

## **6.2 Types and Modalities**

### **New Zealand Intervention**

Thank you Madam Facilitator.

New Zealand sees this agreement as an opportunity for inclusiveness and to ensure that all states are able to participate in the overall objective of conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. We are seeking structured frameworks in this agreement that will strengthen the implementation of the relevant UNCLOS provisions on capacity building and transfer of marine technology and promote coordination and integration of these efforts.

My delegation stresses our support for the special case of SIDS to be considered in this chapter of the agreement. From our perspective, a successful capacity building approach must consider the close connection and connectivity between areas within SIDS' jurisdictions and their surrounding high seas, and the potential impacts of activities in areas beyond national jurisdiction on SIDS.

As to the types of capacity-building and transfer of technology to be included in the agreement under para 1, New Zealand agrees with others that we see value in including a non-exhaustive list (as in Option I) but would prefer to cluster the current items into broader categories. We think that there may be a risk of obsolescence if are too specific in this section. For brevity, we will submit our full list of suggested categories to PaperSmart.

New Zealand also supports references to traditional knowledge, climate change and ocean acidification as proposed by the Pacific SIDS depending on how the broad categories of types of capacity-building end up being reflected in this section.

Like others, we also think that we could merge Options I and II and provide for further addition of categories or types and are open to which body would undertake this responsibility.

New Zealand supports including text on a review mechanism at para 2 and would prefer that this be practical and cost-effective.

On modalities, we are interested in balancing clear guidelines with a process that is practical and efficient. We consider that some modalities, for example the needs assessment and needs-based approach, which we support, are worth specifying in greater detail.

## 6 Capacity building and transfer of marine technology

On the relationship between transfer of marine technology and IPR in para 8, we do not see the need to diverge from the positions stated in Art 16.2 of the CBD and Art 13.2 of the Plant Treaty, as reflected in option D.

On para 7, we are flexible as to where this concept is included, for example as the EU suggests as part of mutually agreed terms or as a guiding principle suggested by AOSIS, but we consider it is important that our objectives under CBTT are not undermined by onerous reporting requirements for recipient countries.

On para 9, we query whether consultations with adjacent coastal states would be required for capacity-building and the transfer of technology. We do not support option C which merely reiterates Art 266, which we think needs to be clarified in a way that operationalises the obligation.

Finally, we are open to listing the types of cooperation in para 10 but consider that the wording of the provisions needs to be amended to reflect the legal obligation to promote technology transfer rather than carry out such transfer.

Thank you.

### *Suggested categories for 6.2(1) Option I:*

- (a) Information sharing of relevant knowledge, data, research and manuals (e, f, w, x, aa, bb, cc, kk, oo)*
- (b) Dissemination and awareness raising (g, q, v, ll)*
- (c) Infrastructure - including developing/strengthening institutional capacity and national regulatory frameworks/mechanisms and research equipment (b, c, l, n, r, u, y, z, ee, jj)*
- (d) Development of technical expertise through exchanges, collaboration on research, technical support, education and training (a, d, i, j, k, m, o, p, s, t, ff, gg, hh, ii, mm, nn) and technologies (e, f)*
- (e) Development of standards (dd)*