

Statement of Norway

on

Arrangements to enhance cooperation with relevant legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional, subregional and sectoral bodies (IFBs)

- Norway places great importance on the arrangements to enhance cooperation with relevant IFBs.
- In our view, this is really the main function of the Agreement: to serve as a vessel for cooperation and coordination between relevant IFBs, thus benefiting from the economies of scale and filling in gaps where they exist through taking a holistic - rather than fragmented - approach to ocean governance.
- For us, this is - in essence - the practical realization of the cooperation duty as stipulated in Art. 8 of the Agreement, in addition to the parallel duty of this Agreement to not undermine relevant IFBs in Art.5 (2). It's important that we get this one right.
- This obligation of cooperation and coordination is further spelled out in the different specific provisions of the Agreement, for instance in relation to marine genetic resources, area-based management tools, environmental assessments and capacity building. Depending on the specific topic, there are a range of different IFBs that will be relevant.
- Against this backdrop, several questions seem appropriate:
 - How to set up a coordination structure that is responsive, inclusive and effective,
 - How to facilitate the Secretariat to reach out to other IFBs,
 - How can the different parts of BBNJ org structure (which we are discussing) engage with relevant IFBs,
 - How these requirements relate to the specific mechanisms under BBNJ. As an example, the relationship between this topic and the CHM. The CHM will receive large parts of the knowledge base and information from States and from IFBs. How to ensure that this information disseminates into the relevant parts of the organization, and informs recommendations, cooperation, consultations and decisions,
 - How these other IFBs are set up to respond and or engage by their own initiative within and to manage their respective mandates, for example in the consultation process in relation to ABMTs, including MPAs,
- The obligation obviously applies to the Secretariat, (Art 50 (4) letter d of the Agreement), but this is also a broader obligation, and Norway definitely sees the need for State engagement. We also note the obvious fact that it is us – the States –who are represented and that participate in all these various IFBs. Consistency in messaging is key,
 - Here, we could look at existing arrangements under established frameworks for inspiration. We could mention for instance the Collective Arrangement under OSPAR, (a regional sea convention that operates in the Northeast- Atlantic), that consists of States Parties and has involved organizations such as OSPAR, NEAFC and ISA. The Collective Arrangement serves as a forum for cooperation between competent

organizations in the same area, which have adjacent, and on occasion, overlapping mandates. To our mind, the same will be the case for the BBNJ - but on a much larger scale.

- For our discussions in august, we find it necessary to discuss cooperation both as an overarching, but also as a specific obligation. We welcome the inputs of IFBs in progressing this work further.