# Relevant documents and questions for consideration on

# lessons learned from the second cycle of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects

# I. Relevant documents

**1. General Assembly resolutions**

* General Assembly resolutions on oceans and the law of the sea: [70/235](https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/70/235) (General Assembly decides to launch the second cycle), [71/257](https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/71/257), [72/73](https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/72/73), [73/124](https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/73/124), [74/19](https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/74/19).

**2. Reports of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process**

* Reports on the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process: Seventh Meeting ([A/71/362](https://undocs.org/A/71/362)), Eighth Meeting ([A/72/89](https://undocs.org/A/72/89)), Ninth Meeting ([A/72/494](https://undocs.org/A/72/494)), Tenth Meeting ([A/73/74](https://undocs.org/A/73/74)), Eleventh Meeting ([73/373](https://undocs.org/A/73/373)), Twelfth Meeting ([A/74/315](https://undocs.org/A/74/315)).

**3. Lessons learned from the first cycle of the Regular Process**

* [Abstract of views on lessons learned from the first cycle](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/7th_adhoc_2016/Abstract_on_Lessons_Learned_rev26072016.pdf)

**4. Programme of work**

* Programme of work for the period 2017-2020 of the second cycle of the Regular Process ([A/71/362](https://undocs.org/A/71/362), attachment to the recommendations)
* Secretariat activities relating to the Regular Process (A/71/362, Annex)

**5. Group of Experts**

* Terms of reference and working methods for the Group of Experts ([A/72/89](https://undocs.org/A/72/89), Annex)
* Designations of lead members and co-lead members ([A/73/373](https://undocs.org/en/A/73/373), Annex II, Enclosure II)
* [Revised designations of lead members and co-lead members](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/list_of_lead_and_co-lead_members_revised_2019-11.pdf)
* Guidance for Contributors Part I ([A/72/494](https://undocs.org/A/72/494), Annex IV)
* Guidance for Contributors Part II ([A/73/74](https://undocs.org/A/73/74), Annex II)

**6. Pool of Experts**

* Mechanism for the establishment of the Pool of Experts for the second cycle ([A/72/494](https://undocs.org/A/72/494), Annex I)
* [Revised mechanism for the establishment of the Pool of Experts for the second cycle](https://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/8th_adhoc_2017/mech.pdf)
* [Gaps of expertise in the Pool of Experts](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/gaps_in_expertise.pdf)
* [List of the members of the Pool of Experts of the second cycle](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/2020_04_27_pool_of_experts.xlsx) (as at 1 May 2020)

**7. National Focal Points**

* Terms of reference for National Focal Points ([A/72/494](https://undocs.org/A/72/494), Annex II)

**8. Technical abstracts of the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment**

* [Technical abstracts of the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/content/technical-abstracts)

**9. Second world ocean assessment**

* Outline for the second world ocean assessment ([A/73/74](https://undocs.org/A/73/74), Annex I)
* Annotated Outline of the second World Ocean Assessment (WOA II) ([A/73/373](https://undocs.org/en/A/73/373), Annex II)
* [List of writing teams for the second world ocean assessment](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/list_of_writing_teams_asof_13_april_2020.pdf) (as at 13 April 2020)
* Template for chapters of the second world ocean assessment ([A/73/373](https://undocs.org/en/A/73/373), Annex II, Enclosure I)
* [Preliminary timetable and implementation plan for the second world ocean assessment](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/10th_adhoc_2018/2018_GOERP_Timetable.pdf)
* Report on the preliminary timetable and implementation plan ([A/73/373](https://undocs.org/en/A/73/373), Annex I)
* [Revised preliminary timetable and implementation plan](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/revised_timetable_and_implementation_plan.pdf)
* Report on the revised preliminary timetable and implementation plan ([presentation](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/ahwgw_july_2019_-_implementation_report.pdf))
* [Further revised timetable and implementation plan](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/goerp_2019_revised_timetable_and_implementation_plan_october_2019_as_approved_by_bureau_on_15_nov_2019.pdf)

