

Annex C – Minutes of presentations and discussions (in plenary)

Workshop under the Auspices of the United Nations, in Support of the Regular Process on Global Reporting and Assessment of the Marine Environment, including Socio-Economic Aspects was held in Grand Bassam, Côte d'Ivoire, 28-30 October, 2013.

Monday 28 October 2013.

Preamble

Workshop opened at 9:35 and preceded directly to the technical program, since the arrival of the Minister and key Government officials was delayed. Opening ceremony was slated for a later period of the day, to allow for the presence of the key government officials. Consequently, modifications were made to the Agenda.

Election of the co-Chairs

The Representative of the Secretariat, Abidjan Convention Mr. Romain Chancerel, and facilitator for this session proposed the co-Chairs for the session, Mr. Diby Martins, Focal point, Abidjan Convention and Ms. Beatrice Ferreira, Group of Experts, Brazil to the floor, and they were accepted. Consequently, they were called to the high table.

Approval of the Agenda

The following modifications were made to the program for 28 October 2013. Presentations slated for 10:00 and 11:00 on the Agenda were moved forward earlier time (9:30 and 10:30) respectively.

Presentations: This workshop continued with the delivery of the following presentations:

1. Overview of Evolution and Structure of the Regular Process (RP)

Mr. Alberto Pacheco,

In his brief presentation made on behalf of UN DOALOS, Mr. Pacheco spoke about the general concerns of the Regular Process (RP), which include the absence of a system of assessment that gives a global picture of the state of the marine environment or its socio-economic aspects. He went on to underline the need for a more effective interface for its realization. He elaborated on the history of the RP dating from the preparatory phase (2002-2005), which garnered proposals for modalities, then the Assessment of Assessments, (AoAs) which looks at what has been done, and to its operationalization (2010-2014). He gave further details about the mandate of the RP, which includes the development of a strategy for an integrated assessment for onward peer review and presentation to the General Assembly. His presentation included an outline of the institutional arrangements, with the General Assembly at the head, followed by the Ad Hoc Working Group, the intersessional Bureau, the Group of Experts, the secretariat of the Regular Process and the Pool of Experts.

On funding, he mentioned that the General Assembly, by resolution 64/71 of Dec. 2009, established a Trust Fund to provide assistance to members of the Group of Experts from developing countries. In concluding, he sounded a note of hope that this workshop will be a forum to enlist more experts and plans to finalize the World Ocean Assessment in 2014, although the questions remain as to what will be its format. He noted that the Bureau acted as a mechanism to speed up the RP, since it meets more frequently.

Q & A

After this presentation, time was allotted for questions and comments from participants. A question was asked as to whether there was going to be an end date to the RP and it is an ongoing initiative. The response was that the RP was an important process which will be undertaken every 5 years.

A representative from Nigeria shared a concern regarding the indebtedness of the process to the tune of \$60,000.00, and wanted to know if there was a more concrete strategy/ or firm source of income for funding the cycles. In response, it was noted that it is important to have that kind of planning. To this end, there have been a lot of discussions, some with the EU. The process has been quite challenging, even though a TF was established in 2009.

The representative from Côte d'Ivoire asked to know what the information gathered through the assessments will be used for. The reply was that the final product, which will compile the challenges and recommendations, will be presented to policy makers, and would form part of bigger report for the regions.

Participants in the Workshop

The facilitator welcomed colleagues, who had just arrived, and informed them that the House skipped the 'Opening Ceremony' for later in the morning. Members of the House were asked to introduce themselves.

Participants in this Workshop include Representatives from the following Countries and Organizations: Niger, Guinea Equatorial, Kenya, Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, Norway, Australia, Brazil, Congo (DRC), Gabon, Sierra Leone, Guinea (Conakry), Liberia, Nigeria, Morocco, Mauritania, Argentina, Uruguay, UN-New York, BirdLife, Kenya, PZCAS, Ports Environmental Network, Ghana.

2. *The Role of Organizations in the Region*

Mr. Hartwig Kremer, made a presentation on the above-mentioned topic. After his presentation, he also served as moderator for other presentations on the same topic. In this presentation, Mr. Kremer highlighted the various areas in which UNEP has contributed to the progress of the RP, ranging from capacity-building, regional workshops, technical workshops, and through the platform of the Regional Seas Convention.

