Management Plans, joint decision making, or training and capacity building. He explained some of their regional challenges include differing mandates and geographical scopes, lack of effectiveness in collaboration, and competition. Mr. Debels also introduced the regional Ocean Coordination Mechanism which will be open to membership by the countries in the region and by specific intergovernmental organizations and will lead to the first-ever full implementation of the “Integrated State of the Marine Environment and Associated Economies” (SOME) concept.
23. Following that, **Mr. Peter Davies (SPREP)** reported on cross-sectoral collaboration in the *Western Pacific Ocean*, **Ms. Zuleika Pinzón (CPPS)** presented the Regional Action Plan for the *Southeast Pacific*, and **Mr. Jean-Francois Pulvenis (IATTC)** provided brief remarks on behalf of IATTC. Mr. Davies introduced the 2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent, which is the region’s approach to collectively work together to achieve the long-term vision and aspirations of the Strategy. He further stressed main challenges in the Pacific related to climate change, especially sea-level rise, warming ocean temperatures, ocean acidification, and tuna redistribution. Mr. Davies highlighted the Pacific Regional Action Plan for Marine Litter (2018-2025), and the Pacific Coral Reef Action Plan (2021-2030), and noted their current work on improving collaboration and efficiencies in the collection and use of Ocean Observations science data and Maritime Domain Awareness information. Ms. Pinzón then introduced the Strategic Plan (2022-2030) focusing on key areas such as marine biodiversity or sustainable fisheries. She further provided examples of cross-sectoral collaboration in the Southeast Pacific, including the Regional Program for the Conservation of Sea Turtles, and the

Regional Action Plan for Conservation of Mangroves, as well as collaboration with RFMOs in the region. Finally, Mr. Pulvenis noted that they have several MoUs with regional organizations and promote capacity building in Central America on the protection of shark stocks, noting their widened mandate going beyond tuna species.

24. **Mr. Aomar Bourhim (COMHAFAT-ATLAFCO)** presented updates on regional cooperation on behalf of the *East Atlantic region*. Mr. Bourhim noted the inter-regional cooperative project Coastal Fisheries Initiative Programme, which focuses on fisheries governance and value chains, and ecosystem-based management of fisheries through mangrove restoration and conservation. He added that an upcoming programme to support the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem will help enhance cooperations with RSOs and RFBs. He further highlighted several challenges in collaboration, such as misunderstanding of respective roles and mandates, insufficient interactions, lack of opportunities for feedback, and internal processes and capacity of regional organizations. He stressed that, to promote their Regional Roadmap, it is important to improve fisheries data reporting systems, regional coherence in reporting frameworks, and reporting of small-scale fisheries, and to ensure that regional fisheries organizations work closer with the local communities. He concluded with noting the importance of recognizing existing mechanisms and management frameworks, and that collaboration can be at various levels, each relevant for a given topic/issue.
25. For the *Mediterranean and the Black Sea*, **Mr. Anis Zarrouk (SPA/RAC)** and **Mr. Nicola Ferri (GFCM)** delivered a presentation on cross-sectoral cooperation in their region. They stressed the successful collaboration between GFCM, UNEP/MAP and SPA/RAC, setting joint strategies, approaches and a shared vision to ensure healthy ecosystems and productive and sustainable fisheries in the region. They highlighted several recent joint initiatives, including the [Regional Repository of National Legislation](#), which works as an information hub, the Post-2020 Strategic Action Programme for the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources (Post-2020 SAPBIO), complemented by a Post-2020 Regional Strategy for MCPAs and OECMs, the Mediterranean Quality Status Report 2023 currently under preparation with strong involvement of GFCM for fisheries indicators, and the MedBycatch Project which has led to the development of a regional bycatch monitoring protocol. They further announced a joint cooperation strategy on spatial-based protection and management measures among the regional Secretariats, and the preparation of the pioneer 5 Seas Initiative which will promote a harmonized approach in 5 regions to support the implementation of relevant international mechanisms, including the post-2020 draft target 3.
26. **Mr. Liu Ning (NOWPAP)** reported on regional collaboration in the *North Pacific region*. Mr. Ning highlighted collaborative agreements and activities of PICES, e.g., the ICES-PICES Program on Sustainability of Marine Ecosystems through global knowledge networks (SmartNet). He noted a joint work plan, collaborative activities and future plans between NPFC and North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC), including research efforts, and conservation and management measures for species of mutual interest. He further highlighted joint workshops of NPFC and PICES, and a joint framework for Enhanced Scientific Collaboration in the region with a focus on, *inter alia*, VMEs and EAFM. Mr. Ning also noted collaboration between NOWPAP and PICES, particularly on OECMs, harmful algal blooms, and environmental indicators of plastic pollution. He concluded with highlights on ocean governance in the region, including MoUs and joint activities, engaging in global environmental agenda, participating in global networks as regional hubs, inter-regional cooperation, and strengthening science-policy dialogue.
27. **Mr. Krishnan Paulpandian (BOBP-IGO)** presented updates on regional cooperation towards a productive and resilient ocean for the well-being of all in the *Indo-Pacific region*. Mr. Paulpandian



mentioned the establishment of a Regional/Sub-regional Framework for Collaboration – the BOBLME Project, and its second phase in 2023, which focuses on, *inter alia*, EAFM, IUU fishing, pollution, and livelihoods, noting that the successful implementation of this project will lead to the first institutional multisectoral transboundary platform. He further shared several joint plans of action, roadmaps and frameworks in the region, as well as cooperative frameworks and activities involving other regional bodies, e.g., RECs. Mr. Paulpandian also presented on the region’s vision for cooperation, including meetings and working groups, action plans and frameworks, harmonized monitoring system and transboundary activities, and the upcoming Strategic Directions (2023-2027) focusing on land and sea-based pollution, marine and coastal ecosystems, and governance. He concluded with highlighting opportunities for areas of future collaboration and coordination in the region, including mariculture, evidence-based fisheries management, pollution and marine litter, and interventions enabling fish migration.

28. **Mr. Ahmed Al-Mazrouai (RECOFI)** reported on regional cooperation in the *Red Sea, Gulf of Aden and Persian Gulf*. Mr. Al-Mazrouai introduced some notable achievements, including formalized cooperation through an MoU with ROPME. In this context, he further noted the Workshop on the Ecosystem-based Approach to Fisheries Management, and the Regional Fisheries and Climate Change Adaptation Workshop in January 2022, as good examples of their cooperation. Mr. Al-Mazrouai also provided updates on regional collaboration from PERSGA. This includes, for example, the management of marine litter in the region, the GEF-UNDP-IMO GloFouling Project (2019-2025) providing guidelines and building capacities for best practices on bio-fouling management, or the PERSGA-UNEP-GEF Project on an Inclusive Approach for Harnessing Ecosystem Services and Sustainable Blue Economy in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (HESBERSGA).
29. Lastly, **Mr. Dominic Pattinson (OSPAR Commission)** presented updates on cross-sectoral collaboration in *North Atlantic*. Mr. Pattinson pointed out that there is no RSO in the Northwest Atlantic. He discussed cooperation between NAFO and NEAFC, and NAFO and ICES, including MoUs, joint advisory and working groups, and symposia. He noted that NAFO is currently discussing the possibility of MoU with the Sargasso Sea Commission, focusing on marine scientific research. He highlighted the adoption of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan (BSAP) in October 2021, which is an ambitious and comprehensive regional programme of measures and actions for a healthy marine environment. He also stressed that the cooperation between HELCOM, the Baltic Sea Fisheries Forum (BALTFISH) and the Baltic Sea Advisory Council (BSAC) has increased in recent years. He further highlighted the regional organizations working together to develop methods and evidence for ecosystem-based management, as well as the implementation of the North-East Atlantic Environment Strategy 2030, which contains quantitative targets on climate change, restoration, and regional-scale ecosystem-based management. He concluded with some key lessons learnt, including the preference for face-to-face consultations, establishing trust taking time and effort, and the need for evidence-based practical approach for regional scale ecosystem-based management, and with further opportunities to collaborate on OECMs and international processes under the CBD and BBNJ.
30. Following the above series of coordinated regional presentations, participants had the opportunity to engage in a discussion. Some participants stressed that a lot of the highlighted initiatives are time-bound and may not always be renewed noting the challenge of continuity, which demands planning and strategic negotiation of new projects before the end of the previous project. However, it was added that, so far, there has been limited positive examples and experiences of investment in ocean coordination beyond such project-based initiatives. Other participants further discussed the challenges they face, particularly overlapping mandates and different understandings of mandates, and competition between regional organizations and some influential NGOs in the region. The issue



of collaboration with other stakeholders was also raised, for example with those in the renewable energy sector in the North Atlantic region, noting that involving such stakeholders in the discussions is important, especially considering the growing expansion in the North Sea. It was further added that the initial aim of the SOI Global Dialogue was to try to expand the collaboration and coordination within regions and across, focusing on RSOs and RFBs. In the future, we could consider involving other sectors, but questions remain on where and how coordination is truly productive in order to implement global goals and targets.

31. At the end of this session, **Ms. Irina Makarenko (Black Sea Commission)** provided brief remarks remotely via Zoom, noting their cooperation and progress on marine litter with UNEP/MAP. She also highlighted their MoU with GFCM and the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS), as well as the UNDP/UNESCO-LME project covering MPAs, in order to create a network of MPA managers and ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs).

### E. Global Institutions Supporting Regional Collaboration and Governance

32. Under this agenda item, **Ms. Sinikinesh Beyene Jimma (UNEP)** presented on the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (RSCAPs) under UNEP. Ms. Jimma introduced the RSCAPs as enhancing marine environmental cooperation tailored to regional specificities and strategically placed to respond to the urgent call for securing planetary health. She explained how UNEP supports RSCAPs, particularly in order to design and implement high-impact projects that address complex environmental issues, such as, *inter alia*, establishing MPAs of national and international importance, developing marine spatial plans and sustainable blue economy plans, or mainstreaming marine area-based management and spatial tools in regional entities. She added that UNEP further provides support to RSCAPs in delivering their mandates, facilitating access to GEF funding, and providing guidance and tools for the implementation of relevant UN Environment Assembly (UNEA) Resolutions, regional priorities and RSCAP COP decisions. Ms. Jimma concluded with noting that RSCAPs are key instruments to implement the UNEA Resolutions.
33. **Mr. Lorenzo Paolo Galbiati (GEF/FAO)** followed with a presentation on the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its relevance to regional collaboration. Mr. Galbiati highlighted six focal areas under GEF, with a particular emphasis on the International Waters Focal Area which supports cooperation in shared marine and freshwater ecosystems to achieve long term benefits and aims to deliver ecosystem status changes in these ecosystems. He identified the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Programme (TDA/SAP) approach as a highly collaborative process that has proven to be a major strategic planning tool for GEF International Water Project. In this context, he mentioned the Fisheries and Ecosystem Based Management for the Blue Economy of the Mediterranean (FishEBM-MED) project, which is the first GEF funded project supporting factual collaboration of RFBs and RSOs and has targeted well defined priorities (TDA) by the implementation of agreed upon regional programs (SAP). Mr. Galbiati added that the 8<sup>th</sup> phase of the GEF has seen the largest replenishment in history, with up to USD 7 billion potentially made available to countries for this cycle.
34. Following these two presentations, the co-chairs opened the floor for Q&A and discussion. Some participants inquired into whether the GEF indicator for MPAs can also be interpreted to include OECMs. It was clarified that this is definitely possible and has already been done in several projects. Others have raised the need for much larger funds for marine biodiversity in some regions than GEF currently provides, adding that the private sector is often the key to complement the funding that comes from GEF. Some participants added that the GEF is not the only option for funding,

highlighting a good example of a public-private partnership and funding to be the blue bond in Seychelles.

## F. Thematic Issues of Relevance to Regional Coordination and Cooperation

35. As part of the thematic issues of relevance to regional coordination and cooperation, **Ms. Despina Symons (Fisheries Expert Group of IUCN)** introduced the OECMs as a new opportunity for RSO and RFB collaboration towards achieving global goals. Ms. Symons first explained that OECMs originally come from the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, but their definition and criteria were adopted by the CBD COP14 in 2018. She identified their importance through their, *inter alia*, contribution to long-term in situ biodiversity conservation, recognition of the diversity of governance systems and promotion of equity, and reconciliation of food security, conservation, and sustainable development. Ms. Symons provided an example of the Canadian marine refuges OECMs, which are fisheries closures under the Canadian Fisheries Act and protect marine ecosystems but may not protect from other activities such as mineral or oil and gas extraction. She emphasized on-going progress on OECMs in capture fisheries, including capacity-building activities, regional initiatives, and a FAO handbook on OECMs in fisheries. She concluded with the timely opportunity of OECMs to, for example, strengthen the integrated management and ecosystem approach in RFMOs and RSOs, enhance conservation outcomes of existing and new fishery closures in ABNJ, enhance dialogue on conservation and fisheries in RFMOs, or foster cross-sectoral collaboration in EEZ and the High Seas.
36. Following that, **David Johnson (Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative [GOBI])** delivered a presentation on the developments and opportunities in the context of a future elaborated regime for biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ). Mr. Johnson first provided background to the BBNJ process, noting that the 5<sup>th</sup> IGC was convened in August 2022, but consensus was not able to be met on several key issues, so IGC-5 will likely reconvene in early 2023 with the aim to finalize the agreement. He explained that the agreement covers four essential elements: (i) marine genetic resources, (ii) area-based management tools, (iii) environmental impact assessments, and (iv) capacity building and transfer of marine technology, adding that the agreement needs to fit into the existing high seas governance landscape and not undermine it. Mr. Johnson also identified the areas of the agreement which currently refer to regional bodies across the four elements, noting that it will remain to be seen whether there will be a global body or existing international frameworks and bodies who will have the authority to implement different parts of the agreement. He concluded with some important implementation considerations, including with respect to the ratification, institutional mechanism, and to advance effective and equitable conservation and sustainable use.
37. Lastly, **Ms. Nancy Soi (UNEP)** gave updates on the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment, stemming from the UNEA Resolution 5/14. Ms. Soi noted that UNEP convened an ad hoc open-ended working group in May/June 2022 in Senegal to prepare for the work of the INC, with some key outcomes including, *inter alia*, an overview to promote cooperation and coordination with relevant regional and international conventions, instruments and organizations, avoiding duplication. She added that the first INC will convene on 28 November – 2 December 2022 in Uruguay, with the aim to complete its work by the end of 2024, when the instrument is expected to be submitted for adoption and open for signature at a diplomatic conference of plenipotentiaries. The instrument will consider, for example, promoting sustainable production and consumption of plastics, capacity building, data monitoring and reporting, addressing compliance, research and innovation, and multi-stakeholder engagement and cooperation.

