
Advance and unedited reporting material

ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OPEN-ENDED INFORMAL CONSULTATIVE PROCESS ON OCEANS AND THE LAW OF THE SEA (21-25 June 2010)

CO-CHAIRPERSONS' SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS¹

1. The eleventh meeting of the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea (the “Informal Consultative Process”) was held from 21 to 25 June 2010 and, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/71, focused its discussions on the topic entitled “Capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science”.
2. The meeting was attended by representatives of 89 Member States, 27 intergovernmental organizations and other bodies and 11 non-governmental organizations.
3. The following supporting documentation was available to the meeting: (a) report of the Secretary-General on oceans and the law of the sea (A/65/69); and (b) format and annotated provisional agenda of the meeting (A/AC.259/L.11).

Agenda items 1 and 2: Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

4. The meeting was opened by Thomas Stelzer, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, on behalf of the Secretary-General. In his statement, he noted that adequate capacity-building could enable States to effectively implement the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and other legal instruments, and support the achievement of commitments set out in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.
5. Ms. Patricia O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, the Legal Counsel, underlined that the effectiveness and the sustainability of the outcomes of

¹ The summary is intended for reference purposes only and not as a record of the discussions.

capacity-building activities and initiatives suffered from the lack of a comprehensive needs assessment, limited information exchange, the absence of comprehensive outcome assessments and low levels of coordination amongst the various entities engaged in these activities and initiatives.

6. The two Co-Chairpersons, Paul Badji (Senegal) and Don MacKay (New Zealand) noted that the topic of focus was not only timely, but also of fundamental importance to the implementation of UNCLOS and other law of the sea-related instruments. They underscored that capacity-building was at the heart of States' abilities to benefit fully from the oceans and their resources. The Co-Chairpersons also drew attention to the critical status of the Voluntary Trust Fund established by resolution 55/7 for the purpose of assisting developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small islands developing States (SIDS) and landlocked developing States, in attending the meetings of the Informal Consultative Process.

7. The meeting adopted the format and annotated agenda and approved the organization of work.

Agenda item 3: General exchange of views

8. The discussions held on the topic of focus at the plenary meetings and within the panels are reflected in paragraphs 10 to 83 below.

9. Delegations expressed their appreciation for the report of the Secretary-General on oceans and the law of the sea. Several delegations noted with concern, in particular, the report's finding that no comprehensive assessment had been carried out at the global level of the capacity-building needs of States in relation to ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science. Some delegations expressed regret that the report did not include the input of States, since the General Assembly, in its resolution 64/71, had not requested the Secretary-General to seek their views and hoped that this information might be obtained on a subsequent occasion.

Area of focus: capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science

10. In accordance with the annotated agenda, discussions in the panel were structured around four segments: (1) assessing the need for capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science; (2) overview of capacity-building activities/initiatives in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science and transfer of technology; (3) challenges for achieving effective capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science and transfer of technology; and (4) new approaches, best practices and opportunities for improved capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea. The segments were launched by presentations from panellists. The presentations were followed by discussions.

11. The general view was expressed that capacity-building was essential to ensure that all States, especially developing countries, were able to implement UNCLOS, benefit from the sustainable development of the oceans, and participate fully in global and regional forums dealing with ocean affairs and the law of the sea. Several delegations noted that UNCLOS was the legal framework for all ocean issues and ocean-related activities, including capacity-building.

12. Many delegations highlighted difficulties for developing countries to exercise their rights under UNCLOS and benefit from the oceans. The view was expressed that, in order to realize lasting peace and security in the oceans and their sustainable use, it was essential to enable developing countries to participate in ocean affairs on an equal footing, and assist them in managing, and exploiting the resources of the seas, including those under their jurisdiction. Several delegations underlined that capacity-building should aim at developing capacities for effective participation in economic activities, in particular in sustainable fisheries, and should not be limited to the implementation of international commitments.

13. The general view was expressed regarding the importance of the topic of focus. Several delegations underlined its particular relevance in light of the numerous threats to the marine environment, including the major oil pollution incident in the Gulf of Mexico.

(a) Assessing the need for capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science

1. Panel presentations

14. Mr. Phillip Saunders, Dean, Dalhousie Law School, noted that the general provisions of UNCLOS on capacity-building had been further developed by subsequent conventions, “soft law” instruments and practice of States. There remained gaps in implementation and the international community should be more cognisant of the pressures posed by the continued adoption of new legal regimes. Mr. Åsmund Bjordal, Director, Center for Development Cooperation in Fisheries, Norwegian Institute of Marine Research, presented Norway’s experience in developing sustainable fisheries management based on: science, laws, control and sanctions. This approach was also promoted through the Nansen Programme. He observed that despite the valuable capacity-building efforts in marine science, major needs still existed. Mr. Su’a N. F. Tanielu, Director-General, Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency, provided information on the capacity-building requirements of SIDS, particularly relating to fisheries. The forms of assistance needed included: financial assistance; human resource development; technical assistance; transfer of technology, including through joint venture arrangements; and advisory and consultative services. The need to support long-term capacity development and to coordinate sources of capacity-building was emphasized. Mr. Germain Michel Ranjaonina, “Chef du Service de la Legislation et du Contentieux,” Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Madagascar, noted that insufficient understanding of existing international instruments and limited capacity to implement them was a major challenge. Other capacity-building needs related to:

monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) in the exclusive economic zones (EEZ), in particular to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing; the capacity of coastal developing countries to develop their resources for their socio-economic benefit, education regarding fish handling and processing; transparency and good governance; the protection of the marine environment; and maritime security, in particular piracy. Ms. Fabiola Jiménez Morán Sotomayor, Deputy-Director of International Law, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, delivered a presentation on behalf of Mr. Galo Carrera, Member of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (CLCS), and Ms. Rebeca Navarro, of Petróleos Mexicanos (PEMEX), highlighting the challenges posed by the determination of the outer limit of the continental shelf under UNCLOS.² She cited some capacity-building initiatives available to States making submissions to the CLCS. Mr. Peter Gilruth, Director of the Division of Early Warning and Assessment, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), presented UNEP's experience in capacity-building. He underlined that further efforts were needed in areas, such as: ecosystem-based management, ecosystem restoration, valuation of ecosystem services, climate change adaptation, marine spatial planning, addressing effects of fishing on the ecosystem, and monitoring methods and assessment processes.

