



Intervention
Delivered on 7 September 2018, New York

**Intergovernmental Conference on an international legally binding instrument under the
United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use
of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction
First substantive session**

6.2

Capacity Building and Transfer of Marine Technology:

Thank you, Madame Facilitator for giving me the floor. This delegation aligns itself with the statement made by Maldives on behalf of AOSIS and Nauru on behalf of PSIDS. This delegation agrees that the means of implementation should be responsive to the needs of states as has been stated by others.

As you warned this morning, I will try to follow your rules for focus and clarity.

The list should be non-exhaustive and broad enough that it allows us to address issues that we may not know exist yet.

The list should be responsive to the needs of states as well as regions with an aim to build capacity to ensure that developing states especially are equipped to fulfill their obligations to implement the instrument. Nationally, we have been successful in allowing our scientists to interpret their research to help inform our policies on conservation and sustainable use of marine resources within areas of national jurisdiction, so like Tonga we believe that in order for science to adequately inform policy for BBNJ, the scientific information needs to be translated.

A conference of parties could develop a broad list, that is not limiting. The COP should also review and update the list periodically and regularly evaluate the implementation of CB and TMT for efficiency and responsiveness to ensure states' needs and obligations are met.

If the list is not included in the Instrument, obligation to develop a list, subsequently, at the regional level should still be included in the Instrument.

Specific forms of partnership, cooperation and assistance should be determined from the point of view to develop already existing capacity. Like others who have spoken before, capacity building should be needs-driven and should take into account the practical capabilities of the recipient of the assistance. (agree with Mauritius)

CB efforts should not be limited to states only. There are other stakeholders that could aid in providing CB. The inclusive manner in which these sessions are conducted today should be adopted as we move forward.

This delegation is mindful that there are existing mechanisms that can still be used to implement CB and TMT, but this should not hinder our efforts to develop new mechanisms as the need arises.

For the discussion on a clearinghouse mechanism, this delegation agrees with delegations that have pointed to the importance of a global mechanism that would be a one-stop shop or as close as possible to a one-stop shop for all stakeholders. Palau has recently enacted into law an access and benefit sharing legislation, and we have looked to the clearing-house mechanism of the CBD and so like other delegations, we note that relevant aspects of CBD, ISA, and IOC could be helpful to look at as models to develop a clearinghouse mechanism.

Effectiveness and responsiveness to the needs of parties on the implementation of CB and TMT should be reviewed regularly by an international body based on reports from additional bodies, both regional and technical, to ensure that the review is done comprehensively, and that the international body is well informed to undertake decisions on how to improve the effectiveness of the implementation of CB and TMT. Thank you.