**10. Regional workshops**

* Guidelines for the first round of workshops in 2017 to assist the second cycle of the Regular Process ([A/72/494](https://undocs.org/A/72/494), Annex III)
* [Guidelines for the second round of workshops in 2018](https://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/10th_adhoc_2018/Elements.pdf)
* Summaries of discussions from the Regional Workshops of the second cycle of the Regular Process
	+ First round of regional workshops in 2017: [Lisbon, Portugal](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/2017_Portugal/Summary_Portugal.pdf); [Auckland, New Zealand](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/2017_NewZealand/Summary_NewZealand.pdf); [Camboriú, Brazil](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/2017_Brazil/Summary_Brazil.pdf); [Bangkok, Thailand](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/2017_Thailand/Summary_Thailand.pdf); [Zanzibar, United Republic of Tanzania](http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/2017_Tanzania/Summary_Tanzania.pdf).
	+ Second round of regional workshops in 2018: [Koror, Palau](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/summary_of_discussions_koror.pdf); [Valetta, Malta](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/summary_of_discussions_malta.pdf); [Odessa, Ukraine](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/ukraine_regional_workshop_summary_of_discussions.pdf); [Bali, Indonesia](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/bali_workshop.pdf); [Doha, State of Qatar](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/doha_report.pdf); [Accra, Ghana](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/ghana_report.pdf); [Guayaquil, Ecuador](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/ecuador_report.pdf).
* Report on the second round of regional workshops ([presentation](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/ahwgw_july_2019_-_regional_workshops.pdf))

**11. Multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event**

* [Concept note for the multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/regular_process_capacity-building_event_concept_note_.pdf)
* [Summary of discussions from the multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/sites/www.un.org.regularprocess/files/way_forward_conclusions_from_the_multi-stakeholder_event.pdf)
* The way forward: conclusions from the multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event ([A/74/315](https://undocs.org/A/74/315), Annex I)

**12. Third cycle**

* Possible outcomes and building blocks of the third cycle of the Regular Process ([A/74/315](https://undocs.org/a/74/315), Annex II)

***\*Relevant documents are available on the*** [***website of the Regular Process***](https://www.un.org/regularprocess/)

# II. Questions for consideration

***Duration, outputs and the programme of work***

1. The duration for the second cycle of the Regular Process is five years.
* Did you find this duration suitable for the achievement of the objectives of the second cycle?
* Was the allocation of time to the individual phases of the second cycle optimal for the achievement of the objectives of the second cycle?
1. The scope of the first cycle was to establish a baseline concerning the state of the marine environment, while the scope of the second cycle was extended to evaluating trends and identifying gaps.
* Did you find the scope of the second cycle suitable from the perspective of the overall objectives of the Regular Process?
* What other aspects might have also been covered by the scope of the second cycle?
1. The main outputs from the second cycle include: the technical abstracts from the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment (First World Ocean Assessment – WOA I) and the second world ocean assessment (WOA II).
* Did you find the technical abstracts useful and relevant?
* If not, what might have been done to make these outputs more useful and relevant? For example, how could the format, scope and focus of these outputs have been improved?
* Based on the experience of the second cycle, what may be done to create more direct links between these outputs to global, regional or subregional objectives, in particular the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals?
1. In accordance with the programme of work for the period 2017-2020 of the second cycle, a number of activities were carried out to make the second cycle operational, including activities relating to the achievement of the two outputs, on outreach and awareness-raising, and relating to the achievement of capacity-building, such as the maintenance of a capacity-building inventory, the holding of regional workshops and their follow-up, and the holding of a multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event.
* Which activities did you find most useful and relevant?
* Are there any activities that may need to be reviewed with a view to better supporting the overall objectives of the Regular Process?
* What other activities might have also been done to better support the second cycle?
1. As the secretariat of the Regular Process, the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the Office of Legal Affairs (DOALOS) performs a series of functions, as defined in the Annex to the programme of work for the period 2017-2020, to support the activities undertaken within the second cycle.
* Are there any additional activities that could have been assigned to the secretariat to better support the second cycle?
* Are there any activities that may need to be reviewed with a view to better supporting the overall objectives of the Regular Process?
* When assessing the performance of the secretariat in supporting the second cycle, what feedback would you offer to assist it in further improving its work?
1. The Guidance for Contributors noted that the Group of Experts would develop proposals for the scope and structure of the assessment(s) to be produced during the second cycle, as well as a timetable and implementation plan for each. The General Assembly later decided that the Group of Experts should proceed on the basis of a single, comprehensive assessment. The preliminary timetable and implementation plan for the production of WOA II was adopted in March 2018. This was subsequently revised, in light of the progress being made, with the final version of the timetable and implementation plan approved by the Bureau in November 2019.
* Did you find the timetable and implementation plan useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to making the timetable and implementation plan more useful?
1. The Group of Experts was first requested to develop an outline of WOA II for adoption by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole and later requested to also provide an annotated outline for WOA II. During the discussions on the annotated outline, the Joint Coordinator of the Group of Experts noted that “the annotated outline required inputs from writing teams and could only be prepared once all the writing teams were approved” (A/73/373, para. 11). For WOA II, the last writing teams were approved in April 2020.
* Did you find both the outline and the annotated outline useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to making the outline and the annotated outline more useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to ensuring that writing teams are in place at an earlier stage, to facilitate the production of the annotated outline?

