

Second substantive 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

Intervention by Marie-May Muzungaile- Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change- Seychelles

Item 6- Informal Working Group on *Area Based Management Tools; including Marine Protected Areas*

28 March 2019- New York

Thank you Madam Facilitator

Seychelles aligns itself to the statements made by Palestine on behalf of Group 77/China, Belize on behalf of AOSIS, and Algeria on behalf of the Africa Group.

With regards to the section 4.3.2 on the Designation process for ABMT we have the following comments:

In general we find that there is very strong focus on MPAs rather than the broader idea of Area Based Management Tools, hence feel that some of the text provided in the section would have to be relooked at.

Regarding *Proposals*

We prefer **Option I**

For Serial number 1- we prefer Option A - (a) that proposals should be submitted by State Parties This can be done individually or as recognized groups, with or without assistance and collaboration of other entities including civil society.

For serial number 2- We favor Option C: that the proposals should be submitted to the secretariat as is the normal practice in other such processes.

For Serial number 4, we prefer Option **B**- That the full format of proposals be elaborated by the body set forth in part We feel that this is something that can be articulated at a later time as well.

Regarding *Consultation on and assessment of the proposal*

We share similar views of the broader African Group in that we prefer **Option I, (1)**- and recognize that there is a need for an all-inclusive, transparent stakeholder consultation that is done in a time-bound process.

For serial number (2), we would like to see text given, instead of a no text option. We are leaning more towards **Option B** because it makes provisions for both adjacent coastal states and SIDS.

Being from a SIDS we would therefore like to request that due consideration be given to our capacity to engage in such consultation process.

With regards to *Decision-making*

We prefer **Option I**, but at this stage have not committed to any preferences to the other parts under this option. What is important to us is that the adjacent coastal states are part of this final decision making process, as any decision will impact management activities that such adjacent States may already be undertaking.

Thank you Madam Facilitator