38. Following these thematic presentations, participants engaged in facilitated breakout group discussions on these issues. The results of these discussions are under section IV. However, before that, Mr. Joseph Appiott (CBD Secretariat) engaged the participants in another live polling session to find out how much have the different regions been discussing or considering these thematic issues. With respect to OECMs, the majority of the respondents felt that there has been some discussion and work, but this is still in progress and questions remain. With respect to BBNJ and the agreement on plastic pollution, the highest number of the respondents felt that there has been minimal discussion, but interest in these two topics.

### G. Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and Roles of, and Opportunities for Regional Coordination and Cooperation

39. Mr. Basile van Havre (Co-Chair of the Post-2020 GBF Open-Ended Working Group [OEWG]) delivered a video presentation providing updates on the post-2020 GBF process and its relevance for regional coordination and cooperation. Mr. van Havre noted the 4<sup>th</sup> OEWG in Nairobi as well as the Informal Group Meeting in Montreal, explaining that since the Nairobi draft did not provide a basis for expediting finalization and adoption of an ambitious and implementable post-2020 GBF, the intersessional work of the Informal Group was needed to streamline the text prior to COP 15. Its mandate was to, *inter alia*, refine text, remove duplication, redundancies, and ensure consistency. He added that the [meeting's outcome](#) includes a report with the full draft of the proposed text, and a separated annotated document detailing technical rationale for streamlining. This document will be considered at the 5<sup>th</sup> OEWG in Montreal in December, producing a revised draft to be then considered at COP 15. He further emphasized several draft targets particularly important for the regional organizations, especially with respect to sea use, conservation, pollution, fisheries and aquaculture, as well as the draft goal D on implementation. Mr. van Havre then briefly shared the status of the Digital Sequence Information (DSI) on Genetic Resources negotiations and stressed other preparatory work underway including the briefing webinar on indicators, DSI, and resource mobilization. He concluded with noting that the entire framework is relevant to ocean issues, and that the GBF will need to be implemented in a complementary manner with other global processes of key importance for the ocean, seeking advice from the participants on whether there is a need for a companion document to the GBF that provides an ocean perspective to the document.
40. Mr. David Johnson (GOBI) presented on the draft post-2020 GBF goals and the opportunities for regional cooperation and collaboration. Mr. Johnson highlighted the UNEP Regional Seas Working Paper (June 2021) on the role for the Regional Seas Program under the post-2020 GBF, emphasizing regional organizations working together to develop more coherent data collection and management, as well as help target capacity building to implement the GBF. He further stressed that regional organizations could work towards increasing coherence and integration towards common commitments, through knowledge exchange, collaboration, and technology transfer, noting that they already have a strong track record in aggregating national-level inputs, producing evaluations and synthesis reports. He then reminded that the four draft GBF goals are the desired long-term outcomes to be achieved by 2050, highlighting the linkages of each goal with the work of regional organizations and their collaboration. This includes, for example, status reports and assessing connectivity and integrity of ecosystems under the draft Goal A, collaboration contributing to sustainable livelihoods and sustainable economic growth under the draft Goal B, ensuring full and effective participation under the draft Goal C, and expediting access to financial and other types of resources under the draft Goal D.
41. Ms. Adelaide Ferreira (GOBI) then followed with a presentation on the draft post-2020 GBF targets, noting that they are concrete actions to be implemented in the shorter term up to 2030 to effectively

pave the way for the achievement of the goals by 2050. Ms. Ferreira noted that most of the draft 22 targets have relevance for RSOs, RFBs, and for regional cooperation and coordination on biodiversity and fisheries, but this will vary across regions. She stressed the need to consider how well the targets align with existing regional efforts, and how regional organizations may scale up their coordination and collaboration to support the implementation of the targets. She also highlighted the components of the Sustainable Fisheries and Oceans Transition from the Global Biodiversity Outlook 5. Ms. Ferreira then proceeded to highlight some examples of opportunities for regional coordination and cooperation for draft targets 1-8, 9-13, and 14-22, emphasizing the critical role of regional organizations in capacitating national stakeholders (e.g., on OECMs), and highlighting their relevance to a range of other stakeholders, including governments, donors and general public. She also reminded the participants of the [Briefing Note](#) on the post-2020 GBF that was prepared for the meeting.

42. Following each of the two presentations above, participants engaged in facilitated regional breakout group discussions on the post-2020 goals and targets, respectively. The results of these discussions are under section IV. However, before that, Mr. Joseph Appiott (CBD Secretariat) first engaged the participants in another live polling session to find out how much the various regions have been thinking or working on the post-2020 GBF, with the highest number of the respondents being very much engaged and eager to see how it will develop.

#### H. Special Information Session by the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries of the Republic of Korea

43. Under this agenda item, the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries (MOF) of the Republic of Korea delivered a series of presentations sharing policies and experiences on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in Korea.
44. **Mr. Deokhoon Han, Director General of International Cooperation Bureau, Korean Maritime Institute (KMI)** delivered a presentation on the Korean Oceans and Fisheries Official Development Assistance (ODA) program and its direction. Mr. Han first introduced the KMI which aims to contribute to national development through research and development in the realm of ocean. He then provided an overview of the Center for International Development Cooperation, including its Cooperation Framework, functions, and the main ODA projects of KMI. This year, these projects focus on, for example, aquaculture, fisheries, environment, or education, and are implemented in Asia, South Pacific, and Africa. Mr. Han particularly touched upon the Vietnamese Seafarer Training and Capacity Building, National Aquaculture Development Center in Kyrgyzstan projects, and the WMU-MOF-KMI CAPFISH project addressing IUU fishing.
45. **Mr. Yeongdon Kim, Assistant Manager in the Korea Marine Environment Management Corporation (KOEM)**, followed with a presentation on the 4<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Plan for Climate Change Response in Oceans and Fisheries in Korea. Mr. Kim first gave an overview of the climate change impacts in the ocean, including in Korea, followed by a background of climate change policy in Korea with respect to the ocean, including adaptation and mitigation measures, and the 4<sup>th</sup> Comprehensive Plan for the years of 2022-2026. This includes the marine and fisheries sector to be carbon neutral by 2050, and four strategies focusing on the (i) reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, (ii) absorption of GHG and electricity production, (iii) pre-emptive responses to the climate crisis, and (iv) securing the ability to respond to the climate crisis.
46. **Mr. Bong-Oh Kwon, Kunsan National University**, presented on the blue carbon research in Korea and the cooperation plan for blue carbon. Mr. Kwon noted some ocean-based solutions in their policies, including tidal marsh, seagrass meadow, and mudflat restoration, marine forests afforestation, and

expansion of MPAs. In terms of research, he further mentioned the development of the Blue Carbon Information System, and the recent first national scale evaluation of organic carbon stocks and sequestration rates of various habitats. He also shared the plan to restore 4.5km<sup>2</sup> of coastal wetlands by 2025 to expand carbon sinks in Korea, and further inquiries into emerging blue carbon ecosystems as carbon sinks, including tidal flats, shelf sea sediments, and macroalgae. He concluded with highlighting the Korean government's international cooperation in blue carbon research.

47. Lastly, **Mr. Ilkang Na, Assistant Director of the International Cooperation Division in the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries (MOF)**, delivered a presentation on the Republic of Korea in the context of RFMO-transition from a rule-taker to a rule-maker. Mr. Na first gave an overview of Korea's membership in various RFMOs. He noted Korea's efforts for full compliance with RFMO rules, but that they are also trying to ensure that the rules are practical and enforceable in the context of Korea. He also shared their efforts in applying the precautionary approach and protecting marine biodiversity, as defined in the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, particularly through the Korean Proposal for Protection of Cetacean. Mr. Na further reported on their scientific contribution with respect to tropical tuna species, and gentoo and chinstrap penguins, as well as cooperation and communication with other Member countries.

#### I. Enhancing the Impact of the Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with RSOs and RFBs

48. On the last day of the meeting, **Mr. Darius Campbell (NEAFC)** provided brief remarks on enhancing the impact of the SOI Global Dialogue with RSOs and RFBs, including the next steps for the Dialogue in the context of the evolving global and regional landscape, and the ways in which the Dialogue can best support regional-scale work and inter-regional experience-sharing. Mr. Campbell reminded the participants of the results of the SOI survey on regional cross-sectoral collaboration and coordination, stressing particularly the gaps and challenges, especially insufficient funding, and the ideas on how the challenges can be addressed, and he highlighted the positive results on regular communication and dialogue between regional organizations. He also engaged the participants in a live polling session instructing them to identify one word to describe biggest challenge and biggest opportunity in their current regional plans for cooperation. The participants found the biggest challenges to be funding, capacity, mandates, duplication, conflicting interests, maintaining dynamic, common vision and understanding. They found the biggest opportunity for cooperation to be knowledge, data sharing, science, MoU, synergies, joint activities, and ongoing projects.
49. Mr. Campbell then facilitated the plenary discussion on this topic. With respect to the **best next steps for the SOI Global Dialogue in the context of the evolving global and regional landscape**, some participants thought that it is very useful to show the benefits of engaging in the SOI process to their Member States and demonstrate how it can benefit the Parties, particularly in helping them to support the achievement of global goals and targets at the national level. Others noted that, indeed, the Secretariats present at this meeting should become ambassadors and transmit the key messages from here to their Member States, also noting the importance of other global platforms continuing the engagement between RSOs and RFBs. Participants also added that SOI has provided a very good platform for engagement and discussion on global policy instruments and processes, which should continue, as well as continue the collaboration through MoUs, information-sharing, and attending each others' meetings.
50. In terms of the **ways in which the SOI Global Dialogue can best support regional-scale work**, some participants mentioned that it is very useful to see how specific issues are addressed in different regions, and how they link to the GBF targets. This includes the opportunity to further exchange information on how other regions advance work on OECMs, bycatch, or apply low impact fishing

methods to avoid impacts on habits. Others agreed that the SOI Global Dialogue, in the future, could identify these specific themes to focus on and facilitate the information exchange, as some regions have been progressing well on these issues and some haven't. Others noted the key role of the SOI Global Dialogue to establish communication and common dialogue between the RFBs and RSOs, as well as enhance the visibility of the work of RFBs and RSOs, as regional efforts support countries and help toward the achievement of global goals. Participants also stressed the need to engage other international organizations (e.g., IUCN, WWF) and funding agencies in these meetings.

51. Lastly, with regard to the **ways in which the SOI Global Dialogue can best support inter-regional experience-sharing**, some participants mentioned the need for a focal point in each region. Others noted the importance of engaging with other relevant actors and sectors, not only with RFBs and RSOs, although adding that different regions may have different relevant actors. In the future, the CBD Secretariat may disseminate a survey to find out the participants' interests and preferences in terms of the programme and who should be engaged in these meetings going forward.



#### IV. SYNTHESIS OF BREAKOUT GROUP SESSIONS

##### A. Thematic Issues of Relevance to Regional Coordination and Cooperation

For the first breakout group discussions focusing on the key thematic issues of OECMs, BBNJ, and the plastic treaty, participants were organized into breakout groups (aiming to group together participants from different regions), and were asked to discuss the relevance of these issues to the work of RSOs and RFBs, and the relevance for regional coordination and collaboration, with respect to the (i) alignments of these issues with mandates, strategies and areas of work, (ii) means and opportunities to scale up on these issues, (iii) enabling factors and capacities needed, and (iv) key challenges and questions.

**Table 1. Synthesis of breakout group discussions on other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs)**

Other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs)	Relevance to RSOs	Relevance to RFBs	Relevance for regional coordination/collaboration
<b>Alignments with mandates, strategies and areas of work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very high priority, important and relevant to RSOs</li> <li>• Alignments and relevant mandates of: Abidjan Convention, UNEP-MAP strategy, NE Atlantic, OSPAR, Pacific</li> <li>• Both individually and together – important contributions to the work of the other</li> <li>• LMMAs: highly relevant to OECMs, could be developed and discussed as OECMs under the Nairobi Convention</li> <li>• Even though RSOs’ mandate may not directly mention OECMs, they can become a tool to achieve the biodiversity and conservation goals within their mandates (same with RFBs)</li> <li>• Need new ways of protecting marine spaces as existing protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with respect to fisheries, direct alignment with VMEs</li> <li>• Challenges with adopting this. Need to scale this up/need more collaboration with FAO and others to elaborate on this</li> <li>• It depends on the profile of the regional mechanism: need to distinguish whether management or advisory bodies. The first have the legal profile to implement OECMs. The advisory bodies can advise their members, but it is not binding</li> <li>• Recognize authority and binding measures and the value of the advice of the scientists</li> <li>• Focus in coming increasingly into biodiversity associated with/ affected by fisheries</li> <li>• A nice way to proceed in the future, but need to analyze</li> <li>• Already some closures in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Poster child” for coordination and collaboration among RSOs and RFBs – joint projects and contributions from the work of both. Aligns closely with mandates and strategies of many RSOs and RFBs</li> <li>• Very relevant, conservation targets under RSOs, but fisheries OECMs are to be implemented under RFBs so there needs to be alignment</li> <li>• Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) in MesoAmerican reef, need transboundary coordination</li> <li>• Regional coordination mechanisms working towards conservation – OECMs can be the objective to do so</li> <li>• Need for alignment in terms of the terminology for RFBs and RSOs to have common understanding of the concept</li> <li>• OECMs can include VMEs, PSSAs, LMMAs. If LMMAs are OECMs, regional seas will have relevant role to play. If VMEs concern with the integrity of marine environment, then RFBs and RSOs will also need to collaborate, because it’s</li> </ul>



