Multi-stakeholder Dialogue and Capacity-building Partnership Event for the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects

United Nations Headquarters, New York, 24 to 25 January 2019

I. Summary of discussions

1. This document provides a summary of the information presented, and discussions that took place, during the multi-stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event (Event) for the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects (Regular Process). The Event was held at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 24 to 25 January 2019.

2. The presentations, discussions, and the Co-Chair's possible conclusions from the Event are summarized under their respective segments: (a) Segment 1: The importance of integrated assessments for decision-making; (b) Segment 2: Capacity gaps and needs related to the conduct of integrated assessments; (c) Segment 3: Multi-stakeholder discussion on opportunities, best practices and lessons-learned for enhancing the science-policy interface; and (d) Segment 4. Way forward. The annexes to the present summary provide other details of the Event and its outcomes, including the agenda and list of participants. All relevant documents are available on the website of the Regular Process.[1]

II. Background

3. Capacity-building is one of the core objectives of the Regular Process. The programme of work for the period 2017-2020 for the second cycle of the Regular Process, developed by the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process (Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole)[2] and endorsed by the General Assembly,[3] includes in the activities the holding of a multi-stakeholder dialogue (case studies of good practices and a capacity-building partnership event).[4]

4. The concept note and draft agenda for the Event were finalized by the Bureau in consultation with the Group of Experts of the Regular Process (Group of Experts) and the secretariat of the Regular Process following the eleventh meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole.[5]

5. The concept note indicates that the aims of the Event are to:

   (a) Provide information on the science-policy interface from both the scientific and policy perspective;

   (b) Synthesize the gaps and needs related to the conduct of integrated assessments for enhanced participation in and use of the outputs of the Regular Process;

   (c) Increase awareness of assessments undertaken at various scales, the modalities which support these assessments (such as data acquisition,

---

1 https://www.un.org/regularprocess/content/multi-stakeholders.
2 See the attachment to A/71/362.
3 See General Assembly resolution 71/257, paragraph 299.
4 See paragraph 13(c) of the programme of work 2017-2020, attachment to A/71/362. See also A/72/494, para 18.
5 A/73/373, para 21(f)

collection, collation, analysis, sharing, and access) as well as the utilization of their results;

(d) Provide relevant lessons learned from best practices through the presentation of case studies from all levels;

(e) Serve as a forum for the presentation of information on relevant capacity-building initiatives, and identify needs and gaps, as well as shared priorities for capacity-building initiatives;

(f) Provide opportunity for the identification of synergies and opportunities for cooperation and coordination with respect to capacity-building initiatives.

III. Conduct of the Event

6. The Event was organized by the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the Office of Legal Affairs (DOALOS), which also serves as the secretariat for the Regular Process. The agenda is set out in Annex 1.

7. The Event was jointly chaired by the Co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole, Ms. Juliette Babb-Riley (Barbados) and Mr. Gert Auväärt (Estonia). The Event was attended by 106 participants, representing a diverse set of stakeholders such as, representatives of States, relevant United Nations system organizations, bodies, funds and programmes, relevant intergovernmental organizations and other stakeholders, including representatives from academia, civil society and industry. A number of members of the Group of Experts and Pool of Experts also contributed to the Event, both as panellists and participants. Most panellists were drawn from the list of panellists drawn up by the Bureau in response to the request of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole.[6] Every effort was made to achieve balanced panels in terms of both geographical diversity and gender. Of the 24 panellists and three moderators, 14 were men and 13 were women.[7]. The Event was webcast live via UN WebTV.[8]

8. A side event was organized in the margins of the Event by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). An information fair was also organized in the margins of the Event, where various stakeholders presented their capacity-building projects and partnerships.[9]

9. Ms. Gabriele Goettsche-Wanli, Director of DOALOS, noted in her opening remarks the timeliness of the Event with regard to charting the way forward for capacity-building for the Regular Process, and to help inform the preparations of the implementation plan for the United Nations Decade of Ocean Science for

---

[6] A/73/373, para 21(j)