***Review processes for the second world ocean assessment (WOA II)***

1. The review process for WOA II has two stages: peer-review, completed by experts drawn from the Pool of Experts that did not take part in drafting the chapters they were reviewing; and review by States, where Member States are invited to review and provide comments on the first and second drafts of WOA II. Non-member States and intergovernmental organizations have not been invited to review the first and second drafts of WOA II.
* Did you find this two-stage review process useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the review process for the outputs of the Regular Process?
1. Dedicated webpages were created for the process of review by States on the website of the Regular Process.
* Did you find these webpages useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to making these webpages more useful?

***Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole and its Bureau***

1. During the second cycle, the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole has been meeting once a year, with additional meetings as necessary. Until the end of the second cycle, the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole will have held 8 meetings. An average of 50 Member States participated in these meetings, varying from 31 (the Ninth meeting) to 63 (the Seventh meeting) Member States participating. The length of these meetings has varied from two (most meetings) to five days (the Seventh meeting).
* Was the frequency of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole optimal for the achievement of the objectives of the second cycle?
* What would have been the ideal length for a meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to increasing participation in the meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the organization of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole?
1. The Bureau of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole consists of 15 members, with three members from each regional group. The Bureau usually meets monthly to put into practice the decisions of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole and providing guidance during intersessional periods. The Bureau also takes decisions by silence procedure between meetings, including in approving the summary records of the proceedings of its meetings which are only shared with the Bureau membership.
* Was the frequency of the Bureau meetings optimal for its work during the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the work of the Bureau?

***Group of Experts***

1. The General Assembly, in paragraph 287 of its resolution 70/235, requested the Secretary-General to invite the Chairs of the regional groups to constitute a group of experts, ensuring adequate expertise and geographical distribution, comprising a maximum of 25 experts, with no more than five experts per regional group. Currently, the Group of Experts consists of 19 members: five each from the African Group, the Asia-Pacific Group and the Western European and Others Group, three from the Eastern European Group, and one from the Latin American and Caribbean Group; 12 members are men and seven are women. The Group of Experts is led by two Joint Coordinators, one from a developed country and one from a developing country, elected by the Group of Experts. In the second cycle, an advisor to the Joint Coordinators was also appointed by the Group of Experts which was considered necessary in view of its workload.
* Was the constitution and composition of the Group of the Experts suitable for its work during the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to ensuring more adequate expertise and geographical distribution in the Group of Experts?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to achieving gender balance in the composition of the Group of Experts?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the constitution and composition of the Group of Experts?
1. A database was developed on the website of the Regular Process to provide detailed information on the expertise of the members of the Group of Experts. The information in this database was maintained by the members of the Group of Experts, but not all experts have provided their information.
* Did you find this database useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving this database?
1. Communication between members of the Group of Experts has primarily taken place via e-mail and teleconferences. While Unite Connections and Microsoft SharePoint were used successively in the second cycle to provide a platform for all members of the Group of Experts to connect and work jointly on documents, not all members of the Group of Experts were able to use these platforms due to technical limitations.
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the communication between members of the Group of Experts?