2. Plenary and panel discussions

15. Several delegations suggested that the needs of developing States should be approached from an interdisciplinary and comprehensive perspective, and tailored specifically, to accommodate different requirements and situations. In this regard, it was emphasized that needs assessments were critical to priority setting and programme design and were essential if the capacity-building programmes were to reflect the specific conditions and priorities of beneficiary countries. It was noted that assessments were time sensitive, in particular in sectors like fisheries, where priorities could change. At the same time, the need for programmes that respond to long-term challenges as opposed to immediate problems was noted. The utility of capacity-building needs assessments for IUU fishing was specifically underlined by some delegations.

16. Several delegations stressed that developing countries, on the subject of capacity-building assistance, were in the best position to assess their own needs and that their views should be respected in that regard. It was noted that opportunities for capacity-building needed to be identified on the basis of capacity-building arrangements, identified capacity-building priorities, and needs and requests proposed by developing countries. The view was expressed that priority should be accorded in particular to the needs of least developed countries and SIDS.

17. One panellist pointed out that, at the project level, it was routine to carry out needs assessments. It was further noted by another panellist that needs assessments could also be based on the information from regular reviews of the state of the marine environment, including the Global Environmental Outlook, the Millennium Ecosystem

² Responding to a question posed by one delegation, Ms. Fabiola Jiménez Morán Sotomayor confirmed that the maps used in the presentation were exclusively attributable to its authors. A reservation regarding the contents of one of the maps used in that presentation was expressed.

Assessment, the “assessment of assessments”, and needs identified within the Regional Seas Programme and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities.

18. Delegations emphasized the need for capacity-building to enable them to effectively implement UNCLOS. The need for assistance to effectively implement instruments of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) was also pointed out. Furthermore, the need for training in policy and legislation development was underlined, as well as in enforcement measures and tools. The need for capacity-building in these matters was also identified.

19. The general view was expressed that capacity-building needed to encompass a wide range of assistance, including financial, human resource, institutional and scientific capacity, and be sustainable. Several delegations suggested that international organizations should encourage capacity-building through the creation and strengthening of national and regional centres for technological and scientific research, as provided for in UNCLOS. It was suggested that inter-governmental organizations and other partners could also explore areas for cooperation and capacity-building with sub-regional organizations, such as South African Development Community (SADC). Other delegations stressed the importance of international cooperation agreements, especially those that encourage public-private partnerships and that recognize, for example, certificates of competency of seafarers. It was also pointed out that capacity-building should strengthen national legal systems, particularly in the development of ocean policy, the adoption of ecosystem approaches, and resource and environmental management.

20. Many delegations identified capacity-building in the conservation, management and sustainable use of fisheries resources as a critical need. In particular, it was noted that capacity was necessary to enhance the availability of scientific advice; data collection and processing of such data, including on fisheries and the status of stocks; MCS, in particular to combat IUU fishing; compliance and enforcement; development of markets; fish handling and processing. In that context, the legitimate aspirations of developing countries to develop their fisheries in the EEZ and to gain access to high seas fisheries were recognized. In addition, it was observed that fishing agreements should not be concluded between developing countries and long-distance fishing nations, unless there was a scientific evaluation of the availability of surplus stock. In this context, it was stated that the granting of access to living resources in the EEZ to foreign vessels had not translated in capacity-building opportunities. Some delegations expressed the view that the evaluation of capacity-building in established agreements was necessary and crucial.

21. It was underlined that the discussion relating to capacity-building needs in the context of fisheries and the on-going high-level review of progress made in addressing the vulnerabilities of SIDS through the implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (MSI) in the General Assembly should proceed hand in hand, to ensure a link between development strategies and fisheries strategies. It was recalled that capacity-building was a cross-cutting issue to all the thematic chapters

contained in the Barbados Plan of Action and MSI and that, for their implementation, SIDS needed capacity and specific skills. Referring to the need to link UN processes, several delegations suggested that there was a clear link between the discussions on capacity-building of the Informal Consultative Process and the upcoming high level review of MSI+5, which will take place in September 2010. A call for the establishment of regional centres for marine scientific research (see paragraph. 19), particularly in the Pacific Region, was highlighted as an example of a possible concrete outcome for the MSI+5.

22. Some delegations stressed the problems related to conservation needs and economic development in small-scale and artisanal fisheries. As a possible option, some delegations were of the view that Governments could intervene in creating alternative employment for such fishers in order to prevent over-fishing and the depletion of stocks, while ensuring the livelihood of local communities.

23. Attention was also drawn to the importance of accurate weather forecasting and accessible weather information for the small-scale fisher. In this connection, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) was requested to consider expanding its collaboration with the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

24. The general view was expressed that the sustainable use of the oceans depended on marine science and adequate scientific knowledge. The importance of Part XIII of UNCLOS on marine scientific research was emphasized, as well as the need to disseminate the results of research and analysis of marine scientific research, pursuant to article 143 of UNCLOS. Several delegations observed that the need for capacity-building for marine scientific research had been reflected in various instruments, including the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, Agenda 21 of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the Millennium Development Goals, General Assembly resolutions and the outcome of the second meeting of the Informal Consultative Process.

25. Several delegations stressed that many States still lacked the capacity required in terms of human resources, equipment and infrastructure to perform the basic research required to gather the best scientific information, using best available practices, to support sound decision-making for the sustainable development and protection of the oceans and their resources. Building capacity for conducting marine scientific research, in particular in developing countries, was therefore essential.