The organization continues to pursue a fundamental mandate which is to keep under review the state of the global environment. UNEP views assessments as very critical building block; therefore its contributions to the RP include assessments that are scientifically sound. They examine closely the human environment, including the interactions between resource, space use on land and seas. He mentioned that oceans could not be looked at in isolation, since they mirror global change and scales; for example, how does increase in fertilizer use in the Danube catchment and Dead Seas correlate?

Mr. Kremer went on to describe UNEP's assistance in the area of resource mobilization, enumerating four levels of support that have been identified for the region. He expounded on the UNEP live website, an open platform of environmental information. The website can be used by Government Ministries, Assessment practitioners, UN audience and the Civil Society.

3. **Mika ODIDO, UNESCO/IOC.** – Continuing on the same topic above, Mr. Odido mentioned that the IOC has 4 high-level objectives, which includes the prevention and reduction of marine hazards. In Africa, the focus is particularly on understanding the ocean and coastal processing to strengthening training and research. Regarding Sea Level network, their work has included providing support to institutions; development of libraries, coastal and marine Atlases, an African register of marine species and undertaking comprehensive assessments, using UNESCO chairs in marine development to develop capacity in Africa.

4. *Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans* – Mr. Alberto Pacheco

Mr. Pacheco enumerated the various challenges which contribute to the degradation of the Oceans and depletion of the marine environment. Since the oceans provide economic opportunities for coastal communities, it was thus pertinent that the multiple challenges receive an integrated approach for its protection. Mr. Pacheco explained that the Convention, as well as promoting the implementation of cross-cutting policies, also fosters trans-boundary cooperation among States. He gave the main activities of this initiative as dealing with marine and land-based sources of pollution, providing an eco-system-based management, monitoring and evaluation of the state of the environment every 3-5 years. His presentation can be summarized as the contributions that UNEP can bring to the RP.

5. *Role and responsibilities of the Secretariat of the Abidjan Convention to the RP*

Mr. Romain Chancerel, Secretariat, Abidjan Convention. Mr. Chancerel spoke about the different initiatives undertaken by the Secretariat, which include the embracing of a legal framework at the regional level, detailing platform for cooperation for national and regional levels. This framework is about the protection of the environment and enhancing coastal and marine zones of West and Central Africa. There are also a capacity-building and evaluation components in the contributions of the Secretariat to the RP. He mentioned that various reports have been produced. Partnership was entered into with GRIO-ARENDAL, with a view of producing a report on the state of the marine environment. A geo-reference database and a map have been developed in collaboration with the Spanish Institute and within the framework of the project. In conclusion, Mr. Chancerel emphasized that agreements are binding, and the priority is the assessment of goods and services provided, and to develop partnerships with national and international institutions.

Q & A - Morning Session.

Questions were called for and each speaker was requested to provide responses to questions related to their presentations.

1. Participants requested that presentations be forwarded to their mail boxes.
2. Mr. Patcheco was invited to shed more light on the subject of 'green economy' which he spoke about in his presentation. He mentioned that the 'green economy' is mainly sectoral. If we take, for example fishery, it would consider socio-economic policies that apply to fishery. It looks at other aspects such as determining environmental impacts of drilling of ocean minerals, managing fertilizers better and more.
3. The representative from Morocco referring to the Abidjan Convention, wanted to know if there were other ways to monitor activities at national level, besides what is presented in the national reports. Are there mechanisms to follow up activities of individual countries? The response was that there was no specific mechanism in the Abidjan Convention. The meeting facilitator mentioned partners who are well apt to do this.
4. Referring to the presentation by Mr. Chancerel, the representative from Nigeria asked how coastal profiling reports queue into the RP, considering the 16 GCLMEs have been conducted. Mr. Chancerel replied that there were ongoing initiatives on the implementation of this mechanism. That was in order to avoid duplication. However, a meeting which will be held on a later date will kick start a follow up mechanism.
5. Relating to an acceptable fact that all operations are financed for some countries, and this is very expensive, what level of support is provided to national institutions to finance activities and secondly, will finances be made available to support studies at this level? The response is that UNEP provides extra-budgetary finances, to support technical activities and capacity building. Though support may be made available at the national level, financing is subject to approval of the Abidjan Convention.
6. A concern was expressed by the Representative from Nigeria, which bothered on while the coasts suffer such depletion and degradation, finances are not made available to address the issue, instead, more spending would rather be on meetings and conferences. She wondered if it be more pertinent to tackle the problems identified before proceeding to identify more? In response was that her observations are well noted. Practical projects are essential and the Abidjan Convention would put more efforts on addressing problems on ground.