***Pool of Experts***

1. The period for States to nominate and intergovernmental organizations to recommend experts for appointment to the Pool of Experts was originally intended to have an end date. However, gaps in needed expertise in the Pool of Experts persist throughout the second cycle. In its document on Gaps in expertise in the Pool of Experts, the Joint Coordinators of the Group of Experts noted the need for additional experts from specific regions for a number of chapters or topics. Experts for the North and South Pacific regions and the Indian Ocean were the most in demand. The Joint Coordinators of the Group of Experts also noted that more expertise was needed related to gender studies and to socioeconomic aspects. Due to the persisting gaps in expertise, several calls were sent for States to nominate and intergovernmental organizations to recommend experts for appointment to the Pool of Experts.
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to ensuring adequate expertise in the Pool of Experts?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to ensuring that any gaps in expertise are filled at an early stage of the second cycle?
1. As of 4 May 2020, there are 790 experts in the Pool of Experts: 87 experts from the African Group, 128 from the Asia-Pacific Group, 19 from the Eastern European Group, 133 from the Latin American and Caribbean Group, and 423 from the Western European and Others Group. Of all experts, 553 are men and 237 women.
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to improving the geographical distribution in the Pool of Experts?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to achieving gender balance in the Pool of Experts?
1. In the second cycle, appointment of experts to the Pool of Experts were based on nomination by States or recommendation by intergovernmental organizations and in accordance with the approved mechanism. In cases where the secretariat received “self-nominations” from experts interested in being part of the Pool of Experts for the second cycle, or where the Group of Experts requested the assistance of the secretariat to identify potential experts to be members of writing teams, the information of such experts were shared with the States of nationalities for their consideration of nomination.
* Did you find the mechanism for the appointment of experts to the Pool of Experts suitable and adequate?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the mechanism for the appointment of experts to the Pool of Experts?
1. In the second cycle, the nomination of an expert to the Pool of Experts was to be accompanied by a Personal History Form (PHF) and the curriculum vitae (CV) of the expert. In the PHF, the area(s) of expertise of the nominated expert and the sea area(s) that expertise covers were indicated, with reference to a list of expertise desired in the Pool of Experts (attached to the PHF). The PHF also indicated the category for which the expert was nominated: member of the writing team, commentator or peer-reviewer.
* Did you find the materials required for the nomination of an expert to the Pool of Experts suitable and adequate?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to making the PHF more useful?
1. A database was developed on the website of the Regular Process to provide detailed information on the expertise of the members of the Pool of Experts. The information in this database was maintained by the members of the Pool of Experts in a searchable format to facilitate the work of the Group of Experts, but a large number of experts did not provide their information in the database.
* Did you find this database useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving this database?

***National Focal Points***

1. In the second cycle, States were invited to designate, by 31 May 2017, national focal points (NFPs) to facilitate the implementation of the programme of work for the period 2017-2020 of the second cycle, in particular with respect to the nomination process for additional experts to the Pool of Experts, swift communication between the scientific community, the Group of Experts, the Pool of Experts, the Bureau and the secretariat of the Regular Process and awareness-raising. The Terms of Reference for NFPs note that States may wish to consider professionals working in any of the main disciplines in the social, economic and environmental sciences, in particular those with experience of the science-policy interface in ocean/marine affairs, and with due regard to the need for gender balance. As of 4 May 2020, 67 States have designated NFPs.
* Did you find the designation of NFPs useful?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to encouraging further designations of NFPs?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to promoting gender balance in the designation of the NFPs?
1. The Terms of Reference for NFPs provides for a series of mandates of the NFPs and the modalities of their work. It provides that the secretariat of the Regular Process will hold regular virtual meetings with NFPs as needed and that communications between national focal points, the secretariat and the Group of Experts should be transmitted through a database that they will be able to access electronically through the website of the Regular Process. No such meetings were held during the second cycle, and no such database had been used.
* Did you find the Terms of Reference for NFPs, including the mandates and modalities of work, suitable for the second cycle?
* Are there any additional functions that could have been assigned to the NFPs to better facilitate the implementation of the programme of work?
* Are there any functions of the NFPs that may need to be reviewed with a view to better facilitating the implementation of the programme of work?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the modalities of work of the NFPs?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the Terms of Reference for NFPs?

***Writing teams***

1. In the second cycle, the writing team for each chapter or subchapter of WOA II was composed of: a member of the Group of Experts with overall responsibility for the production of the chapter (lead member); any additional members of the Group of Experts with relevant expertise (co-lead members); one or more experts responsible for the coordination of the work of the writing team (convenor or joint convenors), drawn from the Group of Experts or the Pool of Experts; and several other experts drawn from the Pool of Experts. The minimum requirements set for each writing team by the Bureau was that it should have at least one convenor and three other members. The members of the writing team were selected by the Group of Experts, with some input from States and the secretariat where gaps were identified.
* Was the constitution and composition of the writing teams suitable for their work during the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the process of selection of experts to the writing teams?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the composition of the writing teams?
1. Communication with and within the writing teams primarily took place electronically, and the specific method of communication was determined by each individual lead member or convenor. Due to budgetary implications, the members of the writing teams were not provided with access to a common online collaboration platform for their work on WOA II. The writing teams for each chapter worked independently unless lead members decided that collaboration would be beneficial.
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the communication within writing teams?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the communication between writing teams have been improved?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the communication between the writing teams and other parts of the Regular Process have been improved?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the working methods of the writing teams?