26. Some delegations observed that capacity-building for marine science had two objectives: to create and improve knowledge on resources and the understanding of the nature and biology of marine ecosystems; and to inform the adoption of conservation and management measures. In particular, the science/policy interface had to be carefully considered, both with regard to fisheries and the protection of the marine environment. It was noted that such an interface was an important consideration in the discussions on the Regular Process for global reporting and assessment of the state of the marine environment, including socio-economic aspects (the “Regular Process”). It was also

noted that in the context of regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements (RFMO/As), the insufficient interface between science and policy was partly due to lack of data reporting and analysis, as well as poor fisheries statistics.

27. The need to improve global monitoring networks on oceans and seas was highlighted by some delegations, in particular, ocean observing programmes, such as the Global Oceans Observing System, to increase understanding of the oceans-atmosphere interface.

28. Several delegations noted that the transfer of marine technology was essential to build capacity, in particular in marine science. They further noted that, in their view, Part XIV of UNCLOS was the part with the greatest gap in implementation. Attention was also drawn by one delegation to the UNEP Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-Building.

29. The general view was expressed that the delineation of the outer limit of the continental shelf was a key area in which a number of States required capacity-building. The need for capacity to be able to exploit the resources of the continental shelf was also highlighted.

30. The general view was expressed that the further development of infrastructure and human resources' expertise were critical. Specific issues identified as requiring capacity-building included: energy-related research, with a specific focus on training in marine geophysics, sedimentology and oceanography; marine biotechnology and intellectual property rights; hydrographic surveying and nautical charting, including electronic nautical charts; ocean mapping; strengthening management structures, including integrated coastal management; protection of the marine environment, including vulnerable marine ecosystems; in-depth studies on marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction; the establishment of marine protected areas; the prevention, mitigation and control of marine pollution including oil spills; port and ocean management to address issues concerning maritime safety of life at sea, the handling of hazardous material and port security; safety of transport of radioactive material; disaster preparedness; tsunami alert systems; security in the oceans, in particular in relation to piracy; underwater noise; and addressing the adverse effects of climate change, particularly on low lying coastal regions and SIDS.

31. The need was also highlighted by some delegations for assistance in: addressing gaps in the implementation of international rules for the protection of the marine environment and the conservation of resources, taking into account the capacity levels of States; enhancing the capacity of flag States to implement their responsibilities with respect to vessels flying their flag on the high seas; and the need to effectively participate in activities in the Area, including marine scientific research, and also in RFMO/As. Assistance was also required to support participation in international meetings, for example through contributions to relevant trust funds. The need for specific training for the use of modern tools, such as Environmental Impact Assessments, was also highlighted. In addition, the need to build alliances between the academic and private

sectors with a view to sharing the benefits derived from marine genetic resources, including intellectual property rights was identified.

(b) Segment 2: Overview of capacity-building activities/initiatives in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science and transfer of technology

1. Panel presentations

32. The second segment, on overview of capacity-building activities/initiatives in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science and transfer of technology, addressed the scope and types of current capacity-building activities and initiatives in oceans and the law of the sea. Mr. Juan Carlos Martín Fragueiro, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Environment, Rural and Marine Affairs, Spain, presented Spain's experience with international cooperation in ocean affairs by highlighting the principal objectives of such cooperation, the types of cooperation instruments used, and examples of cooperation initiatives.³ Ms. Haiwen Zhang, Deputy Director, Institute for Marine Affairs, China, provided an overview of China's capacity-building activities and initiatives in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science and transfer of technology, with an emphasis on China's domestic framework for addressing oceans issues, highlighting examples of bilateral and multilateral cooperation initiatives, including south-south cooperation. Mr. Ehrlich Desa, Director and Deputy Executive Secretary of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, described the overall context of capacity-building activities within the mandate of IOC, as well as its principles for capacity development aimed at empowering developing countries to address their priorities. Mr. Nii Odunton, Secretary-General of the International Seabed Authority (ISA), described the activities carried out by the Authority to develop the capacity of developing States to participate in, and benefit from, the results of marine scientific research in the Area, highlighting the Endowment Fund for Marine Scientific Research, regional sensitization seminars, and the Tongji University-ISA Scholarship Programme. Mr. Marcel Kroese, Director of the International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network Training and Liaison (IMCS Network), presented the activities of the IMCS Network in combating IUU fishing through information sharing, assistance in the harmonization of laws and procedures and the provision of guidance on effective uses of limited resources. Mr. Cherdsak Virapat, Executive Director of the International Ocean Institute (IOI), explained that IOI promoted a multi-level approach to capacity-building on ocean governance and sustainable development through its strategic road maps and training programmes and adaptive management projects at all levels, including in collaboration with United Nations agencies, international organizations, Governments and local communities, as well as other relevant entities. He highlighted the work of IOI to develop human capacities for adaptation and building resilience in coastal zones.

³ One delegation expressed a reservation on the contents of two of the brochures that were made available by the panellist at the back of the conference room, related to some of Spain's activities carried out by the vessel "Miguel Oliver".

33. The Director of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS), Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations, Mr. Serguei Tarassenko, provided information on DOALOS's capacity-building activities, including its role in administering trust funds, fellowships and developing and delivering training programmes.

2. Plenary and panel discussions

34. Several delegations emphasized that capacity-building activities in ocean affairs and the law of the sea were of paramount importance to the development process of many developing States, in particular least developed countries and SIDS. Many delegations provided information on their current capacity-building programmes and activities on a broad range of issues, including marine science, protection of the marine environment, marine protected areas, conservation and sustainable management of resources, oil and gas development, delineation of the outer limit of the continental shelf, maritime delimitation, maritime shipping and transport, hazard mitigation and sustainable tourism. They also provided information on IUU fishing, compliance and enforcement in fisheries, such as boarding and inspection and observer programmes, fisheries development cooperation, maritime security and safety, port operations and port State control, integrated coastal area management, deep-seabed mining, drafting of legislation, and promotion of regional cooperation.