At 11.55. Mr. Kremer excused himself from the House, in order to travel out for another meeting.

Coffee –Break.

Opening Ceremony

The opening ceremony began by 12:50 after seating officials of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire – the Minister of Environment, Public Health and Sustainable Development, the Mayor of the City of Grand Bassam, representatives of the UN mission in Côte d'Ivoire and the International Community, (UNEP, ZPCAS, the Zone, Abidjan Convention) important personality such as Miss Earth, 2013 Côte d'Ivoire, Miss Bintou TRAORE.

In receiving this delegation, a brief welcome was addressed to them, in which the question of the workshop was once again posed. 'How do we assess the state of the Coastal environment on a global level? Effectively, the meeting aims to address the issue.

1st Address. – Mayor of the City of Grand Bassam

First to deliver his welcome address was the representative of the Mayor of the city of Bassam. Speaking on behalf of the Mayor, the representative described Grand Bassam as the cradle of the larger Côte d'Ivoire. He emphasized that the Mayor, Mr. George Phillipe Ezaley was happy to be their host. He counted it important for the UN to deem it proper to look into the matter of the oceans since they form 70% of the Universe. He presented his strong congratulations to the participants, while wishing them fruitful deliberations.

2nd Address- Secretariat of the Abidjan Convention

Mr. Romain Chancerel spoke on behalf of Abou Bamba, the coordinator, Secretariat of the Abidjan Convention. He thanked the Government of Côte d'Ivoire for hosting the 7th Workshop of the RP and for their efforts in making the meeting a possibility. While he regretted the absence of Ms. Annebeth Rosenboom (Secretary of the Regular Process, Senior Legal Officer, Division for the Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations.), he welcomed Mrs. Ferreira, underlining the fact that the workshop is important, and encouraging all participants to engage effectively. The success of the workshop reposed on the input of each and every participant.

3rd Address – Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, Office of Legal Affairs

In her absence, a speech was delivered on behalf of Ms. Annebeth Rosenboom of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea welcoming participants to the meeting organized for the 1st cycle of the 7th workshop of the RP. Gratitude was expressed to Mrs. Nassere Kaba and her colleagues for an excellent organization of the workshop. Profound gratitude was expressed to Ambassador Youssoufou Bamba, Mr. Dah and staff of the Côte d'Ivoire Mission to the UN for their cooperation and assistance. Efforts were recognized of the representative of the ZPCAS in supporting these initiatives. After providing a brief history of the workshops, participants were called upon to be involved effectively, convinced that their expertise will enhance the outcome of the workshop.

4th Address – Mr. Alvaro Ceriani, Representative Zone of Peace and cooperation of the South Atlantic

He reiterated that the ZPCAS remains a forum of development, offering socioeconomic opportunities for the 'Zone'.

5th Address – Miss Bintou TRAORE, Miss Earth, Côte d'Ivoire, 2013

After bidding the traditional 'AKWABA' to participants, she went on to detail the climatic, economic and spiritual importance of the seas. She also detailed threats and dangers posed to these water bodies. She welcomed the initiative of the Abidjan Convention, and thanked participants for the effective contributions to the Workshop.

6th Address – Dr. Remi Alla Kouadio – Minister for Environment, Urban Sanitation and Sustainable Development.

The Minister thanked the Mayor of Grand Bassam for hosting the workshop. After welcoming participants to our home and country, Côte d'Ivoire, he thanked participants and experts for their participation at the Workshop. In his speech, he mentioned that Grand Bassam, being a coastal city has suffered its share of degradation and pollution. It is therefore welcomed that the city be chosen as venue for a workshop of this nature. Upon wishing participants great success in their deliberations, he declared the workshop open. The time was 13:31. In concluding his speech, he explained the necessity of finding out what the problems are and pulling concerted efforts for addressing them. He said that the Government was committed to initiatives such as the RP; the very fact of the presence of a Minister, and the Mayor of Grand Bassam (who was now present in person) demonstrate political will of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire to the issue of protection of our coastal areas.

A group photograph was taken. House took a lunch break.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon session convened by 15:40. It was agreed that comments and questions will be taken at the end of presentations. The following presentations were made:

Mr. Peter Harris, made a presentation

6. *The Outline for the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment* regarding the methodological framework adopted by the United Nations — drivers, pressures, state, impacts, responses (DPSIR).