	<p>measures (MPAs) cannot achieve 30x30 on their own</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SACEP countries have mandate but there is a need to improve coordinated approaches</li> <li>• In East Asian seas, not as developed as it could be: a framework that includes OECMs was just started in the region</li> <li>• HELCOM has started working on OECMs in the Baltic Sea Action Plan. It is a priority: 1. Attempt to reach regional agreements among parties on how to understand/define OECM. 2. Creating a decision support tree to guide the process of designating possible OECMs in the region. Had a joint workshop with FAO and IUCN to get started on this process. Desire to reach common understanding and decision tree from 2021</li> <li>• CEP: Protocol on Specially protected areas (SPA) - only regionally binding agreement on biodiversity conservation, complements, focuses on MPAs, but don't have OECMs in mandate/workplan - next COP may possibly consider this - existing strategies may be relevant</li> <li>• UNEP is convening agent for RSCAPs and providing support at policy level - UNEA resolution - Nature-based solutions - 30% target - supporting capacity of regional seas - joint declaration agreement between countries on joint area management (e.g., Seychelles);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trying more to identify different areas in relation to the effects that fisheries have on juveniles on various species, sharks, turtles, birds</li> <li>• Work towards creating spaces that consider various threats and biodiversity elements</li> <li>• Possible transboundary enforcement of MPAs</li> <li>• IATTC tools for spatial management considered and, in some places – effectiveness of measures has yet to be proven (perhaps because focus is tuna species not wider biodiversity)</li> <li>• IATTC has holistic approach to management because of not distinguishing between national areas and high seas</li> <li>• In Caribbean, RFBs very interested in OECMs</li> <li>• SWIOFC is more focused on advice on stock assessment, so it's more relevant to RFBs with binding measures; SWIOFC had some initial discussions where it has been presented</li> <li>• BOBP-IGO: Very relevant and fits within the mandate. There has been discussion on this with FAO</li> <li>• BCC: Relevant for the region. Increased efforts towards standardization</li> <li>• NEAFC has closures related to sponges and corals, these are nominated as OECMs and recognized as protected; already have some working groups in some</li> </ul>	<p>about conservation, and because of the ecosystem approach. By extension, both RFBs and RSOs have to collaborate to use the ecosystem approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP-MAP already adopted strategy for OECMs and working with GFCM</li> <li>• OSPESCA: need coordination and collaboration in SICA, very important to coordinate</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: need more discussion on this issue in the regional coordination discussions, although there is talk about migratory species</li> <li>• PROCARIBE+ has an element on OECMs</li> <li>• OSPAR is already linking up with RFBs to put in place management measures (in the case of MPAs), so the collaboration is to ID areas important for conservation and work with RFBs to put in place measures that conserve those. Issue overlapping OECMs with MPAs. Double counting issue</li> <li>• BOBP-IGO: difficulty in the region to meet the 10% target for MPAs, so there is a willingness to look into OECMs for fisheries to count towards the new targets. Some groups are discussing this including for cooperation purposes across different sectors</li> <li>• NOWPAP plans to cooperate with regional fishery bodies on OECMs</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

	<p>agree on how to manage shared area - Mozambique channel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPPS: it is one of their mandates, already have a workshop with IUCN to explain OECMs, but there are still many questions.</li> </ul>	<p>areas, some delays. Well-advanced, already identifying areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFCM has a number of relevant measures. Will have GFCMs annual meeting, potentially discussing OECMs</li> <li>• IATTC: interested to work towards creating spaces that consider various threats and biodiversity elements; also important to consider that national governments can take complementary measures.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Means and opportunities to scale up work on this issue</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more discussion in some regions. Still at an early stage to understand what the issues are and get stakeholders on board. Regional workshops can be very useful</li> <li>• Nairobi Convention: Produces MPA outlook - a mechanism to look at OECMs in future</li> <li>• SPAW Protocol have their targets and work plans, and upcoming COP. Opportunity to scale up OECMs as a means to achieve 30x30, and incorporate that in the biannual work plan; contracting parties could include through their annual reporting OECMs, even though the existing text of SPAW Protocol does not mention OECMs</li> <li>• Nairobi Convention has similar protocol but OECMs not explicitly highlighted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helpful if transboundary species (e.g., tuna) can be considered in OECMs, working towards transboundary OECMs to better protect transboundary species</li> <li>• RFBs do stock assessment of each species group, and they can do coordination and provide stock assessment to the states, and advice on management</li> <li>• Supporting national level work is perhaps more relevant</li> <li>• Co-management structures, and community-based structures</li> <li>• This could be an opportunity to have a more effective and sound dialogue between resource users and conservation managers</li> <li>• Fisheries sector is generally reluctant to close/protect any areas – it is the RSOs who are more involved in this. There is opportunity to scale up, but they challenge each other</li> <li>• Discussion at GFCM/UNEP-MAP (some Fisheries Restricted Areas already being considered)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint projects. Important for individual orgs to consider what OECMs are for each of them to start. Useful to have internal initial dialogue before engaging with others</li> <li>• Candidate to literally “joint work”: scientific projects, monitoring, etc.; Establish joint working groups, on area-based measures for example. Facilitate knowledge and best practice</li> <li>• Participation in multilateral workshops /discussions; Joint research</li> <li>• Need to understand the existing measures in different areas and if they can already be identified as OECMs, collaboration can help with this</li> <li>• Cooperation with RSOs to raise awareness; making sure it’s included in the work plan and put in the agenda</li> <li>• Make provisions in the work plan; and allow for time to implement and address them</li> <li>• RFB/RSO coordination in their biannual work plans with discussions on OECMs: Once OECMs are incorporated into the biannual work plans of RSOs and RFBs, there will be more need for collaboration</li> <li>• Ensure organizations invite each other</li> <li>• More research needed to understand collateral effects (e.g. displacement of fishing)</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration and coordination with RFBs and RSOs within their respective mandates, the geographical reaches of both are different so need to leverage the synergies</li> <li>• Need for a regional coordination mechanism (such as in the Caribbean)</li> <li>• Work with the CBD to strengthen capacity building on OECMs and how that can be implemented in different regions, and better define OECMs</li> <li>• Continue working with SOI at the regional levels to achieve capacity building at the regional levels</li> <li>• Useful to find out what the status is now, and what the aspirations of member states are, and then capacity building and support can be better targeted</li> <li>• How can regional organizations support member countries to achieve 30x30, using OECMs? The VMEs and PSSAs might not get the world to 30x30 but help understand the baseline</li> <li>• MSP efforts should be included in OECMs efforts</li> <li>• In order to get to 30x30, large MPAs are created offshore, but they need to be closer to the shore; for this, MSP is needed otherwise MPAs will not address local communities' concerns and will not be effective</li> <li>• Priorities in blue economy to frame them within MSPs, allocating marine space to various uses, some of those uses will be MPAs, this needs coordination between both RFBs and RSOs</li> <li>• Need transboundary marine spatial planning too, which is relevant for coordination, regional orgs could provide capacity building for existing national MSP; transboundary MSP is very difficult</li> <li>• Seychelles: tried to do MSP for their entire ocean space, driven at the national level by multiple sectors, not only environmental sector</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need both qualitative and quantitative, representativeness, connectivity, and effectiveness</li> <li>• Providing guidance on how well to design OECMs so that they can meet criteria at outset</li> <li>• International guidelines on how to get working</li> <li>• Facilitating innovative finance to support biodiversity measures</li> <li>• UNEA Resolutions make a big difference</li> <li>• BOBP-IGO: soon to start LME GEF programme and OECM will be part of this programme. National level strategy</li> <li>• GEF: could be eligible for GEF funding support</li> <li>• Regional banks also provide funding</li> <li>• BCC: high interest in funding. The EBSA/MSP project – funded by Germany, but other donors also interested to support. Enough opportunities to include OECMs in follow up projects</li> <li>• In many areas, OECMs would likely be based on existing areas where there is already a measure. One need for cooperation is the follow up, to demonstrate that the existing fisheries measures are effective in protecting the environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Enabling factors and capacities needed</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement with non-governmental actors, community groups and organizations active in promoting this. Some capacity building; need for greater awareness</li> <li>• Build capacity of trainers</li> <li>• Wide range of existing measures</li> <li>• In the East Asian seas: hope for more capacity in the region once this framework is in place due to currently differing levels of capacity</li> <li>• Need resources, learning from other regions to scale up/knowledge sharing/guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest and momentum exists</li> <li>• Need more resources, learning from other regions to scale up/knowledge sharing/guidelines</li> <li>• BBNJ implementation could be an opportunity to focus on OECMs</li> <li>• Handbook for RFMOs to register VMEs as OECMs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for more biodiversity data to complement information on fisheries: cooperation most useful. And vice-versa, knowledge on fisheries management</li> <li>• Softening the silos; it bleeds into the national level (Iceland ex of regional level strengthen the national level.)</li> <li>• Engaging with policy makers to have them provide the policy commitment to enable it to happen and dedicate resources (human and financial)</li> <li>• Capacity needs to promote coordination</li> <li>• MSP training, fisheries assessment and the capacity for that, better coordination for regional level MSP</li> <li>• Ongoing support on MSP can be relevant</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Win-win solutions when both fisheries and conservation targets are met</li> <li>• Role of NGOs can play important role in providing point of views and advice that are useful - but the leading role has to rely on the government and authority</li> <li>• Important role for global institutions - more proactive presence of global institutions at regional level</li> <li>• Important support from not only the international bodies, but also civil society, NGOs, universities</li> <li>• UNEP is providing capacity support - scholarships; collaborative center (WCMC) - this can help to enhance capacity to implement OECMs</li> <li>• WCMC could provide training and information</li> <li>• Communicate in a way that is meaningful across sectors</li> <li>• Sitting together to discuss and work out ways to implement OECMS</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key challenges/questions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness raising; capacity building</li> <li>• Silos and competition; building trust</li> <li>• Integrate migratory species in transboundary initiatives</li> <li>• 30% area-based conservation target</li> <li>• Finding a coordinated approach</li> <li>• Regional workshops by FAO can be useful</li> <li>• A new topic that requires increased understanding</li> <li>• Do VMEs fall into the category of OECMs?</li> <li>• Extensive areas and expensive to monitor and assess progress; Requires ROVs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for an improved understanding of conservation, and on fisheries conservation and environment, and aquaculture</li> <li>• Unless aquaculture is increased, to ensure food security, it will be more difficult to achieve 30x30: need to provide alternative livelihoods for those who use marine resources, ex. Morocco – generating revenues for Moroccan small-scale fisheries, giving small scale fishers small projects farming for mussels, and putting artificial reefs as nurseries for the fish, and the fishers accepted; another ex. – conserving mangroves and planting them in places where fishers go for fish baits, as a result the mangroves died</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key challenge is to increase capacity</li> <li>• Silos also a key challenge</li> <li>• Include NGO actors, international and local - with the international ones often oversimplifying things</li> <li>• Major challenge is the fact that the agenda is set by the donors and not the people in the area. Need for the drive to be local. Key how to utilize the strength of international actors / donors, but ensure that the local is the largest voice in setting the details. Avoid alienation of local communities</li> <li>• Ensuring local stakeholder and engagement in a meaningful manner</li> <li>• Conflicting ocean uses</li> <li>• When countries are not at the same level, coordination is a challenge</li> </ul>

		<p>→ so, need to provide alternatives to the local communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once there is a spatial measure, how are other sectors addressed?</li> <li>• Multiple pressures other than fisheries</li> <li>• OSPESCA: the local government is very important, OSPESCA has a legal framework at national level</li> <li>• BCC: beginning the process of defining</li> <li>• Multi-sectoral issue: is it possible to say that a fishery measure is an OECM if other activities are taken place in the same space? Case by case basis. If there is no conflict with other sectors, yes, but if there are conflicts, then no.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care needed to adopt FAO Guidance to avoid ‘sub-standard’ closures just to meet numerical targets</li> <li>• Limited definition of mandates, then it is difficult to engage in this issue</li> <li>• Limited capacities within organizations</li> <li>• Big issue is funding, and the cost of coordination</li> <li>• Current processes and global agreements: Potential opportunity to enhance the ability of RFBs and RSOs to come together and deliver on them</li> <li>• Resistance to change</li> <li>• Anybody can still decide that this is an OECM, standardization is random, same with MPAs, but at least there the IUCN guidelines are followed</li> <li>• Overlapping issue – between MPAs and OECMs: divergent views on this – in some regions there could be overlapping (e.g. VME closure that could be an OECM and MPA, but in others not. Need to see how this will work in practice.</li> <li>• EBSAs and MSP and now will begin discussing how to guide countries on MPAs, but not looking at OECMs at the same time. There is no balance across countries – need to use a good balance</li> <li>• Review mechanism for OECMs: WCMC doesn’t verify the information submitted by Govs, if it changes over time, e.g. 5 years later the situation would change (no biodiversity outcome or new threat, or the ABMT (e.g. fishery closure is lifted) expires, how to review?</li> <li>• National laws are lagging behind on integrating the concept of OECM</li> <li>• Other sectors (beyond fisheries) will probably come up with their own guidance on OECMs too (e.g. renewables) – a challenge</li> <li>• Where OECMs can be transient – e.g. seasonal closure be considered OECMs?</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to find an inclusive approach when defining OECMs when it comes to all stakeholders, including RSOs and RFOs</li> <li>• Need for more guidance in the Baltic Sea, general confusion regarding OECMs</li> <li>• What is the difference between OECMs and MPA? Maybe there is already some form of closure and OECM can reinforce this closure</li> <li>• Different understanding/appreciation of OECM between countries/regions; lack of understanding of the OECM definition</li> <li>• Different languages (Language of fisheries vs. language of conservation)</li> <li>• Why is all this work being done if it's not going to be recognized by other sectors?</li> <li>• Foreseeable difficulties if it is implemented by states because of multiplicity of organizations.</li> <li>• Easier if designated by organisations such as regional organisations</li> <li>• Areas where there are no RSOs have no means of designating protected areas</li> <li>• Difficult to translate research/science into policy</li> <li>• GFCM: have the same challenges, lots of interest and the importance is understood but need for more information</li> <li>• Political willingness can be a barrier or a limitation, internal coordination is sometimes difficult, the process of nomination to the CBD depends on each government. Try to promote a conservation-friendly approach, technically it makes a lot of sense</li> <li>• Country interest is the most important aspect, difficulty to reach the 30% just by MPAs, fisheries do some good things, the challenge is enforcing and monitoring, need to demonstrate the biodiversity benefits, can illustrate clearly where the short-term snapshots are, need for more cooperation so that the benefits of fisheries</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---



			<p>measures can be demonstrated to those in the fisheries sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IATTC: Presently, no mechanism that coordinates across bodies, like in Caribbean, so rather relying on countries, or with CPPS, OSPESCA, also have MoUs with these groups, but this development is new</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

**Table 2. Synthesis of breakout group discussions on the new instrument on biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction**