***Capacity-building***

1. Capacity-building is one of the core objectives of the Regular Process. A capacity-building inventory was prepared by the secretariat during the first cycle of the Regular Process and continues to be updated with information provided by States, intergovernmental organizations and nongovernmental organizations, with a view to providing up-to-date and easily accessible information on capacity-building needs and opportunities.
* Did you find this capacity-building inventory useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving this inventory?
1. A two-day multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event was held in 2019, in order to provide an opportunity to build awareness and collaboration with respect to capacity-building in support of the Regular Process, including with respect to building capacity to participate in, and make use of, integrated assessments. Of the 27 moderators and panellists selected for the event, three moderators or panellists were nationals of States in the African Group, six of the Asia-Pacific Group, two of the Eastern European Group, six of the Latin American and Caribbean States Group and six of the Western European and Others Group; 13 were women and 14 men. The outcome document which contained conclusions from this event was approved by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole during its twelfth meeting.
* Did you find this event useful and relevant?
* If not, what might have been done to make this event more useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the organization of this event, including in relation to the nomination and selection of moderators and panellists?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the outcome document of this event?
* Are there other capacity-building activities that could have also been done to better support the second cycle?

***Regional workshops***

1. Two rounds of regional workshops were organized in support of the second cycle. The first round of regional workshops, which consisted of five workshops, was held in 2017 to inform the scoping of the assessment, raise awareness, provide information and receive feedback on the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment (WOA I), and generate interest from the scientific community. A major contribution of the first round of regional workshops was to the elaboration of the outline of WOA II. The second round, which consisted of seven regional workshops, was held in 2018 to, inter alia, inform the collection of regional level information and data for the preparation of WOA II. A major contribution of the second round was that it provided an opportunity for the various writing teams to meet and start preparing their chapters. Guidelines and a draft agenda were developed for both rounds of workshops.
* Did you find these regional workshops useful and relevant?
* If not, what might have been done to make these regional workshops more useful and relevant? For example, how could the amount, structure and focus of these regional workshops have been improved?
* Did you find the guidelines and draft agenda for regional workshops useful and relevant?
* If not, what might have been done to make the guidelines and draft agenda for regional workshops more useful and relevant?
1. Participants in regional workshops during the second cycle were selected based on nominations of experts received from Member States of the United Nations, members of United Nations specialized agencies, as well as relevant organizations, funds, programmes and bodies within the United Nations system. Priority was given to nominees from the host country and from States from the region in question, including with regard to the funding of experts. In the first round, the number of participants in each workshop ranged from 17 to 51, with an average of 35 participants per workshop. The percentage of female participants in each workshop ranged from 29 to 52 per cent, with the average being 35.8 per cent. In the second round, the number of participants in each workshop ranged from 34 to 86, with an average of 53 participants per workshop. The percentage of female participants ranged from 28 to 50 per cent, with the average being 36.7 per cent. The late scheduling of regional workshops was identified as one of the main challenges that had constrained attendance by some of the experts during the second cycle, including the lead members for the chapters tabled for discussion (A/74/315, para. 8).
* Did you find the process on the nomination and selection of participants in regional workshops during the second cycle suitable and adequate?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the nomination and selection of participants in regional workshops?
* Did you find the numbers of participants in regional workshops during the second cycle suitable?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the participation in regional workshops?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to achieving gender balance among participants in the regional workshops?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to avoiding or addressing the challenges posed by the late scheduling of regional workshops?
1. Capacity-building was undertaken as part of the regional workshops during the second cycle through presentations and discussions on inter alia, theory and practice related to integrated assessments.
* Did you find the capacity-building elements of the regional workshops during the second cycle useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to making the regional workshops more useful and relevant for capacity-building?

***Interactions with other ocean-related processes***

1. The General Assembly, in its resolution 70/235, recalled the importance of ensuring that assessments, such as those prepared under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Regular Process, support one another and avoid unnecessary duplication, and the importance of taking into account assessments at the regional level.
* How did you find the interactions between the Regular Process and other ocean-related processes during the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the interactions between the Regular Process and other ocean-related processes?