[7] See the booklet on Co-Chairs, Moderators and Panellists, available at: https://www.un.org/regularprocess/content/capacity-building-partnership-event-presentations. See also the presentations available at https://www.un.org/regularprocess/content/multi-stakeholders

[8] The Event received 582 live views, and 236 “on demand” views as at 4 February 2019. The links to the webcast are available at: https://www.un.org/regularprocess/content/multi-stakeholders

[9] Stands were organized by: the People’s Republic of China; the Republic of Korea; the ATLAS project; the Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island; the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies; the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services; the International Coastal and Ocean Organization; the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea; and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

Sustainable Development (2021-2030) (Decade). She stressed that now, more than ever, gaps in capacity, and the gap between science and policy-making, need to be bridged. She noted the need to move beyond a sectoral focus towards assessing in an integrated manner the impacts of the various activities in and pressures upon the marine environment. In this regard, she stressed the importance of the full consideration of integrated assessments, and the Regular Process.

10. The keynote address, entitled "The importance of science in global policy processes", was delivered by Mr. Ariel Troisi, Chair of the Group of Experts on Capacity Development of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (IOC). In his address, Mr. Troisi noted the importance of science for developing policy and realizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), of communicating science to policy-makers, including through the preparation of integrated assessments, and of research and ocean education. In particular, he noted that all the targets of SDG 14 need science support, and that the implementation of SDG 14 will have an impact on nearly all the other SDGs. He further presented some of the key findings of the Global Ocean Science Report,[10] and stressed that ocean planning would be necessary for optimal resource allocation in the future.

11. The opening segment was followed by the consideration of the items on the agenda,[11] which included three segments consisting of panel presentations and an interactive discussion (see summaries in section V below). General statements were also made in the course of the Event by representatives of States, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations (see summary in section IV below).

12. The Event concluded with a presentation by the Co-Chair, Ms. Juliette Babb-Riley, of the possible conclusions from the Event and an interactive discussion regarding the way forward (see summary in section V.D below). The fourth segment was followed by closing remarks by the Co-Chair, Mr. Gert Auväärt.

IV. General Statements

13. Participants provided information on national and international initiatives related to capacity-building, awareness-raising, scientific research and the preparation of assessments. Such initiatives included the preparation of a national State of the Marine Environment Report as part of a pilot project facilitated under the Convention on Cooperation in the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Atlantic Coast of the West, Central and Southern Africa Region (Abidjan Convention); the development of programmes to formulate national plans to minimize green-house gas emissions and build resilience in vulnerable sectors and communities; and the importance of interdisciplinary research and communication for raising awareness. Regarding communication and the importance of ocean literacy, information was provided regarding the International Ship Managers' Association's (InterManager) Adopt-a-Ship Programme which pairs senior officers on board a ship with elementary school students in order to teach them about oceans and

[10] See https://en.unesco.org/gosr

marine issues, with the aim of developing a generation of ocean-literate children who would one day be able to influence management of oceans.

14. A participant highlighted its international partnerships for capacity-building to promote increased understanding of global ocean sciences to enhance predictability of global integrated Earth system science; the allocation of resources to establish international networks of scientists, including the training of new scientists, to observe ocean acidification; and support for capacity-building through international organizations and programmes, such as the Committee on Space Research and Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research.

15. Participants were informed that a major capacity need facing most countries of the West African region was the ability to carry out state of marine environment assessments at national to regional spatial scales, which was largely a result of the lack of resources and capability to conduct such assessments. It was noted that capacity-building plays a central role in the collective ability of humankind to understand the overall marine environment and that in the context of global environmental governance and cooperation, the regional level represents a critical middle ground between the global and national levels. Thus, optimizing the coordination of marine environmental data collection activities of least developed countries and within the regions was critical to addressing the gaps and impediments to the production of integrated marine assessments.

16. Participants welcomed the development of capacity-building under the framework of the Regular Process, including the contributions to the capacity-building inventory and the hosting of regional workshops, and noted in particular the importance of prioritizing the participation of developing States in the workshops in order to build capacity.

V. Summary of presentations and interactive discussions

17. The presentations held under each segment, as well as the interactive discussions which took place thereafter have been summarized below.