35. Several delegations also provided details on the types of capacity-building activities they were carrying out, including the provision of financial assistance; human resources development, education and training, in-kind support, cooperation agreements, technical assistance, hosting of international bodies, south-south bilateral and regional cooperation. Capacity-building activities had also been undertaken in which developing countries provided technical training, through their national cooperation agencies and/or with full or partial financial assistance from international agencies.

36. Member States and international organizations were invited to make the information available to DOALOS for placement on its website.

37. Many delegations highlighted the capacity-building activities of a number of bodies or organizations, including GEF, IOC, ISA, the IMCS Network, the IOI, the International Maritime Law Institute, The Nippon Foundation of Japan, the Rhodes Academy, the United Nations University Fisheries Training Programme (UNU-FTP), the Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC), the IMO through its Technical Cooperation Committee, as well as the activities of DOALOS (see also paragraph 86). The capacity-building activities of the European Union were also noted. Some delegations recalled how specific capacity-building activities had been of particular benefit to them and their countries.

38. Many delegations highlighted that the Endowment Fund of the ISA had facilitated the participation of scientists from developing countries in marine scientific research in the Area. Some delegations noted that IOC had been active in capacity-building in marine

science over the last 50 years and had celebrated its golden anniversary this year. Several delegations noted that the IOC had empowered developing countries to address marine related challenges through science-based strategies. It had assisted in strengthening institutional capacities by enhancing leadership, proposal writing and team-building skills. The activities of IOI were also highlighted through its operational centers or focal points in 25 countries established within universities, Governments, and non-governmental organizations.

39. Several delegations noted that the capacity-building activities of The Nippon Foundation of Japan had been provided in a unique and effective fashion, which had made it possible for some developing countries to close capacity gaps, in particular, in regard to training. The United Nations-Nippon Foundation Fellowship Programme was highlighted as a vital tool to strengthen technical capacity in regard to the law of the sea. Nippon Fellows, who were mostly Government officials, were chosen on the basis of an assessment of the needs of developing States with the view to determining how best to support them.

40. A number of delegations expressed support for the capacity-building activities of DOALOS, including in regard to the UN-Nippon Foundation Programme and the Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe Fellowship, as well as the various trust funds administered by DOALOS. The efforts of the Division in compiling information on capacity-building initiatives, as presented in the report of the Secretary-General, were also highlighted and described as pioneering work. The need to support the work of DOALOS was underscored (see also paragraph 81).

41. The Assistance Fund established under Part VII of the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (Part VII Assistance Fund), co-administered by DOALOS and FAO, was highlighted by delegations as an important source of capacity-building assistance. It was noted that more funds had recently been used for specific capacity-building initiatives, including the establishment of new RFMOs, strengthening existing RFMOs, developing human resources, and providing technical training and assistance. It was also clarified that only States Parties to the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement were eligible to receive assistance from the Part VII Assistance Fund. In addition, it was noted that DOALOS had prepared a compilation of sources of available assistance to developing States in the conservation and management of fishery resources, and the needs of States for capacity-building. The compilation was commended as a valuable tool to identify areas where assistance was available and areas where more focused effort and policy coherence in the provision of assistance and cooperation was needed.

42. The IMCS Network was highlighted as a critical capacity-building effort and an example of how to tangibly improve capacity-building in order to combat IUU fishing (see also paragraph 83).

43. Some delegations noted that there were a variety of other means to provide assistance to developing States in the conservation and sustainable management of fisheries, including funds established by RFMOs, international financial institutions, the

FAO, as well as multilateral and bilateral programmes. Various types of assistance had been provided, including with respect to scientific assessments, MCS, mitigation of by-catch, development of domestic regulatory policies, and institution building. In this regard, the UNU-FTP offered a six-month post-graduate course in the implementation of fisheries development policies, complimented by short training courses in partner countries, which were developed and delivered in cooperation with local training institutions and other partners. UNU-FTP had also fostered cooperation with several regional and international bodies.

44. Other delegations drew attention to the provision of regional capacity-building assistance, including with respect to the sustainable exploitation of fisheries, or highlighted regional efforts among developing States in combating IUU fishing as defined in the FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IPOA-IUU). In these efforts, delegations also emphasized the importance of IUU fishing vessel lists, port State control systems, as well as the importance of information sharing on IUU fishing vessels and the development of an FAO global registry of fishing vessels.

45. Delegations also highlighted capacity-building activities in some other sectors. For example, some delegations noted the role of bilateral cooperation in providing technical assistance to assist developing countries in the delineation of the outer limit of their respective continental shelves beyond 200 nautical miles. It was noted that activities relating to the delineation of the outer limit of the continental shelf, including scientific mapping of the seabed, had increased the technical and scientific capabilities of many States, which could then be used to support capacity-building activities in developing States.

46. The IUCN provided information on its assistance to over 75 countries to prepare and implement national conservation and biodiversity strategies. Through the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI), IUCN sought to help countries and regional and global bodies to develop and use data, tools, and methodologies to identify ecologically significant areas, with an initial focus on the high seas and deep seabed areas beyond national jurisdiction. It also collaborated with the Census of Marine Life. Information on the work of the Census was publicly available on the web and through open-access data bases, and served as a resource for decision-makers when considering how best to manage marine resources in the oceans.

47. In regards to international shipping, the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) provided information on its three distinct phases in the development of capacity, namely, maritime safety information management, hydrographic survey capabilities, and cartographic production capabilities. The Bureau International des Containers et du Transport Intermodal (BIC) had carried out capacity-building activities in cooperation with other international organizations, as well as governmental agencies and industry representatives, including education, dissemination and outreach programmes aimed at raising awareness and increasing compliance with the 1972 Customs Convention on Containers and, in particular, the international standard on the coding, identification and

marking of inter-modal containers. Some delegations also welcomed the joint effort of FAO/the International Labour Organization and IMO in developing safety standards for small fishing vessels.

48. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean (PAM) noted that it was developing tools to fight organized crime, including human trafficking and dumping of illegal waste. It was also cooperating with other organizations to address pollution of the marine environment.

