

## **Views on lessons learned from the first cycle of the Regular Process The Government of Japan**

March, 2016

(Nomination process of the pool of experts)

Currently, for nominating members of the pool of experts, states have to submit their nominations through their missions in New York, by forwarding them to the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea through the regional groups. However, this communication process is not efficient as communication in each regional group is sometimes not immediately shared with all other related states and organizations. Therefore, nomination of pool of experts and related information should be managed by the secretariat in an integrated manner.

(Contact point / Focal point)

An appropriate communication system should be ensured for the correspondence from the secretariat to the members of the pool of experts. In this regard, if the contact point or focal point will be appointed for facilitating smooth interaction between the secretariat and newly designated contact or focal point, the same information should also be shared with the missions in New York, in light of the significance of their coordinating function.

(The number of members of the pool of experts)

Taking into account that the number of the initial members of the pool of experts was not sufficient for proceeding planned activities in the first cycle, which required us to nominate additional experts at later stage, appropriate measures should be explored in the early stages for nominating adequate number of experts for the second cycle.

(Overall Schedule)

There was not sufficient time for writing and reviewing the draft report in the first cycle because it took a long time to decide the overall policy and plan of the

first cycle resulting the delay to start the work of the Group of Experts. We should consider an appropriate schedule for securing sufficient time for writing and reviewing the draft report when deciding the overall policy and plan of the second cycle.

(Selecting process of writing team, commentators and peer reviewers)

In the drafting process of outcome documents etc., the members of writing teams, commentators and peer reviewers should be selected from the pool of experts.

Besides, the process of selecting the members was not clear and transparent in the first cycle. Some experts were selected not from the pool of experts and others were appointed as a member of the pool after finishing the drafting works. There were also cases that the result of selection for the members of writing teams, commentators and peer reviewers was not provided to Member States. There were few opportunities to know whether certain commentators had been already selected or not. The selection process in the second cycle should be clear and transparent.

(Review process)

Member States were not provided with information on the status of the draft report, which had been revised in the light of the comments from Member States and peer reviewers. We cannot judge whether peer review process worked well or not because it is unclear who were selected as peer reviewers. The review process should be transparent and the progress of the review should be shared with the Member States.