A. Segment 1: The importance of integrated assessments for decision-making

18. Segment 1, entitled “The importance of integrated assessments for decision-making” addressed the science-policy interface from both the scientific and policy perspectives. It was moderated by Ms. Judith Gobin, Head of the Department of Life Sciences at the University of the West Indies and member of the Pool of Experts (Trinidad and Tobago).

19. Mr. Julian Reyna, Dean, College of Maritime Studies and Environmental Sciences, Universidad Del Pacifico, Guayaquil, Ecuador, and member of the Pool of Experts (Colombia), presented on “The importance of integrated assessments for decision-making (science and policy perspectives) – two successful examples”. Mr. Reyna’s presentation noted that a common complaint from scientists is that their research is not taken into account by policy-makers. Decision-makers, on the other hand, complain that research is often divorced from their needs and that results are not presented simply and clearly, so they can be easily reflected in policies. Mr. Reyna stressed that these communication barriers could result in less investment being made in scientific research and presented some examples of how these barriers could be overcome, including by implementing a process of open invitations, for the benefit of society as a whole.

20. Mr. Murray Roberts, Professor, University of Edinburgh, Principal Investigator for the ATLAS project, and member of the Pool of Experts (United Kingdom) presented on "Creating partnerships for capacity-building in ecosystem assessment at ocean basin scale – case studies from the Atlantic". Mr. Roberts' presentation highlighted some recent findings emerging from the ATLAS project, a transatlantic alliance aimed at better understanding deep-sea ecosystems. He noted that certain recent scientific advances had fostered more interdisciplinary partnerships between scientists, that the project was also conducting socioeconomic analysis relating to the ecosystems, and that the final stages of the project will use a marine spatial planning approach. He also highlighted some lessons learned from the project and presented a future project, named "iAtlantic". The main objectives of the iAtlantic project were to standardise South and North Atlantic Ocean observations to enable short, medium and long-term assessments of Atlantic Ocean circulation and its physico-biogeochemical environment; map deep and open-ocean ecosystems at basin, regional and local scales; assess the stability, vulnerability, and any tipping points of deep and open-ocean Atlantic ecosystems to changes in ocean circulation, and the effects of single and multiple stressors; and align and enhance human, technological and data inter-operability capacities for cost-effective cooperation and planning across the Atlantic. He emphasized the need to work collaboratively with stakeholders and to invest in the human element.

21. Mr. H.M.K.J.B. Gunarathna, Senior Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and Development and Rural Economy, Sri Lanka, presented on "An integrated approach for Master Plan development - Project to increase aquaculture production through conservation and development of the aquatic ecosystems associated with lagoons and inland waters of Sri Lanka". He provided information on an ongoing livelihood development programme that is being introduced in Sri Lanka, which implemented projects to, inter alia, increase fish production, generate employment and promote tourism. To transform Sri Lanka's lagoon areas into areas of high economic value, the programme employed a multi-disciplinary expert team to prepare a master plan for each lagoon, and used a community-based planning approach. In this regard, Mr. Gunarathna highlighted the importance of broad consultation and the sharing of responsibilities between stakeholders, including for data collection and monitoring.

22. Ms. Joana Akrofi, Programme Management Officer, UNEP, gave a presentation on "The importance of integrated assessments for decision making (science and policy perspectives)". Ms. Akrofi's presentation noted that to appreciate the science and policy aspects of integrated assessments, they must be conceived both as a product, which includes the expert reports and the underlying data and information, and a process, which includes the institutional arrangements established to govern, guide and conduct the assessment and ensure that the relevant arrangements are respected. She stressed that to understand the influence that an assessment might have, it is critical to understand the process that produced it, and that the influence or importance of an assessment would depend on its relevance, legitimacy and credibility.

Interactive discussion/dialogue

23. In the ensuing discussions, a participant sought to understand with regard to the work of the ATLAS project whether, given the work of organizations that are

exploiting the seabed, how impact studies of seabed mining on habitats could be undertaken without sufficient information. In his response, Mr. Murray observed that the ecosystems of the deep ocean are the least known or understood, and that studies to date show that they are very slow to recover. He noted that mined areas will cease to function the way they are functioning now, due to the fact that some microbial functions could take decades to recover from a disturbance. He also noted that the impact of mine tailings disposal on organisms, such as fish, squid and jellyfish, is another area of uncertainty.