<b>New instrument on biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction</b>	<b>Relevance to RSOs</b>	<b>Relevance to RFBs</b>	<b>Relevance for regional coordination/collaboration</b>
<b>Alignments with mandates, strategies and areas of work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although lots of unknown, the regional process still very important and needs to be strengthened</li> <li>• The instrument will apply to BBNJ areas, but there is a connection with existing RSOs</li> <li>• In some cases, it may not apply – in some cases there is no relation with ABNJ or there is political sensitivity</li> <li>• Need to see the alignment between the framework and the mandate of RSOs</li> <li>• Abidjan Convention has mandate to consider ABNJ</li> <li>• Mediterranean has no area beyond 200nm – special considerations for ‘high seas’ areas (e.g., PELAGOS)</li> <li>• OSPAR: very relevant, slightly concerned about the impact on their mandate. Not clear on how non-undermining will play out in practice. How to register/recognize their regional MPAs as global –</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depends on the mandate and area</li> <li>• It depends on the RMFOs – a revision of the mandate might even be necessary</li> <li>• Characteristics of the regulatory mandate matter</li> <li>• Not sure that the regional advisory bodies have the same possibility of engaging with BBNJs</li> <li>• Is there a need for one organization for fisheries and environment? No – Tuna, for example, covers all the High Seas</li> <li>• Fisheries have engaged in some countries. But it may be that this is coming from the environmental side</li> <li>• No RSOs in NAFO area. BBNJ may have different implementation where there are RSOs</li> <li>• Most modern RFMO have as their objective the safeguard of marine ecosystems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of the OECMs issues noted apply here too</li> <li>• Building awareness and providing input to finalize the agreement to make it beneficial to every region</li> <li>• Regional process still very important and need for strengthening it – limited discussions currently ongoing on question of where there are regional or sectoral org in place.</li> <li>• BBNJ an extremely complicated agreement</li> <li>• Need to look at: (i) possible effects on all this work; (ii) how can those organizations impact the discussions at the national level and by having reps be in the corridors of negotiations (noted differences in fisheries orgs, waking up after COVID-19 pandemic, though a bit too late)</li> <li>• Need for improved national coordination</li> <li>• Need to build on cooperation between fisheries and environmental organizations working at regional level; this will have a much bigger impact</li> <li>• Up to countries to decide which regional platforms they wish to use - countries could</li> </ul>

	<p>ongoing discussion at BBNJ – but positive if they are globally recognized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCC: BBNJ is relevant – especially with time – in the future</li> <li>• RSOs, SPREP heavily engaged, various concerns IUU, transshipment, local knowledge, because of the nature of the region. Strong benefits to the region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that resulting measures will impact existing arrangements</li> </ul>	<p>instruct their regional organizations how to engage in this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For some regional organizations, it is clear, but for others, countries may need advise</li> <li>• Regional level is essential - aligns with much of the work already in many RFMOs - cannot solve regional, national or local problems from the global level</li> <li>• The key is how to interface BBNJs and existing regional bodies. Need to avoid overlapping</li> <li>• Cooperation between RSOs and RFBs also in the context of BBNJ makes a lot of sense. NE Atlantic has already formalized mandates</li> <li>• CPPS: matter of great importance, had workshops to explain and some capacity building, but some hesitations remained. It is very relevant and important, but need for clearer mandate, no MPAs as in other regions, there are still many questions, need for more discussion at the regional level why MPAs should be there</li> <li>• Much interest in how the BBNJ COP will decide implementation at the regional level, there are regions where many challenges have been identified– guidance is needed.</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: need for more discussion on BBNJ</li> <li>• OSPESCA: different authorities should talk to each other, but need for opportunities, difficulties to resolve the silo approach, need more capacity building on this topic, at country level as well as the regional level</li> <li>• NEAFC has been involved, there are opportunities and risks for EIA and MPAs</li> <li>• Need for a mechanism where joint decisions are made, need to ensure the approaches and standards are at the same place, some want to protect the fisheries, some supporting MPAs, little discussion on marine genetic resources. Not undermining can be a risk to RFBs that some NGOs may push things very fast, they have all</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			the power at the centre, then the COP makes decisions, they should reflect both the ecosystem and the economic issues, some regionalization should be allowed. The parties consider the national interest, and the Secretariats consider the regional aspects. So, at all levels, all the different sectors should be part of the discussions, and key players should be integrated
<b>Means and opportunities to scale up work on this issue</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MAP: new megafauna corridor under consideration by Spain</li> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Improving the understanding the instrument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IATTC: had a big discussion on BBNJ, but need to do more awareness-raising at the national level</li> <li>• Opportunities to review/update mandate to be consistent with the BBNJ</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This, like OECMs, could also be a great opportunity for collaboration</li> <li>• Opportunities for existing areas (e.g., SPAMIs)</li> <li>• Genetic resources</li> <li>• Should create working group on specific topics as a driver for national coordination</li> </ul>
<b>Enabling factors and capacities needed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will fund, who will manage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to apply the ecosystem approach and the precautionary approach</li> <li>• Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenging to have coordination across national level actors/sectors</li> <li>• Need to use this process as a way to see where new regional agreements are needed to fill gaps in regional governance</li> </ul>
<b>Key challenges/questions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While acknowledging delay, need to ensure that it's reflective of the needs going forward</li> <li>• Need for improved understanding, and a need to reach out and communicate what is there</li> <li>• Funding to support new programmes</li> <li>• Some regions include politically sensitive areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More science needed to understand impact of measures</li> <li>• Migratory species</li> <li>• Could the BBNJ develop a fisheries measure? Or that would be undermining? Need to work with the competent body to develop the measures. What about areas where there are no RFMOs or no mandates over certain stocks</li> <li>• Need for improved understanding, and need to reach out and communicate what is there</li> <li>• A lot of uncertainty in RFMOs of how this instrument will intercept with their work and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional collaboration</li> <li>• Diverse positions and capabilities of States</li> <li>• Existing structures to be empowered rather than disenfranchised</li> <li>• Need to better understand what the role of regional organizations is in the future treaty - what role will they play - there are some that support a global organization with oversight authority, but others disagree and should rely on competent organizations</li> <li>• Oceans governance: missing the economic, social, connectivity. Working in siloes despite the fact that the resources are connected</li> <li>• There are so many organizations with different mandates that do their own thing – the BBNJ is useful but need a more comprehensive take with an ecosystem approach</li> <li>• A lot of uncertainty</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation of the “Not undermining” principle</li> <li>• Different languages, different perspectives</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

**Table 3. Synthesis of breakout group discussions on the new global agreement on plastic pollution**

<b>New global agreement on plastic</b>	<b>Relevance to RSOs</b>	<b>Relevance to RFBs</b>	<b>Relevance for regional coordination/collaboration</b>
<p><b>Alignments with mandates, strategies and areas of work</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional seas have done a lot on marine litter, and very keen to be involved</li> <li>• Many existing strategies at regional levels that should be utilized</li> <li>• Quality Status Report in Mediterranean will show the extent of the challenges</li> <li>• Can be difficult to attract government attention</li> <li>• \$50m project 8 SACEP countries – private/public partnerships</li> <li>• Abidjan Convention is mandated for all types of pollution: Decision 16 specifically for plastics</li> <li>• NE Atlantic: political win</li> <li>• CEP: currently developing technical brief to inform negotiators on this process</li> <li>• Discussions among CEP, CARICOM others on how best to advice countries on this</li> <li>• BCC: in this region, there are transboundary fisheries surveys by Fridtjof Nansen checking for microplastic in the fish – it’s relevant. Finding microplastics in fish stomach, and beach cleaning initiatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To do mainly with lost and abandoned fishing gears. Developing unbreakable / improved fishing gears and technology: collaboration with scientific and tech</li> <li>• Impact of plastic on resources</li> <li>• Fisheries are one of the contributors of the release of plastic in the environment through fishing gear, for example</li> <li>• RFBs also impacted by the issue of microplastics, which affects the quality of the product</li> <li>• There are many RFBs that don’t address this issue/don’t have competence</li> <li>• Much of this comes from land, so the main areas of work will be land-based focus - also dealing with fishing gear, but this is a minimal percentage</li> <li>• Need to do more effort on some coastal areas that are very badly affected: need to focus on cleaning up plastic hotspots, such as those in South-East Asia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperating to retrieve lost gears</li> <li>• More attention and collaboration in dealing with this problem</li> <li>• Problem is that the source is not in that area. So regional area collaboration may not be sufficient but can contribute through adding pressure and understanding</li> <li>• Important to raise awareness: limited mandates of organizations to deal with the issue; has there been a systematic approach to raise awareness?</li> <li>• Information exchange is important</li> <li>• There is a lot of room to develop this at all levels, there is definitely not enough</li> <li>• Aquaculture industry possibilities</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: promoting the FAO-LFG, it is too wide for fisheries, encouraging countries to collect and share national initiatives, to measure the impact, to have regional data and report and help other regions, even fishing gear is made of plastic, polystyrene boxes, the gear impact the marine mammals and corals – this kind of gearmarking, how to design the gear, accidental abandonment – there is a momentum. Encouraging a regional plan if vessel encounter lost gear from others, they are compensated for bringing these back</li> <li>• NEAFC: Marpol 5 already exists, Marpol 5 applies for abandoned lost gear, looking at polystyrene boxes to keep the fish, not a high</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSPAR: marine litter action plan, it's right for the treaty to focus on upstream – which is further away from OSPAR mandate. Complementary to OSPAR's mandate – stopping going to the sea in the first place. But don't see a role to play in the treaty negotiations per se</li> <li>• Barcelona Convention also has an action plan on plastics, so this is relevant</li> <li>• It has direct impact on RSO work. Pollution is very important. Within that plastic and marine litter essential. Have the Marine Plan on Marine Litter: land and sea-based litter, as well as the science and monitoring of plastic, and reporting at different scales. Need for harmonized reporting</li> <li>• HELCOM: The Baltic Action Plan includes plastic – adopted a regional action plan on Marine Litter for the Baltic Sea. This includes a range of issues including fishing gear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a big issue for RFMOs; reporting on lost nets; disposable garbage</li> <li>• NE Atlantic: not yet on agenda</li> <li>• IATTC: on radar, EU proposals for strong package (yet to be adopted). MSC pressure to recognize ecological impacts. Biodegradable FADs prospects</li> <li>• SWIOFC: has a broad mandate that would give SWIOFC a basis to consider good practices, waste management</li> <li>• BOBP-IGO: no mandate on plastics, but the agreement is relevant and should be considered</li> </ul>	<p>priority – initiatives not to pay the scheme for returning gear and other waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFCM: the guidelines of FAO are applicable, waiting for some funds to be re-channeled to GFCM, the process has been delayed, maybe early 2023 will start with some work, mapping activities, trying to fight the image of the fisheries sector being responsible for the presence of plastics, they are not the main factor, encouraging fishers to take them home, , focusing on raising awareness</li> <li>• In the northern European area pollution is very well controlled, but in the Mediterranean less so, it all depends on the location and how polluted the rivers are</li> <li>• There is a responsibility for fishers to collect the plastic in the rivers and not in the seas. There are some countries that participate in local government on this issue</li> <li>• CPPS: there has been a lot of discussion, the goal is to avoid getting the plastic into the ocean, it is still voluntary, but the plan is to do more research on alternative materials, and to reduce the single-use of plastic</li> <li>• OSPESCA: have all the orgs working together on reducing plastics</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: working with FAO, developing a pilot to develop standard operating procedures and we will publish these regulations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Means and opportunities to scale up work on this issue</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exchange of experience and mentoring</li> <li>• Some countries pushing to lessen plastic at outset</li> <li>• Could open new funding opportunities because it's a treaty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to transition to new FADs</li> <li>• Could open new funding opportunities because it's a treaty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Ministry efforts</li> <li>• Awareness of need for ecosystem approach</li> <li>• Where there are some MPAs, in order to minimize the use plastic, this could provide a link with the fishery bodies</li> </ul>
<p><b>Enabling factors and capacities needed</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best practice and lessons learned from leaders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More training and workshop for fishermen and other end users</li> <li>• COBSEA has created a knowledge sharing platform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transboundary nature of the problem requires collaboration</li> <li>• Segregation at source needed</li> <li>• Regulation will drive actions</li> </ul>

<p><b>Key challenges/questions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abidjan countries – need for more funding to find common positions and bring countries to same level</li> <li>• Med: semi-enclosed, acute problem, lack of funds</li> <li>• Awareness of public in S Asia and ‘buy-in’ from business community</li> <li>• Awareness at national level needs to be extended</li> <li>• Prevention at the source is key: once the plastic is in the water is too late</li> <li>• Integrated approach to the issue, from freshwater to sea</li> <li>• Circular economy approach: make use of the waste</li> <li>• BCC: Need for improved expertise in the region and funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plastic from fishing gears</li> <li>• FADs: positive research into biodegradable prototypes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New companies are changing their practices because it’s good for business</li> <li>• Solution tends to be outside fisheries; need for a more comprehensive approach and need for voice / alarm</li> <li>• Another two-way street: (i) address the factors, (ii) join forces: not only in individual regions but wider; need for land based pollution to address it</li> <li>• More knowledge on impacts needed, away from emotional, anecdotal and for clear scientific-based studies</li> <li>• Working together on plastic waste from abandoned and lost fishing gear (esp. trawling activity)</li> <li>• Whilst concern for plastics is high - skepticism that Treaty will make a real difference</li> <li>• Carrot and stick?</li> <li>• Engaging the private sector: they are not engaged enough</li> <li>• Scope of the issues; what can be the role of Regional organisations</li> <li>• Need to accelerate the process</li> <li>• Social resistance: Shaping public opinion will be key</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---

## B. Draft Goals of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

For the second breakout group discussions focusing on the draft goals of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, participants were assigned to breakout groups organized by the following regions: North Atlantic, Wider Caribbean & Central America, Mediterranean, Pacific, Southeast Atlantic, Western Indian Ocean & Adjacent Areas, South and Southeast Asia. Participants were asked to discuss the relevance of the draft goals to the work of RSOs, RFBs, and the relevance for regional coordination and collaboration, considering the questions of (i) how the post-2020 goals fit into existing regional goals/strategies/mandates of the RSOs and RFBs or those currently under development, and (ii) whether there are common elements between goals/strategies/mandates of RSOs and RFBs that address the post-2020 goals.