He developed each of the tabs, describing 'drivers' as aspects of human activities that put pressure on the oceans, for example, overfishing, population growth, and down to 'response', which he explained as measures adopted by Government and State actors to mitigate the threats. In a 7-part outline, he spoke on how the framework could be used to structure the report, emphasizing that the DPSIR provides several ways in which to structure the integrated global marine assessment. He mentioned that not all themes have been treated, for example, oil and gas have not been considered in the assessments. He concluded his presentation with a quote: "The Ocean will continue without the humans, but the humans cannot continue without the Oceans."

7. Review of existing Assessments in the Region

- *The World Ocean Assessment* – Ms. Beatrice Ferreira. Department of Oceanography, Brazil.

Using the opportunity of her microphone, Ms. Ferreira reminded the House that one objective of the workshop is to get people involved through the Pool of Experts, and hoped the participants would consider this call. She continued to the presentation, giving a brief background of the Assessment of Assessments (AoAs 2006 – 2009), providing a critical analysis of existing assessment methods. She developed the topic further, explaining that methods include the use of:

- experts in each region to do a survey of existing assessments, and populate the GRAMED database;

- expert knowledge;
- templates of several aspects, down to a review of the process.

Regions used for this purpose are mainly the South and West Atlantic. She reiterated that there are gaps however, and a gap analysis was also presented. This could result from instances of non-availability of data. For example, data on commercial fishery are best available, whereas artisanal fishing is hardly taken into consideration in the assessments. Citing examples, water quality issues are also widespread. While standards exist to define degraded water quality, none has been established for good water quality. She concluded by saying that more research surveys are needed and processes for conducting assessments have not being fully documented.

8. *Guidance for Contributors for the Development of Global Integrated Marine Assessments*

Mr. Peter Harris presentation was mainly an exposition of the document “Guidance for Contributors...” Once again, he reminded the Workshop of one of its objectives which is to enlist more specialists to its Pool of Experts. Should interests of incumbent include writing, he explained that authors needed to know what is involved and the document – Guidance for Contributors... provided the necessary information. Mr. Harris gave a point-by-point explanation, presenting the various parties (the Bureau, Group of Experts, Pool of Experts, Peer- reviewers) and their various roles in the process. Authors are drawn from databases of the Pool of Experts and draft chapters are prepared by lead authors.

He added that assessments have been produced already; there was no use of reinventing the wheel. However, where information is lacking, in areas relating to any issue, he cautioned against making extrapolations. The Guidance has been approved by the UNGA. The Bureau has appointed writing teams for 8 chapters, although there have been delays. An upcoming meeting of the Group of Experts slated for the first week of December will be considering appointments to the Pool of Experts. He encouraged participants to seek nomination through their home countries.

Comments, Q & A – Afternoon Session. The questions were directed at the Group of Experts.

Regarding the presentation on the “Guideline for Contributors...” the Representative from Nigeria asked a question on what is the writing team supposed to do? The response was that, once appointed, the writing team was essentially to agree on what to do, following guidelines provided in the Guidance. The exercise demands concise writing and a lot of responsibility to address all the points covered in the outline.

The Representative also asked the mode of contact, or method of connection between members of the writing team. The reply was that the team will interact through emails, telephone and skype.

Still on this presentation, a question was asked as to what will be the role of the Working Group? The response was that experts have the liberty to determine what is important to their nations or regions and they can put forward such critical issues.

A question was asked regarding the mechanism for considering and integrating new issues, such as oil and gas, which were not previously considered in the assessments. The response was that such emerging issues might be difficult to include. Conducting own assessments should be avoided; we should rather consider issues on areas where assessments have already been conducted.

In response to a question on identifying standards for reaching a conclusion, a member of the Group of Expert indicated that it was still a challenge to develop indicators that can be tested.

The representative from Birdlife, Kenya asked how institutions could contribute their knowledge base, including best practices to the RP. The response was that it was not possible to do so through the assessments, but workshops and meetings could serve as alternative venues to do such. Secondly, the monitoring framework for the Group of Experts on best practices is quite limited as they are not allowed to make any comments on policies, positives or negatives.

Commenting on the analysis of the DPSIR diagram, a participant stated that there still could be gaps which bother on policy analysis and wondered why the Group of Experts was not touching on policy analysis. It was the response of the Group of Experts that the Group was not allowed to deal with such matters at those levels. Moreover, countries would want to keep policy formulation to themselves and might not be willing to share it. In addition, policy can stretch to the national or regional level, but will be edited out of the global assessment.