24. Another participant, while observing the need for coordination in managing activities in the ocean, observed the need to ensure that both science and policy are keeping apace of each other so that policy is actually implementing the science that has been communicated. On a related note, another participant observed that it is typically difficult for policy-makers to understand scientists, and that it was important for scientists to learn how policy-makers speak and vice versa.

25. A third participant noted that the Technical Abstracts of the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment (first World Ocean Assessment or WOA I) prepared by the Group of Experts helped to synthesize the information in WOA I for policy-makers, and that similar means of communicating science to policy-makers in a manner that is easily understood were necessary. In response to a query from this participant regarding how UNEP had adapted its presentation of information in the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) assessments, Ms. Akrofi noted that one of the first steps in the process was identifying the target audience and determining the most effective way to communicate the messages. This had resulted in, for example, summaries for policy-makers targeting policy-makers, as well as other products targeting other stakeholders, such as youth. The importance of educating youth to build their capacity to speak on and understand ocean issues was highlighted.

26. Mr. Murray shared some additional information on the iAtlantic project and its relation to the ATLAS project, noting that while the projects were separate, information would be exchanged between them, including through a one-year overlap period, and that they share a number of partners and similar approaches. He stressed that iAtlantic is a fully integrated activity primarily involving partners from Argentina, Brazil and South Africa, focusing not only on capacity-building, but on the conduct of science, improving infrastructure for ocean observation and coordinating activities on the regional level. He further noted the two projects' focus on bilateral exchanges in capacity-building, highlighting as an example that they wished to use expertise in taxonomy from the South Atlantic region to build capacities in the North Atlantic region. A participant, noting that one of the drawbacks of working on the basis of projects, such as ATLAS and iAtlantic, is their short lifespan and the uncertain future of the efforts and activities that took place under them, queried what could be the ways and means to make the research, observations and monitoring sustainable and long-term. Mr. Murray, in response, noted that projects need to run from the information collection stage all the way to the information exchange stage and observed that it was a major setback when projects end before they can be seen through to their conclusion. He also noted that the projects were an opportunity to test ideas and ways of working, and that the legacy of such projects were the people who participated in

the projects, including students trained, who become ambassadors for the approaches tested.

27. In response to a query regarding the extent to which full community participation and involvement of all stakeholders had been achieved in the development of the integrated approach for Master Plan development in Sri Lanka, Mr. Gunarathna noted that each community group had a gender focal point and that the development plans were developed in consultation with different groups e.g., youth, women. He also noted that national and provincial consultations were held following which the plans were developed, including the identification of needs and possible solutions. The applicable legal framework was also factored in, and awareness-raising programmes were noted as a crucial factor in communicating the science.

28. Regarding the connection between the Regular Process and the Decade as well as other ocean-related processes, Ms. Akrofi recalled that assessments should be mutually reinforcing, and that assessments prepared under the Regular Process took into account existing assessments. A question was posed regarding how assessments could be kept up to date and whether other products should be developed. Mr. Murray noted that other products were essential, and provided the example of the One Ocean HUB, which involves a wide variety of stakeholders across a broad range of countries, and highlighted that it is not a pure science project, but includes people working in theatre, philosophers and others in the hope of bringing messages from processes such as the Regular Process across in innovative ways. Adding to this, Ms. Akrofi observed that periodic updates followed by trends were useful, and that formal as well as informal multi-stakeholder dialogues and events or workshops, as well as informational material, such as brochures or flyers, targeting a wide range of audiences including youth and children, were important.

29. Regarding the continued relevance of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs), and what role would be most effective for different countries, Mr. Murray observed that changes were so fast and dramatic that they needed close monitoring. Ms. Akrofi noted that countries can contribute to both national as well as regional assessments.

B. Segment 2: Capacity gaps and needs related to the conduct of integrated assessments

30. In Segment 2, which was divided into two parts, panellists provided overviews of capacity gaps and needs in relation to their various sectors, stressed the importance of broad cooperation and presented some new tools that could be used to fill gaps in capacity. The segment was moderated by Mr. Osman Keh Kamara, member of the Group of Experts.