**Table 4. Synthesis of breakout group discussions on the draft goals of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, organized by the regional groups.**

Draft GBF goals <sup>3</sup> (paraphrased)	Relevance to RSOs	Relevance to RFBs	Relevance for regional coordination/collaboration
<p><b>GOAL A:</b> <i>Biodiversity is conserved, maintaining and enhancing the connectivity and integrity of all ecosystems halting human-induced extinctions, supporting healthy and resilient populations of species, and maintaining genetic diversity of populations and their adaptive potential.</i></p>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different levels of engagement and awareness of regional organizations and their Parties in the post-2020 process</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very relevant for biodiversity conservation, conservation of habitats, regarding species conservation very relevant</li> <li>• In wider Caribbean, can even look beyond, it is very relevant, enhancing implementation</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP-MAP Mid-term strategy to 2027</li> <li>• Regional Post-2020 UNEP-MAP SAPBIO</li> <li>• Barcelona convention strategy</li> <li>• Clear objectives and 27 indicators</li> <li>• Tried to align with draft GBF in the strategy</li> <li>• First priority of the strategy</li> <li>• To complement also adopted strategy for marine and coastal PAs and OECMs (required by parties)</li> <li>• Species conservation, habitat, ecosystem, genetic diversity-- Regional Quality status report Med</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NAFO: key goal being the maximum sustainable yield; focus on sustainable use, while ensuring it doesn't affect biodiversity. Committed to ecosystem-based management, but need more discussion on GBF</li> <li>• Fisheries organizations may be aware that the output from these processes may lead to regulations (ex. with OECMs or bycatch on the agenda)</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamental, if biodiversity is depleted, there is no economic future</li> <li>• The new strategic plan for the different TFBs make specific reference to maintain biodiversity</li> <li>• Adoption of this bill will identify the work plans during that decade</li> <li>• The workplans, decade strategy and global goals complement each other, and what is usually required is refinement and adaptation</li> <li>• The next process will be to determine the targets, whether these are biodiversity or other targets</li> <li>• In Pacific, there are 2-year work plans, fisheries and conservation are impossible to separate, and the need is to conserve a minimal amount of the stocks in order to continue sustainable use of the resources</li> </ul>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question of whether goal A drives goal B, or B drives A</li> <li>• Notable progress in the past decades on how it's looked at – more integrated, even if not yet “meeting in the middle” (references to total misconceptions just some years ago; still some elements of that disconnect today)</li> <li>• Disconnect also between fisheries and environmental authorities at the national level</li> <li>• Tension in terms of indicators and thresholds and acceptable risk and precaution, and challenge of finding mechanisms to discuss it and come to agreement. Many players, difficult system to get to a decision → affected by mistrust? (mistrust of fisheries from NGOs and other non-state actors)</li> <li>• Importance of face-to-face meetings</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are areas that demand compliance, difficult to sustainably use without harming</li> <li>• Having a GBF gives more precise meaning, which makes it easier to act on</li> <li>• It will help with setting targets and help with implementation of the Protocol</li> <li>• While the GEF is a financing tool, whenever someone applies for a project, they subscribe to the targets, the financing mechanism gives motivation to deliver on these goals. The instrument is localized, from international down to regional and finally down to the local</li> <li>• There is a role for both RFBs and RSOs with respect to the measurement</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Recommendation adopted by the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Nairobi, June 2022. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/wg2020-04/wg2020-04-rec-01-en.pdf>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very relevant for NOWPAP, one of their goals, in the process of preparing regional action plan for biodiversity and conservation, GBF will help focusing their work</li> <li>• CPPS: this goal is part of their mandate. How to measure indicators, and how to measure that biodiversity is conserved is still difficult, need more data</li> <li>• SPREP: all the goals highly relevant. Need more discussion on fisheries related goals</li> <li>• On-going project by European Commission on how Regional Seas Convention (RSCs) can be aligned with the post-2020 GBF. There was a review of existing strategies of the RSCs, protocols and action plans, and many of them are aligned in terms of the priorities/goals in the GBF, some are going through revisions, others are developing new regional strategies to make sure their priorities on biodiversity are well aligned</li> <li>• How to ensure connectivity and integrity in key ecosystems, how to demonstrate it, especially for highly migratory species, mammals etc. Countries have their own information on tracking species, but they don't share it with one another (CPPS). SPREP do have common turtle tracking database in their region</li> <li>• NOWPAP: research on key indicators species, and then they can link with MPAs, and transboundary movement. Member states may be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to look at what needs to be harvested and then manage the entire ecosystem in a sustainable and healthy manner</li> <li>• OFB: now starting to talk about restoration, trying to do something to come back to the original situation, maybe biodiversity conservation is a way to conserve resources</li> <li>• RFB goals and targets should benefit the fishers and users</li> <li>• RFBs are more focused on sustainable use</li> <li>• Reflecting on how many have taken the steps to collaborate, for instance, fighting against IUU</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IATTC: All the goals are aligned with IATTC work, except for the genetic resources</li> <li>• There is lots of research on stock assessments, may be useful to measure some of these goals: “close kin mark recapture analysis genetic tool for stock assessment/stock structure difference”, measuring population and genetic structure, important for these goals, tool to estimate abundance for stock assessment purposes</li> <li>• Would RFBs be able to report on goal A? It could be a new development, RFBs would have to shift their focus, this could be a way for RFBs to advance on biodiversity with respect to fish stocks</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is weighted differently between the RSOs and RFBs – interest in sustainable use, which can only be achieved if the resource is managed, protected, developed</li> <li>• What is the conclusion with regards to overlaps?</li> <li>• Have to work together on whatever protocol, on mammals, SPORAC, collaborating to avoid duplication and overlap</li> <li>• There should be a memorandum for coordination</li> <li>• This column is the key thing: at the end of the day this is where important progress should be made, the challenges are: RSOs have an advantage with regards to human resources and capacity building</li> <li>• RFBs have good balances, have joint engagements</li> <li>• Organizations and RSOs have an advantage, but the challenge is that they have to reach out to individual countries – can build a stronger instrument if there are fewer, if local entities can be engaged</li> <li>• Very important: adopted a concept towards the Cartagena Protocol, the MoU outlines working together</li> <li>• The need is recognized. There have been great improvements, on the right path, but a lot more should be done</li> <li>• The progress made should not be discounted – need to continue building the relationship at the policy level and down</li> <li>• Need to work on harmonization of the strategies, institutional reform is crucial but also challenging; should provide the stage for governments to come together on all the different projects (climate, biodiversity, chemicals..) It took a long time for countries to start the implementation of the projects, the integration at organizational level has been progressing (among UNEP, FAO, CBD etc.)</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

	<p>guided by the GBF to achieve the goals and milestones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP analyzed the reporting that is done through the protocols of RSCs, especially the NBSAPs and how it can be harmonized. Conclusion that there will be a need for coherence at the national level, bringing together focal points of the different conventions with the focal points of the CBD. Need to advance conversation, better coordination at the national level and speaking across different conventions. Have the conversation with those working on biodiversity at the national level</li> <li>• SPREP has a group dedicated to CBD which advises countries, it's a big burden to report on everything</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue of whether RSOs have a biodiversity strategy. BCC has a biodiversity strategy and many marine resources and associated working groups. Trying to target the most important species and established EBSAs. In marine areas, trying to analyze how to support other countries so that they are all at the same level in terms of marine protected areas</li> <li>• Abidjan Convention: Mandate is to protect environment of coastal and marine zone. Everything that is being done is to conserve biodiversity. There are challenges in developing countries, and it cannot be done without increasing some</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICCAT: Focus on regulating fishery operations to ensure biodiversity. ICCAT works to mitigate juvenile catch. No specific strategies, but using some measures to mitigate</li> <li>• ATLAFCO: Covers 22 countries. Attending all the meetings relevant such as BBNJ. What is occurring in other organizations, ATLAFCO tries to stay ahead and tries to make synergies between organizations. The main objective is to have conversation between Member States and harmonize efforts around fishery resources</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stock assessments</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOBP has a focus on transboundary resources - maintaining stocks</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: looking at how fisheries work helps to reduce impacts - have a 2030 framework</li> <li>• Ecosystem approach to fisheries management</li> <li>• Assessment of fisheries resources (stock assessment) can be useful to biodiversity assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizations that already have mandates based on decisions of member states, but there are different goals used for evaluation – this calls for harmonization</li> <li>• Regional organizations need to go beyond the biodiversity goals</li> <li>• There is a problem of scale, e.g. in fisheries, general goals can be shared at the international level, but to work together there is a need to be more specific. Need to develop quantitative goals, general goals are very unspecific. Some players are absent in the room such as IMO, perhaps try and engage at the regional level</li> <li>• It is looking a bit like spatial planning</li> <li>• At the goal level, need to have a common goal, but the real value lies in the implementation and actions</li> <li>• In this region there is a challenge and an opportunity by having so many organizations, some are much closer to the ground, but it is difficult to get them all together</li> <li>• At the national level there is a need for mechanisms to enforce an integrated approach, but at local level there is more integration.</li> <li>• On relevance of goals A and B, it is shared, sometimes overlapping, sometimes duplicating or complementing: regional approaches will reduce the overlaps and improve complementarity to successfully deliver on the targets</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measuring biodiversity and ensuring it is being conserved – this is a main point for collaboration</li> <li>• CPPS works on both environmental aspect and fisheries aspects</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

	<p>infrastructure. Overlap with the goal in terms of work</p> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nairobi convention: protocols on fauna and flora, and policies at the regional level (MPAs, OECMs)</li> <li>• There has been lots of environmental assessments</li> <li>• Once GBF is adopted, Nairobi Convention would break down these high-level goals to the regional level</li> <li>• Connectivity of MPAs and functioning of habitats: studies but no policy yet</li> <li>• Blue carbon ecosystems - NDCs but how much of that is understood within the frame of environmental experts that do not understand the climate negotiations. And RFBs have not addressed this issue yet</li> <li>• Nairobi Convention guidance on MSP which also addresses equity issues under goal C potentially)</li> <li>• Should be all ecosystems or representative ecosystems</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SACEP: centrally relevant; focus much on coastal ecosystems, fisheries; each country has their own strategy but may need better coordination</li> <li>• COBSEA has marine ecosystems framework</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more communication and coordination between the organizations in this group, but limitations of financial resources</li> <li>• The areas of competence of the organizations in this group overlap somewhere, but they haven't been aware of existence of common interests, so need to work more on raising awareness. IATTC working to have MoU with FFA</li> <li>• IATTC: enormous gaps in the oceans, the Pacific is covered for tuna species, but for other species there is a gap where there is no organization that would cover other marine living resources</li> <li>• There has been an attempt to cover Pacific with RSOs, the open oceans should be managed exactly as they are in smaller geographical areas such as Caribbean. Key message is to stimulate political constituency to develop these institutions that would cover all the regions. BBNJ probably cannot replace the kind of coordination that can take place at the regional level. Curious to see if there has been any more thought on this on UNEP side to build more institutions to cover the whole oceans</li> <li>• UNEP resolution from 2012 asking the regional seas to look into the geographical coverage, this is stemming from that kind of discussion, when the programme was established, the needs at the time were slightly different than there are now. There is a real push and need for such kind of political support at the highest level possible. Are there any countries that think the same? Can UNEP/RSOs do anything to help them so that a decision on this can be taken?</li> <li>• CPPS is one of the organizations that does everything so CPPS could take the political lead for this kind of approach (if there is national support)</li> <li>• Important not to duplicate the efforts</li> <li>• Need to raise the awareness of the CBD in other sectors, incl. fisheries. SDGs are more widely</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

			<p>understood and reported on, but CBD and GBF not very much.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elevating the role of nature in the day to day work. UNEP prioritizes biodiversity at the same level of climate change issues, and pollution issues. Linkages with the food systems, and monitoring. How to increase the stocks, sustainable fishing, this is all linked to biodiversity and conservation. There is a need to monitor and good indicators. Need for engagement, capacity building, continuous role by institutions, including RSOs and RFBs to educate their member states</li> <li>• 30x30 and fisheries: a report on what the fishers think about 30x30, need for honest and open engagement. A perception that environment is taking over fisheries, need different approach</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP: What can organizations do together to do goal A</li> <li>• RSOs have mandate for habitat</li> <li>• RFBs more for species</li> <li>• When you put strengths together: need for collaboration</li> <li>• ATLAFCO: when it comes to the follow up of fish stocks and their evolution, regional networks can ensure an exchange a know-how</li> <li>• Baseline data is important and lacking in deeper areas. Particularly collaboration with regional bodies can help inform that</li> <li>• Biodiversity is conserved: what does that mean? At current level? At previous level?</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity for having common language</li> <li>• Networks of MPAs</li> <li>• There is a toolbox for the region</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint assessments: dialogue has started on how to start a joint assessment – Nairobi Convention-led but in partnership with others</li> <li>• Need to disaggregate the goals to the regional level – what specific habitats and species?</li> <li>• Critical habitats can provide opportunity for collaboration within the region. Critical habitat outlook</li> <li>• Need to go further than EBSAs and VMEs and identify what should be the critical habitats for priority in the region and countries and the regional and national targets</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity would be an important partner to assess</li> <li>• Elevating awareness of the need to have fisheries elements in biodiversity assessments at national level and elevate this to the regional level and collaborate on regional assessments of state of biodiversity</li> <li>• Countries have biodiversity action plans and legislation - need to enhance capacity to do these in robust way - Country level support</li> <li>• Need to understand fisheries as part of biodiversity</li> <li>• Cannot have robust fisheries without biodiversity being healthy</li> </ul>
<p><b>GOAL B:</b> <i>Biodiversity is sustainably used and managed and nature's contributions to people, including ecosystem functions and services currently in decline being restored by [2030] [2050]...</i></p>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICES, OSPAR and HELCOM deal with this regularly</li> <li>• Some RSOs also deal with practical monitoring, (ex. bycatch)</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link with the SDGs</li> <li>• Sustainable tourism</li> <li>• Sustainable production and consumption</li> </ul>	<p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFCM 2030 strategy on Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management</li> <li>• Regional Quality Status Report for Mediterranean and Black Sea</li> <li>• Sustainable production and consumption – fisheries and aquaculture</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptual basis discussed in RSOs but generally not in RFBs</li> <li>• Reliance on ICES to advance?</li> <li>• Silos remaining; each knowing their place</li> <li>• North America is a big influence in terms of approaches</li> <li>• Ecosystem-based management not much addressing the socioeconomic side (HELCOM does stakeholder consultations, though there are no fisheries representatives as stakeholders).</li> </ul>