A question posed to know how to manage a situation where an assessment has been conducted, but the information was not available. The response was that it was possible for existing assessment information to be existing, but not readily available. It was important to point this out in conferences and workshops. However, processes are being mounted, to make more databases available.

9. *Organization of, and allocation to, working groups*

To organize the work of the participants, Mr. Peter Harris explained that working session for Tuesday 29 October will be divided into four groups based on the areas of the experts present. Consequently, the following working groups were formed:

- Working Group I: Biophysical Aspects
- Working Group II: Food Security and Fisheries
- Working Group III: Socio-economic Aspects
- Working Group IV: Marine Biological Diversity Aspects.

Tuesday 29 October, 2013.

Workshop opened by 9:25. Mr. Peter Harris opened the floor by reiterating that the objective of the break-out sessions was to collect information on resources and resource persons available for this region. He worked participants through the worksheet on instructions and guidelines for completing the Regional/National Input table for break-out sessions. He explained that basically, columns of the spreadsheet should capture information on references of what work has been done, names of persons or institutions involved, identifying information gaps; in other words, relating what information need to be generated. Break-out was finalized and participants continued to various rooms based on the aforementioned working groups.

Work on Tuesday 29 October focused entirely on break-out sessions. Each group conducted its session, facilitated by a coordinator, a Chairperson and a rapporteur. The groups worked concurrently during the morning and afternoon sessions. Participants worked on completing the Regional/National inputs table.

Wednesday 30 October, 2013.

The workshop opened by 9:25 as a plenary session. Mr. R. Chancerel announced the objective of the day which was to continue with the work of completing the Regional/National inputs table. Break-out sessions were advised of the importance of integrating work done in West Africa and South America. Break-out sessions advised to respect the 10 minutes time allocated for groups to do their presentations.

Two observations were raised:

1. One of the participants raised an observation, that since most of the coastal communities lacked social amenities, such as health centers and sanitary conveniences and thus have to resort to the flora and fauna for medicine, or use open spaces to answer to calls of nature, there is a need to take these into consideration during assessments of the state of the environment in these communities.
2. The representative from Namibia drew attention that since all the break-out sessions ran concurrently, he, being the only representative from his country, could only attend Group 4 break-out session, such that his country is not represented in other sessions that addressed other thematic areas. He then asked to know what processes are in place to bring all countries to the same page regarding other themes of the Input table. The reply was that follow-up DVDs will be provided to help address this gap.

Afternoon Session:

The afternoon session reconvened by 14.40. Working Groups were invited to make their presentations. Presentation time was restricted to 10 minutes. Time was allowed for questions and answers after each presentation.

Starting with **Working Group 1: Biophysical Aspects**, the rapporteur of the group started by relating a major challenge which was that of not having contact with the Table before coming to the Workshop. This situation, combined with the short time they had to work on the Table, made it difficult for them to have access to a wide range of sources. For this reason, the group had to rely mainly on information obtained from the internet. He, however, called on participants to complete the Table, upon return to their various countries, and return to the Group of Experts.

Work done by Working Group 1 showed that the workshop by IOC was very relevant in Oceanography and Marine Research. Names of relevant contact persons were given. Among gaps identified was that there was no information on sea levels. Concerning LMEs, the relevant institutions were mostly universities. There are IPCC reports which can provide resources. The Group found the work in Brazil relevant and had integrated that in their work accordingly. As regards trends in meteorological phenomena, IMET Abidjan provided useful resources. Gap was that of poor linkage between the institution and metrological services. Regarding primary production cycling, most of the information was contained in trans-boundary LMEs.

Q & A A participant voiced a concern that information around references of this Table. However, the information is dispersed. There had not been any contact about this input document, prior to the workshop. In order for them to do a good job, like the model from Brazil, the group would like to request the house to give them more time, to enable them contact specialists, institutions, other professionals back home, so they are able to present a well-researched Regional/National input Table, to be submitted on a later date. The response was that it is logical to give time to West Africa participants to enable them do a well-researched input.

Ms. Ferreira of the Group of Experts, referring to the matter of not having previous knowledge of the document, reiterated that several workshops have been conducted, and reports uploaded to the website. Thus, it is anticipated that these documents provided a way for participants to prepare for the workshop.

Mr. Pacheco sounded a note of urgency regarding the time for submission of completed Tables, since the outcome of this Workshop is to be presented to the General Assembly before December. He advised that updated Tables be sent to the Group of Experts and the Focal Point of the Abidjan Convention.