(c) Challenges for achieving effective capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science and transfer of technology

1. Panel presentations

49. Ms. Cristelle Pratt, Consultant, former Director, Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), addressed the challenges and opportunities in capacity building in relation to the research, development and management of non-living resources in the Pacific Region. She identified challenges, such as weak institutions and legal arrangements, lack of ocean governance and legal specialists and absence of marine scientists and research vessels capacity. Mr. Alfa Lebgaza, Director of Maritime Affairs, Ministry of Public Works and Transportation, Togo, highlighted some of the challenges in the development of the maritime sector in Togo, as well as in the application of UNCLOS and other related instruments through national legislation. Mr. Kazuhiro Kitazawa, Advisor, Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC), gave a presentation on the research activities carried out by JAMSTEC, which contributed to capacity-building in marine science. He stated that in JAMSTEC's experience, training activities promoting capacity-building in marine science were more effective when small groups of scientists were engaged at a time on a regional basis. Mr. Andrew Hudson, Principal Technical Advisor, International Waters, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), gave an overview of key challenges encountered in UNDP's experience, particularly related to building capacity for ocean and coastal management in Large Marine Ecosystems, and presented selected approaches to overcome those challenges. Mr. Tumi Tómasson, Programme Director, UNU-FTP, addressed some of the major challenges currently faced in the area of capacity-building for fisheries management. He explained how the emphasis in the field of development cooperation had changed over the last decades and, as a consequence, the previous focus on capacity-building for fisheries management had also diminished. He also referred to activities carried out by UNU-FTP.

2. Plenary and panel discussions

50. Several delegations stressed that lack of financial resources was one of the most common impediments to capacity-building. Other delegations noted that the current global economic crisis had led to budget constraints and partners therefore needed to ensure a better identification of needs and requirements for the targeting of assistance.

51. Despite efforts to assist developing States in building their capacity, it was observed that the needs of developing States had not been met and that capacity in ocean affairs and the law of the sea had not improved substantially. The view was expressed that there was a need to ensure greater, but also better, capacity-building. The view was also expressed that recognition should be given to shifts in needs, priorities and development goals and to new problems and challenges emerging at global, regional and national levels.

52. The general view was expressed that one of the overarching challenges was the lack of coordination among capacity-building providers, which could counteract the effects of capacity-building programmes. In this regard, delegations stressed the need to coordinate capacity-building activities involving oceans and the law of the sea, in particular within the United Nations system, in order to ensure a targeted approach and to prevent fragmentation or duplication of effort. The point was also made that obligations concerning reporting to several donors could further overburden the institutional capacity of recipients. Delegations stated that, while currently a challenge, a long term commitment of donors and coordination of efforts would ensure that capacity-building activities were sustainable.

53. A challenge identified in the Secretary-General's report, and echoed by delegations, was the identification and prioritisation of needs. It was highlighted that priorities of donors and recipients should be established consensually. The lack of participatory processes to define country priorities for technical, professional and institutional needs was noted by some delegations.

54. The general view was expressed that there was a need for capacity-building providers and beneficiaries to have a platform from which to share information, such as a clearing-house mechanism.

55. It was pointed out that developing regional programmes in the context of the United Nations "Delivering as One" initiative, which was country-based, constituted a challenge. A question was raised whether initiatives to coordinate capacity-building initiatives at the global level contributed to the effective implementation of UNCLOS, or whether regional or sectoral approaches were more effective.

56. Some delegations noted that major and critical challenges were the acquisition of, and access to, marine data and information, particularly with regard to the quality, appropriate storage and handling of research results. Constraints in accessing raw data gathered by RFMOs were particularly highlighted.

57. Some delegations addressed the challenges related to the transfer of technology, including the implementation of Part XIV of UNCLOS and the IOC Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology. While acknowledging the framework established under Part XIV of UNCLOS, it was noted that a major problem in capacity-building was the lack of implementation of Part XIV of UNCLOS, which would facilitate transfer of technology between developed and developing States.

58. It was also noted by some delegations that the implementation of the general obligation in international instruments on transfer of technology was challenging due to the fact that such technology was often subject to proprietary rights, and some States claimed there were difficulties in transferring it. Further challenges were the transfer of know-how on the use of technologies, to enable recipients to use the technology in the long term, and the obstacles in transferring maintenance contracts to other States. In that regard, the view was expressed that it was the responsibility of IOC to devise possible cooperation schemes for the transfer of technology under the Guidelines. Although patents, commonly used to grant intellectual property rights in this field, had to be respected, they were limited in time so these partnerships were eventually possible.

59. The general view was expressed that one of the challenges was to ensure the sustainability of the results of capacity-building initiatives. Several delegations referred to the lack of technical competence in developing countries which remained an important challenge for capacity-building, as relevant education in marine sciences could not be provided locally. In that regard, it was noted that attracting sufficient expertise to develop university programmes in marine science was a matter of concern. The view was expressed that education and training particularly for established and aspiring professionals was important to prepare for emerging challenges, such as climate change. In addition, the issue of lost capacity was raised by several delegations, whereby some trainees with expertise newly acquired through capacity-building programmes did not return to their country of origin.

60. A request was made for specialized organizations to initially provide assistance, with the view to ensuring the development of long-term capacity of local universities to sustain those trainings. In that regard, reliance on foreign experts and resources with little attention to local knowledge and expertise was identified by some delegations as a challenge.

61. With respect to capacity-building in the area of research and management of non-living resources, the importance of regional cooperation was underlined in order to meet future challenges, in particular those related to the relationship with the private sector and the possible need to negotiate resource development agreements which would benefit developing coastal States. To that end, it was noted that policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, environmental guidelines, and the fiscal framework would have to be developed.

62. The difficulty of addressing capacity-building in conservation and management with respect to disputed areas was raised.

63. Attention was also drawn to the lack of activities aimed at addressing the environmental challenges posed by underwater noise pollution. An appeal was made to States to increase capacity-building aimed at improving the scientific understanding of the issue.