	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPPS: part of the mandate</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCC strategy includes all stakeholders for discussion. Defining the amount of fish to be caught during the year and this is done per country. And there are joint stock assessment, and which then decide proportionally the amount that each country should fish. The whole region is using the same methodology</li> <li>• Abidjan Conv.: protecting the habitat. Want it to be safe: protecting the environment where the biodiversity is living. Want to restore the best quality of the environment: marine spatial planning; combatting pollution etc</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blue economy strategies (e.g. African Union and regional economic communities and Nairobi Convention is working on this too)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICCAT: Focus on sustainable use of fisheries. Have a scientific committee that calculates maximum sustainable use/allowable catch. Research on very few species: it would be great to add more species</li> <li>• It would be great to increase collaboration and exchange of know how</li> <li>• ICCAT there are fishing observers embarking on fishing vessels</li> <li>• ATLAFCO: Hosting Morocco, which is the leader country in Africa in terms of loading fisheries. Since 2009, ATLAFCO have launched a strategy to stand on three pillars. Sustainability, performance and effectiveness. Need to ensure the sustainable use of what is existing, the fauna and flora and the sea. Could also organize meetings and workshops for the transfer of know-how from Morocco and other parts of the world to the ATLAFCO countries</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are harvesting strategies and advice on both the status of stocks (good stock assessments and evidence to support stock assessments and impacts on ecosystems and bycatch and habitats</li> <li>• Artisanal fisheries are much more complicated than industrial fisheries in terms of solutions and the consequences of the management measures</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p>	<p>(Question of stakeholder engagement a function of distance to coast; interesting to see how the post-2020 GBF will address it)</p> <p>On how to engage the EU on fisheries (trying to get it to talk to itself?), internal coordination issues (ex. on bycatch, management, space, directives); EU still to come up with biodiversity plan</p> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP: Regional Seas should inform and provide data to fishery bodies</li> <li>• Not all MPAs include fishing, and so Regional Seas could inform fishery bodies</li> <li>• Should also highlight activities within CITES, which is important. As some species is endangered</li> <li>• GOBI: Regional Seas and RFBs, it's about understanding thresholds – understanding appropriate advice to support that. Marine spatial planning is the way in which collaboration can come into play. What will be important for 2050 is to engage other sectors as well. Can the convening power of regions include other groups?</li> <li>• When speaking of biodiversity, often speaking of fish, but it includes more than that and there is a need to think wider than just fish</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative impact modelling developed but requires a lot of data and it's data poor (also linked to goal D). (led by Nairobi Convention)</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In another region in working with RFBs, it was clear that regional seas need to be engaged to fully implement the ecosystem approach to fisheries</li> <li>• Stock assessments should be done in collaboration</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEAFDEC: central to SEAFDEC work - working to come up with proper MSY (maximum sust. yield) in each country - supporting capacity in each country to do improved assessments</li> <li>• Also have regional capacity building for assessments</li> <li>• Challenge: good experts retiring and the need to educate new people</li> <li>• Stock assessment happens at regional level</li> <li>• Need for near real-time stock assessment at national and regional levels</li> <li>• Needs to be readily available to inform policy</li> <li>• Difficult to analyze data - need to assist members to do this better</li> <li>• Need for a common approach at the national level to understand potential of fisheries (amount of fish that can be fished)</li> <li>• Some in this group work on sustainable aquaculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to better use available technologies/capacities for different things</li> <li>• Sustainable aquaculture could be an important avenue of collaboration - RSOs can help to provide biodiversity expertise to inform sustainable aquaculture (although many RFBs do not have mandate on aquaculture)</li> </ul>
<p><b>GOAL C: The benefits from the utilization of genetic [and biological] resources are shared fairly and equitably and associated traditional knowledge is appropriately protected.</b></p>	<p><b>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to better integrate</li> </ul> <p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP-MAP's strategy is inspired by the CBD. The specific issue of fair and equitable genetic resources sharing is not applicable</li> <li>• Traditional knowledge is included in the Mediterranean strategy (well documented and protected)</li> </ul> <p><b>Pacific</b></p>	<p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time being it does not apply, the issue hasn't come up</li> <li>• Although there is a possibility that it will become relevant in the future</li> </ul> <p><b>Southeast Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICCAT: now have to consider it more in the way forward. The benefits are financial: one thing ICCAT can do is capacity building, which can contribute to other member countries</li> </ul>	<p><b>North Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICES does have a number of groups working on it, but fisheries generally don't think of genetic resources</li> </ul> <p><b>Southeast Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Talking about genetic resources is often in the context of beyond national jurisdictions. Countries who have the means to gather information on this are not African: those countries need to share the data others such as those in Africa. The data should be commonwealth</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSOs probably don't do a lot on C. SPREP, however, implements Nagoya Protocol, 5-6 of SPREP countries have been working on it</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ocean has no boundaries. There are some shared stocks – the fishes do not belong to only one country. Need to put together for some additional legislation on fishing and conservation – additional protocols – once it is ratified it is binding. If all of them do the same, biodiversity will have room to grow</li> <li>• Also started sensitization about how biodiversity affects fisheries – e.g. mangroves; brought people to do that</li> <li>• BCC has shared species between Namibia and South Africa for example, and use genetic studies to see if they are shared populations or not. In some cases, it was the same stock, and in others it was not. With that, define the size of the fish, and the maturity stage of the fish to see if it is female or male: this helps to define populations for conservation.</li> <li>• Now there is a need to rebuild mangrove</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecosystem approach is used under the Nairobi Convention, but the use of the tool is a different matter, there is a need for capacity building</li> <li>• . This is an area that may require further discussion</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAO SSF Guidelines can be an opportunity but not sure if it has trickled down to implementation yet. The region needs to pay more attention to genetic resources too</li> <li>• The focus is more on fisheries management rather than sharing the benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How could all countries have access to this information?</li> <li>• BBNJ, there is the African body working as a unique body, sometimes with China</li> <li>• RSOs should share advice</li> <li>• This is the least relevant goal at the regional level: important at the global and local level. Regional organizations can highlight and make others aware of problems and inequities: tensions between artisanal and industrial fishing; loss of habitat</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DSI can be used as a tool for conservation including for fisheries management potentially – and this could be an opportunity for collaboration between RSOs and RFBs</li> <li>• Need more collaboration on these issues in the region</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not so relevant, unless BBNJ has role for this region's organizations</li> </ul>
<i>GOAL D: Adequate means of</i>	<i>Mediterranean</i>	<i>Mediterranean</i> • Resources are more than adequate.	<i>North Atlantic</i>

<p><b>implementation</b> [including financial resources, capacity-building, scientific cooperation] and access to and transfer of [technology] [and resources] to fully implement the GBF are secured and employed by Parties with public and private financial flows aligned with the 2050 Vision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity-building; funding: several existing funding mechanisms – Mediterranean trust fund; cooperation</li> <li>• Financial support provided by contracting parties may not be enough to meet all the requirements of the GBF</li> <li>• Once the GBF is approved there’s likely to be more means of implementation</li> </ul> <p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource mobilization and capacity building very important for SPREP</li> <li>• Important to have monitoring of species, need to have more long-term regional studies. Are there any under UNEP/RSOs?</li> <li>• UNEP went through the indicators work, started to support countries to look at the indicators that regions have put together, also in the context of the GBF indicators. Some indicators in the region are somewhat advanced. Challenge of funding, to support those regions that have not been able to have structured indicator framework. Inter-regional support to develop indicators needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Southeast Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCC: The main tool is the agreement between the involved countries, essential about what is shared. Small programs have been set up that can put two-three countries together</li> <li>• Abidjan Conv. has agreements between RSOs and RFBs. There is often confusion on mandates. These</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFCM has secured funds for the implementation of the strategy</li> </ul> <p><b>Southeast Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICCAT: difficult to know what is mandatory and what is optional – that should be clarified</li> <li>• ATLAFCO: need to support capacity-building in Africa, need to focus on inter-agency cooperation</li> <li>• Legal training to build trust</li> <li>• Prosecuting authorities</li> </ul> <p><b>Western Indian</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation of science into management and policy – there are challenges: e.g. If the scientists give proof that the net size is the source of the collapse of fisheries, they recommend ban the net, but the solution is not that – there is an alternative to the net. And the scientists’ job is not to do that. Inter-disciplinary teams are needed to look at solutions that don’t impact livelihoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate means of implementation? Yes, for sustainable use, but not on the biodiversity side</li> <li>• Recent trend towards relatively more funding for biodiversity and marine resources</li> </ul> <p><b>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The challenge of each region can also be the opportunity, need to mobilize resources, can reduce the overheads by sharing resources and collaborating better; it remains difficult, need more capacity and resources for many of the region’s countries; the science and knowledge can build the bridges</li> <li>• The fact that the region jointly developed the new 10-year strategy, by jointly developing the objectives can be shared. Equity is crucial, but geopolitics can prevent proper complementarity because of geopolitical power balances</li> </ul> <p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The benefit of working together is distribution of funds to ensure the implementation of the work programme without duplication</li> </ul> <p><b>Southeast Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder conservation meetings can be useful at the regional level</li> <li>• Exchange of views more formalized about targets and goals are already happening in regional organization. Need to know where actions are already taking place, and where there are gaps</li> <li>• Cooperation and collaboration will aid implementation</li> <li>• For more RSOs and RFBs, it’s about clarifying capacity-building needs at the regional level, it will be supported/funded globally</li> </ul> <p><b>Western Indian</b></p>
---	--	---	---

	<p>are sometimes crossed: whose role is to protect the habitat? And who is the regional fish body? Issue of overlapping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the structures should focus first on their mandate, to avoid overlap</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building should be tailored for both RSOs and RFBs</li> <li>• There have been projects and project proposals promoting collaboration in the region</li> <li>• Guidance on best practices could be developed, including on economic valuation of ES and cost-benefit analysis for EIAs, etc.</li> <li>• Science-policy interface – the scientists are not trained to do the interpretation for policy makers. That’s an area that needs attention. The region’s institutions could be helping interpret science</li> <li>• Opportunity for RSO and RFB to work together to help achieve transfer of technology from developed countries to developing countries (e.g. google X to visually recognize fish) including by identifying the technology that is needed</li> <li>• Capacity building and scientific cooperation is happening, much still needed in the region. Happens at different levels</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information-sharing and technology transfer in a coordinated way at the regional level—happening on a case-by-case basis, but need for improved coordination</li> <li>• Regional approaches to capacity building</li> <li>• Need to consider where resources and capacities can be shared for multiple purposes</li> <li>• Should have an inventory of resources and assets - to see where there are gaps and needs</li> <li>• Knowledge assessment needs to be done to better understand available knowledge</li> <li>• Governments could drive the capacity needs assessments - need to see what member states need, then bring this to regional level</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: organizing various training courses - some of these could be useful for RSOs and biodiversity people also</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional database - regional CHM - could help to see what is already there - this could build on CBD support to national level. CHMs - countries in a region together could ask CBD to help establish regional CHMs</li> <li>• Private sector - agriculture and business people; these are coming in this region</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

### C. Draft Targets of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

For the third breakout group discussions focusing on the draft targets of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, participants continued the discussions in the same regional groups as they did for the previous session. They were asked to discuss the relevance of the draft targets to the work of RSOs, RFBs, and the relevance for regional coordination and collaboration, considering the questions of (i) how the post-2020 targets align with existing regional targets/efforts of RSOs and RFBs or those currently under development, and (ii) how the post-2020 targets present opportunities to strengthen regional coordination and collaboration between RSOs and RFBs.

Table 5. Synthesis of breakout group discussions on the draft targets of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, organized by the regional groups.

Draft GBF targets <sup>4</sup> (keywords)	Relevance to RSOs	Relevance to RFBs	Relevance for regional coordination/collaboration
<i>1. Reducing threats to biodiversity</i>			
<i>1. Biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning</i>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch all one for everybody – spatial planning (mountain or ocean spaces): MSP is very specific (3-dimensional context). MSP is absolutely relevant for RSOs, also for RFBs</li> <li>• Connectivity and integrity – should also include representativity</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RECOFI has not been much involved in spatial planning work. Adopting and gearing specific regulations, but not spatial planning. Important but depends on the area in question</li> <li>• IOTC: nursery areas closure for yellow fin tuna but re-opened 2 years later</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevancy varies from one organization to another</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There hasn't been so much engagement in MSP processes but potential for the RFBs to also share info to help get the fisheries sector to inform cross-sectoral spatial planning.</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Recommendation adopted by the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Nairobi, June 2022. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/recommendations/wg2020-04/wg2020-04-rec-01-en.pdf>

- SWIOFC: There are spatial management measures but not putting it to wider framework
- Nairobi Convention: has a Strategy for MSP and capacity building for MSP

#### *Wider Caribbean & Central America*

- Some have a protocol (Barcelona etc.) – overall relevant, but degree will vary from RSO to RSO, it might be included in their work plan. Without a protocol, there is a need to deliberately introduce it
- In Caribbean yes, but it is not explicitly mentioned
- It might not be specifically mentioned, but it will be very difficult to achieve the protocol without it
- The practice is usually done at country-level, encouraging countries to follow this approach

#### *Mediterranean*

- Significant work on ICZM
- MSP framework adopted by the majority of Parties

#### *Pacific*

- CPPS has MSP project with UNESCO, recipients of MSP Challenge, training people how to do MSP. Ecuador and other countries working together on MSP
- This is relevant, especially with respect to coastal zone management
- UNEP: regional seas strategic document with the support of regional seas, it is clear that the orgs are working on these issues, looking at ways how to ensure better management

- Not part of the founding document or the high-level framework, and it is specifically mentioned in the strategic plan and in the work plans, there are some working groups that are more connected like spawning aggregation of some species
- In the Pacific, organizations are worried about this topic

#### *Mediterranean*

- Providing support for the allocation of space for aquaculture

#### *Pacific*

- Aware of it, but cannot do it by themselves. MSP is being used at the national level, but can be used at the regional level, it is something for the future. At the science level, there are opportunities, good spatial research including habitat models, dynamics and spatial management areas that have been modeled, precursor of the MSP work is there. It's not a foreign concept, but so far as a scientific exercise only, not applied to policy

#### *Southeast Atlantic*

- ATLAFCO: organizing workshops for the transfer of knowledge on MSP at the national level. The RFBs could add their input into the marine spatial planning plans
- WCMC: RFBs have a role in marine spatial planning as it has cross-sectoral dimensions. It is important to identify ecological considerations

#### *South and Southeast Asia*

- SEAFDEC: major focus on EAF and supporting countries - in Gulf of Thailand and in Andaman Sea there is an EAF—

- More at the national level mainly. SFF guidelines also important for this process of MSP. Where artisanal fisheries are located (through mapping) and to support countries in engaging in best practices to recognize areas used by IPLCs. Importance of essential fish habitats, need to be included in MSP not only for conservation but also sustainability to keep the fish productivity. Understanding the life cycle of species
- A tool to use including the IPLCs

#### *Wider Caribbean & Central America*

- Desire to work together with everyone – for regional collaboration and coordination it is key
- If there is a recognition that the region's countries need capacity building, the organizations can tap into the regional expert groups, all have planning expertise to come and help countries
- Usually, countries want to control the consultations, but they trust the regional teams, so they ask the Cartagena Convention to come and work with them
- Coordination will provide extra resources to fill gaps. Organizations like UNEP provide support, but then the COPs decide on transboundary matters
- Need to have the dialogue to ensure complementarity. The strength of the steering committee also dictates