This presentation was rounded off by a reminder from Mr. Peter Harris that Workshops do not produce reports for delegates. Rather, the report is a product of the host country, which in this case, is Côte d'Ivoire. This is part of their contribution to the progress of the RP.

Working Group II - Food Security Chapters. The rapporteur mentioned that the group consisted of 10 specialists from Argentina, Brazil, Ghana, Guinea Equatorial, Liberia, Niger and Sierra Leone. He explained their methodological approach adopted in completing the Input Table, which was mainly through internet research. Group then went on to make conclusions on the overall status, determine gaps and subsequent capacity-building needs.

In this regard, institutions identified as most important in the sector include the FAO, which has information available for the West Africa, COMHAFAT, COREP, SEAFO, BENGUELA Current Commission and so forth.

The group noted that many institutions and regional organizations conducted assessments of the status of fish and shellfish stock in the South Atlantic. Gaps existed on incidental catch of marine mammals and turtles. Also information on illegal and unregulated activities is lacking.

Working Group III: Socioeconomic Aspects: The Rapporteur stated that the Group worked on the Table as is, going from chapter to chapter. Regarding shipping and impacts of pollution from this source, they found the work done by the International Ocean Institute, very pertinent. The Group also took time to consider a legal aspect of marine pollution from shipping, not originally part of the references in the Input Table. Here, they identified a couple of consultancies. On the 'comments' column, they took note of the expansion or construction of ports in the region: Ghana, Liberia. Regarding pollution, the group identified mainly UN reports on the magnitude of oil spillage in Ogoniland requiring up to 30 years to clean up.

Q & A

The representative from Argentina asked a question on Chapter 17, referring to the Working Group decision to introduce a reference to an assessment of legal aspects of marine pollution, since it does not follow the Outline agreed by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Regular Process. The response was that introducing new references for assessment was not permitted, and such reference will be deleted from the Table.

The second intervention voiced a concern which related to the impact of shipping on marine mammals. It emphasized this as security issues for small vessels, as the issue has implications on shipping routes and speed. He emphasized the need to take this issue into consideration.

The representative from Nigeria observed the gap in this area as owing to a lack of many experts in the domain.

The representative from the DRC (Congo) raised a concern as to what to do when economic interests clash with environmental protection and noted there was a need to take issues such as these into consideration when conducting an assessment.

Working Group IV: Marine Biological Diversity Aspects: The rapporteur for this group raised key issues that slowed down the exercise of completing the Regional/National Input Table. Most importantly, the exercise could have been more fruitful if participants had known of the table, in order for them to have consulted it, share the master list with stakeholders, including experts at home and in the workshop. He emphasized that establishing the right compilation of the Regional Table will be more meaningful after receiving and including inputs from experts. To this end, he advised a need for another workshop to be held to effectively discuss the issues and update the Table according.

The chairperson of this Group added that experts from 10 countries worked together during the break-out session. They worked on the Table, following the recommended Guidelines. However, they were able to work on a country-by-country basis, and did not have time to compile all Tables into a single entity. The product is available and has been distributed among members of the group, so that they could work on updating it to send by email to the Group of Experts.

Q & A Peter Harris noted that the group raised very relevant points and that completing the Table could be described as a work-in-progress. He expressed the hope that in future, databases will make consultations easier, but for the time being, it was important for the workshop to share what there is, and what there need to be.

Romain Chancerel noted that the work of the Workshop might not have been comprehensive enough since there was not enough time to prepare. He described the process as ongoing, but sounded the urgency at which Groups needed to submit all work done during the Workshop at the end; these being the product of the workshop. He mentioned the probability of an opportunity to organize another workshop during which the Table would be more finalized.

On this note, Mr. Chancerel gave the floor to the Group of Experts and to UNEP for their recommendations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Group of Experts participating in this Workshop highlighted the meeting as an opportunity for reinforcing the way forward for the RP. This was necessary as it helped to determine areas where capacity building was necessary.

The representative of UNEP reiterated that the RP is an ongoing programme of the WOA (World Ocean Assessment). He emphasized that it was important for participants to maintain the momentum of the Workshop to move the process forward in an effective manner, and to develop more meaningful relationship as the link between Africa and the South America was very strong.

Special thanks were extended to the Government of Côte d'Ivoire for hosting the Workshop, to the participants for effective engagement, the interpreters for a job well-done, to the Secretariat of the Abidjan Convention for a well-organized workshop.