(d) New approaches, best practices and opportunities for improved capacity-building in ocean affairs and the law of the sea

1. Panel presentations

64. Mr. Mitsuyuki Unno, Director, Maritime Affairs Department of The Nippon Foundation of Japan, presented an overview of the Foundation's capacity-building activities in the field of ocean affairs and the law of the sea, highlighting projects undertaken in cooperation with Governments, the United Nations, non-governmental organizations and research and academic entities. Ms. Nicole Glineur, GEF, shared some of the capacity-building and knowledge-management activities conducted by the GEF through the International Waters LEARN Programme (IW LEARN). She also highlighted new collaboration platforms that focused on adaptation to climate change, public-private partnerships, water governance and sustainable fisheries, and included capacity-building components. Mr. Raphael Lotilla, Executive Director, Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) Resource Facility provided an overview of PEMSEA, noting that PEMSEA worked at building regional capacity, was founded on the principle of partnership, and encompassed a multi-stakeholder approach from the local through to the international level. PEMSEA worked to strengthen coastal and ocean governance, employing integrated coastal management, including by building in capacity-building and knowledge transfer from project inception. Ms. Imèn Meliane, Director, International Marine Policy, the Nature Conservancy, provided examples of capacity-building projects carried out by non-governmental organizations and focused on reconciling the development needs of local communities and ocean stakeholders with conservation priorities. She highlighted some key best practices and processes for successful capacity-building, in particular the need to: understand the context specificity of capacity development needs; build local ownership and self reliance; facilitate peer-to-peer sharing of experiences and professional exchanges; strengthen organizational capacity; and long-term planning for sustainability, including through the establishment of protected area trust funds. Mr. Narmoko Prasmadji, Executive Secretary, Indonesia's National Secretariat Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security, made a presentation in which he highlighted the capacity-building activities and programmes conducted under the CTI for the promotion of its regional plan of action. He emphasized the novel approach taken by the members of the CTI in conceiving the regional plan of action as a living and non-binding document. He noted that the CTI still faced issues regarding capacity-building within the member countries, but that the first priority was to share ideas and skills within the region.

2. Plenary and panel discussions

65. The general view was expressed that in order to be effective, capacity-building needed to be carefully designed and tailored to the needs and situation of partner countries (see also paragraph 16). The view was also expressed that capacity-building should also be aligned and integrated with the national priorities and policies of partner countries and avoid duplicating existing activities. In that regard, capacity-building approaches should be pragmatic and self-driven. The development of long-term strategic

approaches was advocated, as was the development of specific time-bound strategies. The importance of involving beneficiaries in decisions relating to the termination of capacity-building programmes was also emphasized. Involving local and national expertise and knowledge was considered necessary from the formulation of the capacity-building programme to its implementation. Examples of how local community involvement was harnessed towards sustainable management of resources, including through rights-based approaches in the fisheries sector, were highlighted.

66. Noting that no comprehensive assessment had been carried out at the global level of the capacity-building needs of States in relation to ocean affairs and the law of the sea, including marine science, several delegations suggested carrying out such an assessment.

67. It was emphasized that capacity-building could not be sometimes implemented by States alone, but required private/public partnerships in order to ensure a viable and sustainable framework. Attention was also drawn to the importance of ensuring that training programmes conducted in developed countries could be effectively applied once the trainees returned to their home countries, where similar facilities and technical capacity might not be available. It was suggested that in situ training in developing countries would be more effective in these cases. In that regard, reference was made to the experience of using of floating research vessels.

68. The importance of information-sharing was underlined. In that regard, a call was made for the implementation of new approaches, best practices and opportunities for improved information sharing and networking in the context of capacity-building within United Nations initiatives, activities and programmes in oceanography and marine science. For example, schemes for education in ocean and marine science, capacity development in ocean scientific research, observations and surveys, instrumentation, data and information and risk management, ecosystem management, marine hazards and awareness raising; regular training on UNCLOS for marine scientists, legal officers and decision makers; support for young professionals to work on capacity development at IOC Regional offices (UNESCO Associate experts programme); enhanced cooperation among international and national experts, technical working groups and advisory bodies; extra-budgetary contributions; and cooperation and coordination among international agencies for capacity-building related to data and information management. Furthermore, it was stated that networking of experts would play an important role. In that regard, the importance of promoting enhanced cooperation mechanisms and communication networks through bilateral or multilateral cooperation was noted. States and organizations, that were in a position to do so, were urged to share their expertise, at both the regional and global levels, in the compilation and analysis of scientific information to meet management needs, particularly in the areas of natural disasters, marine protected areas, marine biotechnology and climate change.

69. Several delegations stressed the need to focus on strengthening South-South cooperation, which was seen as an innovative way to build capacity and a cooperative mechanism enabling the countries concerned to set their own priorities and needs and have ownership of the process. Some delegations highlighted their experience in such

forms of cooperation, such as through the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic, the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries and the IBSA-OCEAN initiative under the India-Brazil-South Africa Forum, which involved scientific workshops and the development of joint research projects in oceanography. Attention was also drawn to an initiative, in collaboration with the ISA, aimed at integrating and consolidating all information on geology and mineral resources within the Equatorial and South Atlantic Ocean. The project envisioned capacity-building in marine scientific research in a South-South context. Several delegations pointed out, however, that South-South cooperation should not replace North-South cooperation, in particular as regards technology transfer, but instead complement it.

70. Some delegations pointed out the value of focusing on integrated ecosystems-based approaches when undertaking capacity-building. The best practices of the Arctic Council members were noted in that regard. In light of their role as upstream countries and water catchment areas, as well as their rights under UNCLOS, the need for specific capacity-building programmes for landlocked developing States was underlined. It was pointed out that PEMSEA applied an integrated river basin and coastal management approach by also involving landlocked countries and landlocked administrative areas within countries.