#### *South and Southeast Asia*

	<p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is national but RSOs bring them together, but it's not really relevant to RFBs</li> <li>• For RSOs this is going to be important and there is already work being done</li> <li>• Abidjan Conv. has many programs now on spatial planning in Ghana, Togo and Senegal. Trying to put guidelines to harmonize implementation methods</li> <li>• BCC established national working groups in each country, using the same methodology the marine spatial planning areas were identified. Transboundary areas were also defined. The national working groups continue working on these</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COBSEA: GIZ toolkits on MSP - how they're connected with MPAs</li> <li>• SACEP: Member countries engaged in their own approaches to spatial planning - discussed in SACEP process but not any regional work yet</li> <li>• MSP guidelines that need to be taken from regional level to national level</li> </ul>	<p>national ICZM could be integrated into EAF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some RFBs implement survey at sea, to assess status of stocks, can be contribution to MSP approaches</li> <li>• Stock specific information on issues such as distribution and abundance can be useful information for spatial planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOBP partners in projects related to MSP with other environment-related partners</li> <li>• Could be a regional platform for spatial planning; capacity exists, but need support to facilitate this and bring all stakeholders to the table</li> <li>• Work to standardize data collection can help support spatial planning</li> <li>• Working with universities - results of research need to be tailored to purposes of spatial planning across sectors</li> <li>• Much interest in this topic in the context of blue economy in the region</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Ecosystem restoration</b></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nairobi Convention: Development of guidelines for restoration: for mangroves and seagrass beds, active restoration programmes for these habitats</li> <li>• Restoration can be an alternative livelihood for communities (but more done at the local level). Need guidance on how to work in multi-use areas, e.g. mollusks in seagrass beds</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ID essential fish habitats and restoring them</li> <li>• SWIOFC: working with fisheries, communities and environmental ministries when it comes to destructive fishing practices when working on restoration</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For RFBs, most of the work is done at the country level, and they don't necessarily buy into the RFBs plans. RFBs don't work on it directly, but recognize that it is very</li> </ul>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The difficulty of going back from conservation measures</li> <li>• Disconnect / differences between the focus on sustainable use by fisheries, and biodiversity conservation concerns. From a fisheries perspective, restoration refers to continued sustainable use (see here targets 5 and 9)</li> <li>• On habitats and fish populations, supporting other species by protecting</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a difficult subject, can think of small spots, it may have advanced far in the local spatial planning, very difficult to practice restoration across large areas. Should it only be done at the local level, if it is done at many local sites.</li> <li>• Cartagena Convention: it is very relevant to the Convention, e.g., mangrove restoration, also together with protected areas and species conservation</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Action Plan for marine vegetation, dark habitats, coralligenous</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP: project guidelines developed by RSOs on mangrove restoration, seagrasses, ongoing projects on habitat restoration</li> <li>• Working how restoration with good scientific base can be scaled up. Looking at genotypes, species diversity etc.</li> <li>• GBF targets very useful for NOWPAP</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCC gave the example of mangroves, e.g. in Angola where they were destroyed and are being replanted. CFOs are also involved in that</li> <li>• Abidjan Conv. has mangrove restoration: the restoration and the natural regeneration, this is depending on the level of degradation; and the coastline itself. Trying to control the erosion too. Also putting some additional protocols to help countries protect the ecosystem</li> </ul>	<p>important. There is an interest and commitments to support this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider black reefs, actions will not come from the RSOs, it should be driven by the RFBs, but still the focus is not directly relevant to ecosystem restoration, it is more focused on regulating fishing efforts and considering species conservation and reproduction. The question is who does what? Local activities are usually driven by countries, but we coordinate</li> <li>• Always limited by the country/geopolitical issues, therefore fisheries are considered as economic sectors of the industry/job creation of a country</li> <li>• Fisheries have always been early advocates to stop</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Science is there, have ecosystem models showing that ecosystems have greatly deteriorated, but there are no reference points on what the ecosystem would be where we want it to be. This process could provide more clarity on this. Lot of opportunities as far as science providing answers</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATLAFCO: seeking to stabilize fishermen in spots instead of being spread; within the nurseries artificial reefs are used for the restoration of ecosystems, trying to teach fishermen how to use them</li> <li>• Trying to bring fishermen to create cooperatives and teach them to use resources. Raising awareness on considering the approach of circular economy</li> </ul>	<p>a key one (tuna for example). All about the wider ecosystem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passive restoration vs active restoration</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A need to understand the connectivity and life cycle of fish and their habitats and then cooperate with RSOs. There is a need to do this more collaboratively e.g. mangroves in Mozambique in a fishing bait area. And all levels involved including IPLCs</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same for RSOs, RFBs and collaboration</li> <li>• There is a need for a battery of tools to achieve any of these targets</li> <li>• The tricky part is that countries may be reluctant to endorse it if it is at regional level due to reporting responsibilities and the resources required for it. Country targets may need more ambition</li> <li>• It is still relevant where the tool is acceptable, but what can be done is limited by what is regarded as a priority or is possible at the national level</li> <li>• If a manual is available, it becomes a tool with a single investment</li> <li>• When reporting or monitoring, it should happen at the local level, while decisions with regards to goals and targets are made at the international and regional level</li> <li>• It always depends on the context</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biological risk is another tool: possibly ban the catch of something</li> <li>• ICCAT does not do restoration itself but does do research. Perhaps can provide scientific information and research to RSOs</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOBP involved in programme to have students sent to other places to learn more about ecosystems</li> <li>• RFBs with mandate on aquaculture need to be centrally involved in restoration efforts</li> <li>• Aquaculture-based sea-ranching</li> <li>• Supporting installations of artificial reefs</li> <li>• Fish-plus, fish highway to allow fish to properly migrate upstream - preventing habitat degradation</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coral reefs and fisheries – collaboration crucial</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good practice: draw on information provided from the UN Decade of Restoration which has produced a lot of guidelines</li> <li>• ICCAT: Perhaps can provide scientific information and research to RSOs</li> <li>• Research can help understand where fisheries are low</li> <li>• UNEP: there is active restoration but also passive restoration when the pressure is being alleviated. RFB’s work are a form of restoration</li> <li>• Working on an ecosystem or on a species goes hand in hand</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEAFDEC inputs to COBSEA-led project on ecosystem restoration (such as mangroves, seagrass)</li> <li>• Integrating fisheries component into coastal zone habitat management - already being done in a number of projects in southeast Asia</li> <li>• RFBs with mandate on aquaculture need to be centrally involved in restoration efforts</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Protected areas, OECMs</b></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nairobi Convention: MPA outlook produced. Chances of achieving 30 x 30 by 2030 will be a challenge for many through MPAs. OECMs – VMEs ok, PSSAs ok, OECMs re LMMAs – one of the best option for WIO. But need for a legislative</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for guidance on Fisheries OECMs</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing there yet, but very relevant</li> <li>• OECM would be more relevant to fisheries than protected areas</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination at the national level on how to coordinate spatial measures to harmonize / map where the different spatial measures are</li> <li>• Collaboration between RFBs and RSOs is absolutely important</li> </ul>

framework for LMMAs at the national level

#### *Mediterranean*

- SPA/RAC
- SPAMIs – SPA Mediterranean interest

#### *Pacific*

- In the Pacific, embracing protected areas, but those should be more balanced with sustainable use and economic considerations
- Countries very interested in PAs, OECMs discussion is ongoing

#### *Southeast Atlantic*

- Abidjan Conv. is assisting countries to create new marine protected areas. Helping them to have action plans and implement them and have some transboundary protected areas so that the management structure can be jointly put in place
- BCC: Each country has its own marine protected area. BCC began at the regional level using the same methodology to find transboundary areas

#### *South and Southeast Asia*

- Very important for RSOs
- COBSEA working on network of MPAs as part of new strategy, and on MPA toolkit and sustainable livelihoods
- SACEP: very important, most work done at member state level, regional level can only proceed as far as national level interest and work goes.–But, regional organizations play a key role to accelerate these activities at national level

#### *Southeast Atlantic*

- ATLAFCO: Protected areas sometimes overlap between countries, e.g. Mauritania. Trying to take advantage of complementarity between countries: help them set up rules, exchange know-how

#### *South and Southeast Asia*

- BOBP has training programme with GIZ on MPA management
- Management methods for MPA management
- OECMs are still new and there is no clear guidance on national level on how to proceed - so RFBs have critical role to raise awareness on OECMs and use and adapt FAO guidance on fisheries OECMs

- Without BBNJ will be even harder to achieve 30% but there is a need for balance to also protect the coastal waters where a lot of important biodiversity occurs
- Quantity vs quality: how to ensure the qualitative elements are achieved. MPA managers and local communities and fisheries managers can work together to effectively protect, manage the MPAs and addressing IPLCs concerns
- At the national level there are committees for coordination where fisheries and environmental ministries are together, but the regional conventions should also provide a platform for collaboration and provide a way to channel funding
- Need for coordination on MCS techniques in the region to ensure compliance with MPA and OECM measures

#### *Wider Caribbean & Central America*

- All of these are of relevance to both groups, recognizing they have shared but different stakes of interests, so at times overlapping. It is key to collaborate towards efficient use of resources, managing conflicted interests, optimize complementarity. These all need to be balanced and to come out with a mix of activities, all of these tools and targets are needed to achieve the goals. It depends on the resources available to an entity/area
- Need to achieve all of these targets in such a way that all of the targets can be accomplished

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key: reinforcing the relevance of this type of engagement, to talk to each other and potential efficiencies that can be achieved</li> <li>• There is now so much greater focus on planning in an integrated and inclusive manner, in order to include all the factors</li> <li>• Can this be successfully achieved by only having RFBs and RSOs – no, need to include different stakeholders in different areas, such as oil and gas industry. These should not be left out</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSSAs, FRA (Fisheries restricted Areas)</li> <li>• Note: national implementation of MPAs</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OECMs affect both fisheries management and biodiversity</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For this target: need to work on eliminating the overlap in between the RSOs and RFBs mandates</li> <li>• The first three targets are primarily for RSOs but RFBs have a contribution to make</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key area of collaboration between RSOs and RFBs</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Species recovery and conservation</b></p>	<p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both relevant, but sharks might be listed in Cartagena Convention, without</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RECOFI: Fisheries management and seasonal closures are widely accepted and supported and limit the size of the fish, and</li> </ul>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 2 above</li> <li>• Concept of essential fish habitats: for ex protecting juveniles – if ICES</li> </ul>

	<p>acknowledging that fisheries management is done with sharks</p> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Action Plans for monk seal, cartilaginous species, sea birds, sea turtles, marine mammals</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge for some organizations that are not working on this</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abidjan Conv.: For target 4, baseline studies are done to know biodiversity in the area. Then assessments are done later on and measures are taken</li> <li>• BCC has measures like closure of areas/ biological risk that can help</li> <li>• For species that are not commercial and that are endangered, conservation is important. That differentiates this target from target 5</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SACEP: supporting member states to work on this - governing council discusses work by member states</li> <li>• COBSEA: working on dugongs and turtles through MoU under context CMS</li> </ul>	<p>mesh size. But no assessment yet to check if these measures have been effective to improve the status of the stocks. But fishermen are happy and are catching bigger fish - empirical observation – need to scientifically assess</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear mandate to manage certain stocks, and some may be on vulnerable situation, and bycatch – those are regulated under national legislation. For RECOFI mandate – straddling highly migratory – shared stock – but just targeted species</li> <li>• SWIOFC: only advisory body – not RFMO – focus on stock assessment but mandate on minimizing bycatch but no binding resolutions</li> <li>• IOTC: MoU with ACCAP, so potential for them to work on bycatch issues</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant, even though there are different annexes</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bluefin tuna, very strong program and measure, as an example, very good results, management across the Pacific Ocean, harvest control rules</li> <li>• Going past the thresholds, chance for ecosystem and economic collapse</li> <li>• Is it more difficult to implement species recovery? For non-target species, yes. IATTC adopted strong measures for dolphins’ death associated with fisheries, very few number of dolphins are now killed because of very strong measures implemented, great success. Planning an ambitious study to assess the population status of bluefins. But monitoring is the problem, and then coming up with the</li> </ul>	<p>advises on an important juvenile habitat, a mandate on fisheries measures is possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities there: ICES advice would help. → Possible interactions that could be looked at</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishers need to be more involved on the listing of vulnerable species to understand why they need to take these measures and possible solutions</li> </ul> <p><i>Wider Caribbean &amp; Central America</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One thing that comes forward is that who will do what? There are already differentiated responsibilities, but have to work together, need to respect the responsibilities, whether it be food security or agriculture, but RSOs have more of a landscape approach</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CMS, CITES</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint assessments would be good</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

		<p>rebuilding plan. For some species, they cannot even do assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing target species based on assessments</li> <li>• IATTC have banning measures, finding techniques to mitigate. Strong measures to protect seabirds. Reporting by observers</li> <li>• IATTC always had species conservation measures through the mitigation efforts like mitigating bycatch. Providing science too</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target 5 should be number 4 because they are connected</li> <li>• ICCAT: a lot of the work is about recovering stock. Not just tuna – mitigation of bycatch</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEAFDEC has scientific working group on species - technical advice on how to sustainably utilize specific species - stock status of species using national and FAO data</li> <li>• Regional action plan for tuna, mackerel, etc.</li> <li>• Previous work on national action plan on bycatch management</li> <li>• BOBP: regional action plan on hilsa, sharks - technical support on programme management</li> <li>• Avoiding marine mammal bycatch</li> <li>• Work on capacity building on bycatch management - implementing FAO guideline on this</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