Part 1

31. Mr. Alan Simcock, Joint Coordinator of the Group of Experts gave a presentation on “Synthesis of gaps and needs identified for enhanced participation in, and use of the assessments and other outputs of, the Regular Process”. In his presentation, Mr. Simcock stressed that promoting and facilitating full participation of developing countries in all the activities of the Regular Process has been a focus

of the Regular Process since its establishment. He noted that one of the main tasks set for the first cycle of the Regular Process was for the first World Ocean Assessment to identify knowledge gaps and assess capacity gaps in relation to the conduct and use of ocean science. He recalled that at the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole held from 31 August to 4 September 2009, it was recommended that States and global and regional organizations be invited to cooperate with each other to identify gaps and shared priorities as a basis for developing a coherent programme to support capacity-building in marine monitoring and assessment. In this regard, he stressed the need for capacity-building that covers all stages of knowledge generation and application.

32. Ms. Caridad Canales Davila, Associate Economic Affairs Officer, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) gave a presentation (remotely) on "Assessment of capacity development needs of the countries in Asia and the Pacific for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14: a regional perspective". In her presentation, Ms. Canales Davila shared the results of a survey undertaken by ESCAP to identify capacity development needs for the implementation of SDG 14. Eighty-seven percent of the national and international respondents surveyed reported that there was a need for more capacity. She noted that the greatest challenges identified for effective coordination included the allocation of responsibilities, lack of technical capacities and limited resources. Ms. Canales Davila further shared how ESCAP supports the needs identified in the survey, highlighting the Ocean Accounts Partnership and its various activities.

33. Ms. Karen Evans, Senior Research Scientist, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere and member of the Group of Experts, presented on "Capacity and capability gaps: needs for marine assessments". In her presentation, Ms. Evans, noting that a number of publications have detailed scientific capacity and capability gaps limiting assessments at all levels, stressed that filling the identified gaps would require long-term commitments founded on partnerships designed to ensure that capacity is maintained in the long term, in the area where it is needed. She further noted that in the absence of such commitments, the ability to retain capacity and knowledge, and thus contribute and respond to assessments, would be limited, or short-term. She stressed the need to improve ocean literacy across all aspects of society, and in particular youth, to secure such commitments, and the importance of finding new and innovative ways of communicating the sustainability challenges societies face in relation to the ocean. Noting that the ocean regulates our climate, and affects all aspects of society, she stressed that efforts to improve ocean literacy need to be multi-pronged, targeted across demographics and communities, as well as at multiple scales.

34. Mr. Roger Wang, Assistant Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Rutgers University, gave a presentation on "The imperative for multi-level cooperation in adapting to sea-level rise: a case study in San Francisco Bay". In his presentation, Mr. Wang, noting the immediate and long-term pressures placed on coastal communities to take protective actions against sea-level rise, stressed the importance of multi-level cooperation involving all stakeholders to enhance the adaptive capacity of coastal regions. He also highlighted the role that integrated scientific research can play in enhancing cooperation, including using social science research to identify the core governance challenges. He further stressed the need for regional cooperation and

coordination in sea-level rise adaptation and proposed that regions with similar risk scenarios should exchange experiences.

35. Mr. Maruf Hossain, Professor, Institute of Marine Sciences, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh, presented on the "Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOB LME) and the capacity gaps and needs related to sustainable management – with specific reference to BOB, Bangladesh". In his presentation, Mr. Hossain presented information on a recent project where the eight States surrounding the Bay of Bengal, one of the 64 globally recognized LMEs, cooperated to identify the major issues and threats to this ecosystem, as well as the underlying causes for its degradation and future opportunities for its sustainable collective management. Mr. Hossain underlined the gaps encountered in relation to the implementation of this project, including lack of trained personnel, awareness and financial resources, as well as data gaps, and ineffective networking among policy-makers. Mr. Hossain also highlighted some key needs for the future.

