



AREA-BASED MANAGEMENT TOOLS, INCLUDING MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

Second Session

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 of the Intergovernmental Conference (BBNJ)

Conference Room 4, UN Headquarters, New York, 28 March 2019

Thank you, Madam Facilitator. We associate ourselves with the statement made by Palestine on behalf of G77 and China, and wish to express our national position on a number of options in the President's Aid.

4.3 Process in relation to area-based management tools, including marine protected areas

4.3.1 Identification of areas

For the identification of areas, 4.3.1 subparagraph (2), the Philippines supports Option I stating the standards and criteria for the identification of areas. Most of these are already being adopted and being used in identification of ecologically and biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs) by the Convention on Biological Diversity.

On subparagraph (4), we support Option I, Option A.

On subparagraph (5), our delegation supports Option I, however, said decision-making body/forum should be guided by a Scientific body proposed to be established under this instrument.

4.3.2 Designation Process

On 4.3.2, the Philippines prefers outlining the designation process in the Instrument over a no-text option, and chooses Option 1 for all items under Proposals, Consultation on and assessment of the proposal, and Decision-making.

Proposal

On proposal, subparagraph (1) under Option I, on who can submit the proposals, we prefer Option A.

On subparagraph (2), we support Option C, where proposals shall be submitted to the Secretariat set forth in the instrument.

On subparagraph (4), we prefer Option A outlining the required elements of the proposal.

On item (p), we can exercise flexibility on the options presented pending further discussion. We do, however, wish to note that in our experience, duration is usually reflected in the MPA management plan where timeframe for implementation, review and updating measures are specified. The said measures may take into account the results of management assessment, effectiveness and evaluation.

Consultation on and assessment of the proposal

On consultation on and assessment of the proposal, we support Option I, and under subparagraph (2), we support Option B. We wish to emphasize the importance of consulting adjacent coastal States throughout the process, as any activity being conducted within States' own jurisdiction may have an effect on the implementation of conservation measures in the ABNJ, and vice versa.

On subparagraph (7), we support Option A.

Decision-making

On decision-making, we support Option I, and under subparagraph (1), we support Option B. Under Option B – item (c), we support Option 1.

On subparagraph (2), whether the decision shall be taken by consensus, we support Option B.

On subparagraph (3), regarding consent of adjacent States, we support Option B.