***Assistance and contribution by relevant organizations and bodies***

1. The General Assembly, in its resolution 71/257, invited the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Maritime Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the World Meteorological Organization and relevant United Nations system organizations, bodies, funds and programmes, as appropriate, to assist in the implementation of the second cycle of the Regular Process with regard to the following activities: awareness-raising, the identification of experts for the Pool of Experts, technical and scientific support to the Bureau and the Group of Experts, hosting workshops and meetings of the writing teams, capacity-building and the scoping process for the assessment(s) of the second cycle. The General Assembly also invited relevant intergovernmental organizations to contribute, as appropriate, to the activities of the second cycle.
* How did you find the assistance by relevant organizations, bodies, funds and programmes within the United Nations system and contribution by relevant intergovernmental organizations in the implementation of the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further encouraging such assistance and contribution?

***Communication***

1. During the second cycle, the secretariat has engaged in outreach and awareness-raising activities, including through the regional workshops, briefings or side events on the Regular Process for States and other stakeholders in the margins of intergovernmental meetings, and the production of brochures on the Regular Process.
* Did you find these outreach and awareness-raising activities useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving these outreach and awareness-raising activities?
1. A website dedicated to the Regular Process was developed during the second cycle.
* Did you find this website useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving this website?

***Resources and funding***

1. In the second cycle, funding was provided through the regular budget of the United Nations for, inter alia, the drafting and publication of the technical abstracts of WOA I, the servicing of meetings, travel to regional workshops, the drafting, copyediting, translation and publishing of WOA II, outreach and awareness raising, and capacity-building.
* Did you find the budgeting for activities of the second cycle suitable and adequate?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the budgeting for the activities of the Regular Process?
1. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 64/71, the Secretary-General established the Regular Process voluntary trust fund for the purpose of supporting the operations of the first five-year cycle of the Regular Process, including for the provision of assistance to members of the group of experts from developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing States. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 68/70, it was further requested that the Secretary-General administer the voluntary trust fund beyond the first five-year cycle and for the duration of the operations of the Regular Process. Contributions to the trust fund may be made by States, international financial institutions, donor agencies, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and natural and juridical persons. Contributions to this voluntary trust fund supported, inter alia, the travel of members of the Group of Experts from developing countries to a number of meetings, including those of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole, the Group of Experts and the writing teams.
* How did you find the operation of this voluntary trust fund during the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving the operation of this voluntary trust fund?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to encouraging contributions to this voluntary trust fund?
1. The Regular Process special scholarship fund was established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/71 to support training programmes for developing countries. No contributions have yet been made to the special scholarship fund. In its resolution 74/19, the General Assembly recalled the potential of the special scholarship fund to support training programme for developing countries, including through cooperation projects among various stakeholders, in order to strengthen the human and institutional capacity of those countries to carry out integrated assessments, and encouraged States, international financial institutions, donor agencies, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and natural and juridical person to make financial contributions to that fund.
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to encouraging contributions to this special scholarship fund?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to realizing the potential of this special scholarship fund?

***Multilingualism***

1. The General Assembly has emphasized in its resolutions on multilingualism (most recently [73/346](https://undocs.org/A/RES/73/346)) the paramount importance of the equality of the six official languages of the United Nations, and underlined the responsibility of the Secretariat of the United Nations in integrating multilingualism into its activities, from within existing resources, on an equitable basis. As outputs of the second cycle, the technical abstracts of WOA I have been made available in all six official languages, and WOA II will be made available in all six official languages. The website of the Regular Process is currently available in English only.
* How did you find the integration of multilingualism in the activities of the second cycle?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further integrating multilingualism in the activities of the Regular Process?

***Lessons learned process***

1. In its resolution 74/19, the General Assembly requested the Bureau to consider the lessons learned from the second cycle of the Regular Process, including with regard to the duration of the cycle and its outputs, in line with the modalities set forth in paragraph 282 of resolution 70/235 and on the basis of input received from Member States and other participants in the Ad Hoc Working Group and the Group of Experts, as well as from the secretariat. In its meeting on 19 February 2020, the Bureau agreed that the lessons learned exercise for the second cycle would consist only of the written submission of input, which would be compiled by the secretariat and submitted for consideration by the Bureau and then by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole. A list of relevant documents and questions for consideration was developed by the secretariat for Member States and other participants in the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole to take into consideration in preparing their written input on lessons learned from the second cycle.
* Did you find the lessons learned exercise for the second cycle useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving this lessons learned exercise?
* Did you find this list of relevant documents and questions for consideration useful and relevant?
* Could you provide any suggestions with a view to further improving this list of relevant documents and questions for consideration?