71. Delegations stressed the need for international cooperation for capacity-building, including cross-sectoral cooperation. In particular, it was stated that in cases where there was no capacity-building or where there were gaps in capacity-building, this could be dealt with through coordination and cooperation at national, regional and international levels. Several delegations supported the use of regional approaches. The importance of cooperation between adjacent developing coastal States was underlined. Particular emphasis was placed on strengthening regional coordination and cooperation in respect of various fisheries-related issues.

72. The view was expressed that the competent international organizations recognized by UNCLOS could take a lead role in promoting international cooperation and coordination of programmes for marine scientific research and capacity-building. Furthermore, several delegations suggested that DOALOS, ISA and the United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, as well as other relevant organizations within the United Nations system could coordinate the establishment of regional marine scientific and technology centres in the Pacific Islands region.

73. It was noted that the United Nations had a special role in regard to capacity-building and training. It was suggested that the United Nations Chief Executives Board could study and evaluate what kind of coordinated approach could be adopted by the various United Nations programmes and bodies to promote an effective and sustainable strategy in capacity-building towards the enhancement of the peaceful uses of ocean space and its resources, their management and regulation, the protection and conservation of the marine environment, including in respect of climate change, and piracy.

74. The general view was expressed that a clearing-house mechanism of available capacity-building opportunities that would facilitate the matching of needs with opportunities be established. In that regard, some delegations suggested that DOALOS maintain an online database of available capacity-building opportunities, donors and funding agencies. Such a database would improve access to information on capacity-building activities/initiatives of donors, and facilitate the coordination of efforts of agencies and the identification of priorities.

75. A number of delegations suggested that the IOC Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology were a critical tool to implement Part XIV of UNCLOS and in promoting capacity-building in ocean and coastal-related matters through international cooperation. The need to continue promoting the IOC strategic guiding principles of the IOC High-Level Objectives, in particular the fourth objective on management procedures and policies leading to the sustainability of coastal and ocean environment of resources, was also highlighted.

76. The view was expressed that the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction had an important role in promoting capacity-building with regard to the use of intellectual property rights related to marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

77. Several delegations noted the potential role of the Regular Process in promoting capacity-building. However, some of those delegations were of the view that the Regular Process should not undertake direct capacity-building, but should facilitate and identify capacity-building needs and projects and aim at facilitating an optimal utilization of existing processes and instruments. It was noted that the Regular Process would provide a cost-effective means to access, synthesize and learn from data and knowledge that were already available, and would also build capacity in all countries by encouraging the development of professional expertise in the collection and analysis of data and the sharing of information and technological knowledge among scientists and managers.

78. It was stated that UN-Oceans members should act in a concerted manner in support of the integrated assessment of the oceans and information and data sharing. It was observed that the role of mechanisms, such as UN-Oceans, was limited to the mandates of the various participating organizations, as decided by their respective member States.

79. It was suggested that additional funding from GEF should be channelled to the International Waters focal area and that consideration be given as to how this could be achieved.

80. Activities undertaken by non-governmental organizations were noted with appreciation by several delegations. In particular, with regard to the approach taken by The Nippon Foundation, it was noted that the holistic and cross-sectoral approach

supported by that organization, which emphasized the integration of physical and social sciences, as well as institutional interlinkages would be continued in the future.

81. The general view was expressed that trust funds and fellowships were valuable approaches to support capacity-building. Several delegations called for financial contributions to the Endowment Fund of the ISA, as well as the fellowships programmes and trust funds administered or co-administered by DOALOS. A suggestion was made that contributions to the Part VII Assistance Fund should no longer be voluntary and could be integrated in assessed contributions from States Parties to the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement.

82. Opportunities raised by trust funds associated with marine protected areas were also noted. It was pointed out that existing trust funds could provide support to regional initiatives for the establishment of areas and parks within national jurisdiction and also enhance the effectiveness of the management of existing ones.

83. It was emphasized that the IMCS Network should be further strengthened and supported, as it provided invaluable services to both developed and developing States in regard to information-sharing, policy development and delivery of trainings in the global response to IUU fishing, including in African countries. Several delegations called for financial contributions to the IMCS Network. A pledge was made to contribute US\$ 100,000.

Agenda item 4: Inter-agency cooperation and coordination

84. An overview of the most recent work of UN-Oceans was provided by its Coordinator, Mr. Andrew Hudson, Principal Technical Advisor, International Waters, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Mr. Hudson opened his remarks recalling the main outcomes of the eighth meeting of UN-Oceans, held in Paris on 5 May 2010. At that meeting, UNDP, represented by Mr. Hudson, was elected as Coordinator, and UNEP, represented by Ms. Jacqueline Alder, was elected as Deputy Coordinator.

85. At that meeting participating agencies provided updates on their recent ocean and coastal activities. In particular, the UN-Oceans Task Force on Biodiversity in Areas beyond National Jurisdiction reported, inter alia, on progress in the compilation of information on existing tools provided for under relevant international instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction. The UN-Oceans Task Force on Marine Protected Areas reported on the Expert Workshop on Scientific and Technical Guidance on the use of Biogeographic Classification Systems and Identification of Marine Areas beyond National Jurisdiction in Need of Protection, held in October, 2009. IOC, UNEP and DOALOS reviewed progress on the Regular Process, including the launching in August 2009 of the report on the "Assessment of Assessments". The meeting also discussed cooperation with UN-Water and the maintenance of the UN Atlas of the Oceans despite the financial constraints under which it was operating.

86. Mr. Hudson also outlined recent capacity-building activities of members of UN-Oceans which had not yet been raised during the discussions on the topic of focus of the Informal Consultative Process. He informed that the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) had organized regional capacity-building and review workshops on its Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA). It had, pursuant to decision IX/18 of the CBD Conference of the Parties, launched a website to improve the national implementation of the PoWPA. The Fisheries and Aquaculture Department of the FAO had developed a number of capacity-building activities at the global, regional and local levels, addressing, inter alia, fisheries and aquaculture management, including policy formulation; food quality and safety; small-scale fisheries; improving fisheries information; IUU fishing; impact of climate change; fish trade and marketing; and emergency response. The Marine Environment Laboratories of the International Atomic Energy Agency expanded their activities to support Member States in capacity-building for the sustainable development of the oceans and the research capabilities to investigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change on the oceans. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), as the Secretariat for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), to be held in Brazil in 2012 and its preparatory processes, organized the first preparatory committee meeting for UNCSD 2012, which was held in New York in May 2010. Mr. Hudson also reported that UNDP had initiated several new projects aimed at strengthening national and regional capacities for sustainable management of several shared Large Marine Ecosystems (LME). These included the Sulu-Celebes LME, the Humboldt Current LME, the Timor-Arafura Sea, and a project to strengthen the engagement of Indonesia, Philippines and Viet Nam and in the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Convention and management framework.