<p><b>5. Sustainable harvest, trade and use of wild species</b></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nairobi Convention: engagement in value chain and listed species on the flora and fauna protocol, there could be coordination with CITES and CMS</li> <li>• Collaboration on IUU especially with regards to bycatch of these species</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitation of the amount of what is being used: total allowable catch</li> <li>• This target is more relevant to RFBs. But, trying to ensure best ecosystem condition for biodiversity to grow</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for work on low impact fishing methods. This is being promoted, but ghost fishing is an issue that needs further attention and implementation</li> <li>• EAF work: Nansen programme supports that and policy support in part of the region.</li> <li>• Aquaculture: there is some guidance but not regulations or nothing in detail (biosecurity). SPF – not local but used in aquaculture – big challenge</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharks – detailed and strong resolutions and measures, ways to treat different species differently</li> <li>• Parties reporting on this target – is this a burden for RFBs?</li> <li>• Fish cannot be traded if it wasn't captured respecting the rules of the organization (IATTC)</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This goal has more to do with RFBs</li> <li>• ICCAT: Sustainable harvest is linked with target 4. Trade of wild species – ICCAT works with CITES, such as giving them information, e.g. on sharks</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing frameworks for stock assessment and capacity development</li> <li>• BOBP: guidelines and regional frameworks for combatting IUU; IT solutions to address IUU</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: regional platform for the development of several tools to reduce IUU - member countries working to address IUU; guidelines on preventing fish and</li> </ul>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clear what the difference is between 5 and 9</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES is engaging in value chain – very important area for collaboration with RSOs and RFBs. Including on bycatch. Collaboration exists (RECOFI and PERSGA) but room for further work. FAO and all RFMOs are starting to engage in CITES work with the potential for further collaboration. Port State Measures Agreement – links to the whole value chain</li> <li>• Joint development of methodologies on lower impact of gear would be good to do at the regional level because not enough capacity at the national level</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is much more relevant for RFBs (RSOs more likely to focus on target 4 and RFBs on target 5)</li> </ul>
---	---	--	---

		<p>fisheries products from IUU - traceability system for products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RFBs could consider how to better engage on implementation of Port State Measures Agreement</li> <li>• SEAFDEC provides training course on implementing PSMA</li> <li>• RFBs could consider opportunity to work more on Port State Measures Agreement</li> <li>• SEAFDEC: establishment of MCS network</li> <li>• BOBP has a Regional Plan of Action on MCS</li> <li>• Trade issues could be better dealt with in RFB discussions and work</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Invasive alien species</b></p>	<p><b>Western Indian</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nairobi Conv.: there used to be a programme, incl. on ballast water with IMO depending on the demand of the countries, but not high profile right now</li> <li>• Maybe one programme in PERSGA</li> </ul> <p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Action plan for NIS SPA/RAC</li> <li>• Protocol for ballast water</li> </ul> <p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NOWPAP conducting some research on IAS</li> <li>• CPPS project - the idea is to know what the baselines are, being able to identify the IAS. There is a discussion on having a new convention/plan on biofouling, for IAS transport, in the Pacific</li> <li>• Thinking about new technology on IAS</li> <li>• UNEP: in their strategy, priority for IAS, prioritized issues such as sargassum, lot of work being done by Cartagena convention, lots of research published and ongoing efforts</li> </ul>	<p><b>Western Indian</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RECOFI: guidelines on sustainable aquaculture includes some recommendation on IAS</li> </ul> <p><b>South and Southeast Asia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOBP: consultation on how invasive seaweed (including through seaweed) affects commercially important species</li> </ul>	<p><b>North Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not everyone works on IAS, but there is potential for that (pink salmon, other); managing the pathways, not exactly eradicating</li> <li>• Difference between “natural” migration of species (climate change related) and introduction</li> </ul> <p><b>Western Indian</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less examples in this region</li> <li>• The monitoring of the status (joint ecosystems surveys) could be an opportunity for collaboration on these issues (including on Redtide, jelly fish – a problem), and to understand the impact of IAS on fisheries and aquaculture production and human health</li> </ul> <p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPPS: project on IAS and biofouling, fisheries ships are not exempt from that. Ship is going to be classified at</li> </ul>



	<p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are too many nutrients in the water, which is why IAS are growing. Creating guidelines for waste and pollution management</li> <li>• It is not just about nutrients, sometimes IAS are brought through climate change for example</li> <li>• Jellyfish is polluting because the temperature is raising, and the predators (sea turtles) are no longer around. Sea grass, brought from the Red Sea because of the Suez Canal</li> <li>• Perhaps this is something more for RSOs to work on with the IMO, rather than the fisheries, as what needs to be done is reducing the pathways for invasive alien species to arrive</li> <li>• BCC has an interdisciplinary monitoring group working on this</li> </ul> <p><i>South and Southeast Asia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not always addressed in RSOs but could use GBF as a reason to bring this to the forefront of discussions</li> <li>• Biofouling projects (workshops) for member states in SACEP</li> </ul>		<p>different levels. This is going to affect fisheries, the hauls have to be cleaner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot of interaction between shipping and fishing industries in the whole Asia Pacific region</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSOs and RBFs need to collaborate: When there is a big collaboration of invasive species, they consume the oxygen in the water which has negative impact on fisheries</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Pollution reduction</b></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nairobi Convention and possibly others in the region have standards and good practices on land sources of pollution and a whole protocol on emergency pollution</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme for the Assessment and Control of Marine Pollution in the Mediterranean (MED POL)</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to do more to reduce marine litter from fishing boats. Need more training and education</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of pollution on fisheries done through GFCM</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NAFO does have an element in its Convention to minimize it; regular reporting on lost gear. Reporting against these targets?</li> <li>• On the importance of reporting (on SDGs or other), maybe possible to report on global percentages without anyone taking the glory? That would work with OECMs, with reporting following CBD criteria.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abidjan Conv.: Protecting against pollution is part of the core mandate. Pollution by land base use. Putting in place protocols and guidelines to analyze how countries manage the waste. In this area, starting to speak about plastic pollution</li> <li>BCC has identified the hotspots of pollution and now are in the process of monitoring. For mining and oil, desire to incentivize the enforcement: agreement to enforce a fine for the company when there is a spill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific measures, observers have to report any kind of discharge</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ICCAT has rules to prohibit abandoning the fishing gear, and encourage Member States to use degradable fishing gear</li> </ul>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lost gears: ghost fishing – need cooperation between RSOs and RFBs to adapt more monitoring and marking of these gears, and limited number by fishermen</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EcAp/IMAP covers targets 1-7</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lots of work on pollution</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marine litter or marine debris assessments would be very helpful</li> <li>Need to put more guidelines to avoid misunderstandings, for example for petrol accident assessments among countries</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Minimizing climate change impacts on biodiversity</b></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change strategy – need for strengthening national level strategies in the marine context. What has not been done is what does it mean to report on the NDCs, what should be a commitment on the blue carbon ecosystems? That’s where more investment can be done in tandem with target 2. The funding mechanism and prioritization for funding of blue carbon is not understood beyond climate change regime. The climate change strategy speaks very little about marine environment. Ocean acidification – how to improve resilience – collaborative partnership with other institutions</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p>	<p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less relevant – mitigation, but more about detecting the effects on fisheries and how to incorporate in management.</li> <li>Climate change has a huge impact and collaboration is needed with RSOs</li> </ul> <p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution of fish stocks because of climate change</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committed to mitigation measures</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ICCAT: IOTC has adopted a resolution on ethical climate change. Need to collaborate: RFBs cannot tackle this problem alone</li> </ul>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For fisheries, more a matter of adaptation; potential for carbon footprint consideration, but very complex at international level. Impacts of climate change on fisheries too recent / the last 10 years. EU allowing for stability in the face of those impacts for individual countries. More work could be done on monitoring. ICES provides some info but need for more information on longer term impacts</li> </ul> <p><i>Western Indian</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need exchange of information to inform management</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess possible impacts of climate change on MPAs; distribution of species and vulnerable species</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efforts by some RSCs, deliberate efforts to assist their countries to include marine ecosystems within NDCs, mangrove and seagrass contribution. Discussions on blue carbon</li> <li>Already identified polar shifting of species. In the Pacific, species are shifting too</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSOs: this is related to targets 1-3</li> <li>This work will promote climate change refuges for species</li> <li>Restoring ecosystems plays a big role in restoring rain season in the area</li> <li>RSOs need to quantify carbon capture and storage opportunities</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SWIOFC in partnership with Nairobi convention is partnership for resilience for local communities</li> <li>Need more collaboration</li> </ul> <p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For those countries that are on the losing sides of climate impacts, what's going to happen?</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNEP: Mitigation can only do so much. Adaptation is the key thing here for RSOs: how to adapt in the Ocean? E.g. tuna migratory routes might change</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Meeting people's needs through sustainable use and benefit-sharing</b></p>			
<p><b>9. Sustainable management and use of wild species</b></p>	<p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targets 9-13 are more relevant to RFBs.</li> <li>Abidjan Conv.: Trying to tackle the issue of destroying mangroves for financial benefits at the source. And trying to focus on other forms of energy: solar energy... to reduce pressure on ecosystem</li> <li>BCC has a project to reduce dependence on sea/sea activities. For example, by advising communities on how to deal with fish: technique, material to use, lifecycles</li> </ul>	<p><i>Mediterranean</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relation with target 6</li> <li>Management plans for NIS (including in the Black Sea)</li> </ul> <p><i>Southeast Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATLAFCO's role is to gather people for consultation and have a common approach</li> </ul>	<p><i>North Atlantic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problems with terminology, with negative impacts on the potential for cooperation ("transition to sustainability" takes as a point of departure that there is no sustainability; fisheries react against such a proposition, which turns out to be counterproductive). There is space for improvement. Difference between sustaining yields and sustaining ecosystems</li> <li>Careful with projecting one's region to other regions; awareness of big differences between regions</li> </ul>

<p><b>10. Sustainable aquaculture, fisheries</b></p>		<p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires reflection because it's a national competence. GFCM can provide training, indicators, but cannot go as far as agreeing on a licensing system. Supporting the countries on the zoning. Working on improving the image of the product/ consumer perception</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source for collaboration, helping to understand ecosystem impacts of aquaculture, and considering social indicators</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Restore, maintain and enhance ecosystem services</b></p>	<p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directly linked to target 1, 2</li> </ul>	<p><b>Mediterranean</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directly linked to target 1, 2</li> <li>• Work related to aquaculture; management and control will come at a later stage</li> </ul>	<p><b>North Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From fisheries' perspective, food is the main service - but there's also recreation and other services</li> <li>• Differing views on which socioeconomic benefits are prioritized</li> </ul> <p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building healthy and resilient ecosystems</li> </ul>
<p><b>12. Green and blue spaces in urban and densely populated areas</b></p>	<p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not very relevant</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not very relevant</li> </ul>	
<p><b>13. Fair and equitable access/sharing of benefits to/from genetic resources</b></p>	<p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant for SPREP</li> </ul>		
<p><b>3. Tools and solutions for implementation and mainstreaming</b></p>			
<p><b>14. Mainstreaming biodiversity in policies, strategies, regulations across sectors</b></p>	<p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pacific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important, increase mainstreaming in what is being done</li> </ul>	<p><b>North Atlantic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fisheries organizations have been doing it for years. Cooperation and strengthening ties between RSOs and RFMBs. This should get captured and brought back to CBD --&gt; importance of reporting</li> </ul> <p><b>Pacific</b></p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the strategies and action plans of conventions, taking into consideration biodiversity, and how to collaborate – through MoUs with RFBs. Getting together environment and fisheries ministries and officers would be helpful</li> </ul>
<b>15. Business and biodiversity</b>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental sector could engage with businesses more strongly, still not sure where to go, so potential to learn from RFB on this</li> </ul>		<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further developing the ideas of blue economy. But everyone seems to have their own definition of blue economy</li> <li>• Private sector participating in the regional processes</li> <li>• Important to associate private sector with the regional organizations' efforts. Example – MoU of IATTC with Ecuadoran private sector - the Tuna Conservation Group (TUNACONS) of Ecuador for the development of a pilot project on prototypes of non-enmeshing and degradable FADs; Promoting participation of the private sector with RFBs. Also, through the system of observers, private sector is involved in IATTC activities. Some of IATTC research funded by the private sector</li> </ul>
<b>16. Sustainable consumption choices</b>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are consumers aware of sustainability? states often manage this on their own</li> <li>• Need more awareness, communication of best choices</li> <li>• Plastic and waste from food, SPREP/CPPS are working on that</li> <li>• It also speaks to sustainable management, the measures that are put in place to manage coastal ecosystems, it relates to this target too, how the resources are being used</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very aligned, result of many certification processes. The consumer in the supermarket can search for the stamp on the label. There is a lot of collaboration within the industry</li> <li>• IATTC have a unique position as they have their own eco label, has been negotiated on and accepted, 1998 agreement, through the system of observers, screening</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More potential for consensus, and conservation measures</li> <li>• RSOs collaborating with other sectors on wastewater and nutrient management, collaboration with agricultural sectors, this could also include other MEAs</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How wastewater is being used, and nutrient management, plastics, working with sectors responsible for agriculture, to spread awareness on sustainable use of fertilizer etc.</li> </ul>		
<b>17. Adverse impacts of biotechnology</b>		<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering genetic analysis of different kinds of species, but not really involved in this</li> </ul>	
<b>18. Eliminate subsidies/incentives harmful for biodiversity</b>		<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important for fisheries but IATTC not involved in implementation, although it can provide information</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be more relevant to also agricultural sector and nutrients runoff. Subsidies for agriculture. Need awareness raising on how this would affect the oceans. Effects of eutrophication. Excessive use of fertilizers. Also relevant to the discussion on plastics, and use of chemicals</li> </ul>
<b>19.1 Increase financial resources</b>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting countries in blue bonds, innovative ways of funding. Support for communities to come up with restoration projects, and then sell the bonds</li> <li>• Important target for developing countries. Can the GEF processes be more accessible? At this moment it can take at least a few years to get a project through GEF</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IATTC created a capacity building fund which was first voluntary, and now forms 10% of the annual budget of the organization, and all members have to contribute to it</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working together on fundraising to support joint activities. Exploring options with GEF too</li> <li>• UNEP, UNDP, Global Fund for Coral Reefs – opportunities for collaboration</li> </ul>
<b>19.2 Strengthen capacity-building and development, transfer of technology, technical/scientific cooperation</b>		<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant and very similar to IATTC strategic plan</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important area for collaboration, decade on ocean science. But still a lot of room for inter-regional cooperation. Building partnerships</li> </ul>
<b>20. Knowledge and information sharing</b>		<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant and very similar to IATTC strategic plan</li> </ul>	

<p><b>21. Participation in decision-making</b></p>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some RSCs have youth representation and IPLCs in their meetings and conferences of Parties</li> <li>• SPREP started a project involving youth professionals</li> </ul>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This target is related more to national level, but IATTC ensures full participation within its processes – members participation from developing countries, nobody should be excluded because of lack of financing. Also, other entities, IATTC has special article on transparency, ensuring that information is widely and transparently circulated, ensured participation of NGOs. The input of everybody in their discussions is important</li> </ul>	
<p><b>22. Gender equality, mainstreaming gender in biodiversity goals</b></p>	<p><i>Pacific</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSCs – gender requirement, making sure that whatever is being done has a gender lens to it</li> <li>• Important in the Pacific region, as there is strong gender separation. Important to engage women to get a full balance of views and management options</li> </ul>		