87. Responding to a question posed with regard to the availability of updated information on the activities of UN-Oceans, Mr. Hudson noted that once a website for UN-Oceans had been established on the server maintained by FAO for the UN-Atlas, it would be possible to directly access to such information

Agenda item 5: Issues that could benefit from attention in the future work of the General Assembly on oceans and the law of the sea

88. Several delegations made reference to issues that could benefit from the attention of the General Assembly and new ones were submitted in writing as possible topics for future consideration by the Informal Consultative Process, as follows:

- (a) examination of progress in the implementation of the oceans chapter of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD);
- (b) implementation of existing international instruments;
- (c) liability and compensation for the adverse effect of environmental damage;
- (d) transfer of marine technology;

- (e) measures against IUU fishing;
- (f) improved fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance and other measures against IUU fishing;
- (g) conservation of marine resources and measures which can be taken by States in this regard;
- (h) conservation of the marine environment, with an emphasis on maritime safety and navigation;
- (i) responsibilities of flag States in all ocean affairs;
- (j) ecosystem-based approaches to adaptation and mitigation of the effects of climate change on oceans and coasts;
- (k) capacity-building for the research and collection of marine fisheries resources data
- (l) capacity-building for the research and collection of marine fisheries resources data and management advice;
- (m) improved fisheries statistics;
- (n) Rio + 20 process;
- (o) threats to the oceans.

89. Several delegations, while recognizing that all the issues included in the composite list circulated by the Co-Chairpersons were important, indicated topics that, in their view, should be given priority. The topics they suggested were, integrated management approaches to address marine pollution; potential new uses of the oceans; and the application of an ecosystem approach, minimizing pollution as well as the use of the environment impact assessment tool. A suggestion was also made to give priority to land-based sources of pollution; and marine debris.

90. It was emphasized that the issues included in the composite list should not be considered only for the purposes of selecting the topic of focus for the next meetings of the Informal Consultative Process, but, more generally, for the deliberations on the General Assembly resolutions. For this purpose, it was suggested that all States proposing topics that could benefit from attention in the future work of the General Assembly, make available background papers to facilitate the negotiation of the resolutions. Some delegations also placed emphasis on the need to avoid choosing topics which fell within the mandate of specific international organizations or institutions, and one delegation gave the example of climate change.

Agenda item 6: Process for the selection of topics and panellists so as to facilitate the work of the General Assembly

91. In accordance with paragraph 188 of General Assembly resolution 64/71, delegations discussed how to devise a transparent, objective and inclusive process for the selection of topics and panellists, so as to facilitate the work of the General Assembly during the informal consultations on the annual resolution on oceans and the law of the sea. It was recalled that the Consultative Process had considered the issue of selection of topics and panellists at its tenth meeting during its discussions on the implementation of the outcomes of the Consultative Process, including a review of its achievements and shortcomings in its first nine meetings (see A/64/131).

92. Several delegations recalled the mandate of the Informal Consultative Process as set forth in General Assembly resolution 54/33 and proposed that every meeting of the Informal Consultative Process include an item in the agenda under which consideration of the proposed themes for the next meeting could be advanced so as to facilitate the work of the General Assembly. A concept paper could be circulated to articulate the rationale for the chosen theme taking into account the need to: (a) carry out the exercise in accordance with UNCLOS and consistent with the agreements reached at UNCED, particularly Chapter 17 of Agenda 21; (b) take into account inputs provided by the Commission on Sustainable Development and other United Nations bodies; (c) avoid the creation of new institutions; (d) avoid duplication and overlapping with specialized fora; (e) consider that it was not intended that the General Assembly pursue legal or juridical coordination among different legal instruments; (f) bear in mind differing characteristics and needs of different regions of the world; (g) contribute to the annual debate of the General Assembly; and (h) provide an integrated stance of the three pillars of sustainable development. Some delegations reserved their position on this proposal.

93. Several delegations proposed that concept papers on each proposed theme for the Informal Consultative Process needed to be circulated at least one week in advance of the second round of informal consultations of the General Assembly on the resolution on oceans and the law of the sea. This would allow sufficient time to Governments to study the proposals in depth.

94. With regard to the topics to be discussed in upcoming meetings of the Informal Consultative Process, the view was expressed that priority should be given to topics of current interest, which had not been considered in previous meetings and could assist in the implementation of the law of the sea. Nevertheless, it remained the responsibility of the General Assembly to give priority to topics of special interest and necessity to developing countries.

95. The view was also expressed that the Informal Consultative Process had given disproportionate attention to the issue of fisheries, which in its view were not global in nature and thus more appropriately addressed at the regional and national levels.

96. With respect to the selection of panellists, a number of delegations stated that as a matter of principle, the participation of panellists from all regions of the world should be promoted and facilitated. In respect of panellists from developing countries, a number of delegations suggested the establishment of a more effective and expeditious selection mechanism in order to ensure their participation. The important role of the Co-Chairpersons was highlighted in identifying and inviting competent individuals to participate as panellists while maintaining the appropriate regional balance, and congratulated the Co-Chairpersons of the eleventh meeting of Informal Consultative Process for their work in this respect. The high level of objectivity and professionalism of the current Co-Chairpersons was noted and the President of the General Assembly was encouraged to maintain the high standard in future selection of Co-Chairpersons for the Informal Consultative Process.

* *
*