Interactive discussion/dialogue

36. A participant asked whether assessments of the marine environment should follow the example of the meteorological community by building infrastructure and hardware, while also building capacity. In this regard, an example was provided of the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts, which provides training to young people and re-training of individuals. Responding to this, Mr. Simcock noted that some progress in this regard had been observed in, for example, the work of the Commonwealth Secretariat to develop a centre of expertise based in Malta for small island developing States (SIDS). In addition to this, Ms. Evans noted that such an initiative could be useful for those States that may not have adequate resources to implement infrastructure and capacity development on an individual country basis and could instead pool resources with other States on a regional level. She noted that part of the discussions leading up to the launch of the Decade included the aim of developing a predictive ocean, by pooling the resources of multiple countries and developing forecasting and predictive systems at smaller scales than the global. These could then be utilized to predict risks impacting oceans, including regarding climate conditions, as well as for better predictions to mitigate risks through adaptive processes. A participant noted the importance of regional approaches and cooperative mechanisms, citing as an example the European Union's Marine Strategy Framework Directive, which requires regional coordination and encourages existing cooperation structures to coordinate, in particular through the four regional seas conventions that are relevant to Europe.

37. The importance of ocean literacy was generally recognized in the discussions. In this regard, a participant noted the importance of assessments of the marine environment in contributing to ocean literacy, including through raising awareness of issues such as impacts of marine pollution. Reference was made to the development of programmes for ocean literacy by the European Union (EU) – empowering citizens and encouraging educators, students, and communities to look at the link between the ocean and health, and the ocean's importance to people. The importance of involving citizens in observation and the production of knowledge (citizen science) was noted, an example being given of EU legislation to tackle marine litter by banning certain single-use plastics which are

found on beaches. This legislation had been informed by plastics identified by EU citizens themselves during beach-cleaning exercises and a representative sample had been processed by researchers. Responding to a question as to the role and importance of coastal marine station networks in giving "hands-on" opportunities in marine biology research to children, Mr. Simcock noted the need to engage youth, politicians and administrators in ocean literacy. In response to an observation regarding the need to think about what particular problems exist in given countries, and what information might be needed, a participant noted that greater emphasis needed to be placed on communicating science to the greater public at all levels, to ensure more awareness and to allow more action to be taken.

38. A participant asked whether natural protection measures could be more effective measures or strategies for coastal protection including against sea level rise, and whether the San Francisco Bay assessment took this into account. In response, Mr. Wang noted that other strategies, such as using wetland systems to accommodate sea level rise, as well as containment could be used, but that ultimately, different solutions were needed for different scales of problems. He also noted that the varying costs associated with the different solutions could be a determining factor. As an example, he noted that land is very expensive in San Francisco, and there is no space to create wetlands, while in Napa, land is more readily available, so wetlands could be utilized. Another factor he highlighted was the perspective of the community towards the land and their readiness to accept proposed solutions.

39. An observation was made that it would be useful to develop ways to bring together different stakeholders to adopt policies that generate more capacities (for example for education) in a short time-frame. In light of the fact that there are still large knowledge-gaps related to the ocean, and the wide divergence in the capacity of States to monitor and assess anthropogenic impacts on the ocean, a question arose as to whether priority should be placed on advancing higher-level science, or build the capacity of States to monitor basic variables. In response, Ms. Evans noted that efforts were being made in both respects and that their prioritization was not always possible. She highlighted the importance of building sustainable partnerships bearing in mind short, medium and long-term objectives.

40. Responding to a question regarding whether local, regional and global needs had really been assessed, Mr. Simcock noted that WOA I looked at ways in which human activities are affecting the ocean environment and identified major pressures, so at the global level, an initial assessment had been done, and that some regional seas organizations are undertaking such work at the regional level. He further noted, however, that local needs were more difficult to assess and that while global assessments could give a general indication of what was needed, ultimately each national or local administration needed to assess and determine what information they need.

41. A question was raised about the utility of the creation of a mechanism to address capacity-building within the context of the negotiations 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 (BBNJ). Mr. Simcock, in his response, highlighted the importance of the capacity-building inventory of needs and gaps,

compiled and maintained by the secretariat of the Regular Process in response to a mandate from the General Assembly. He noted that the inventory had a lot of elements which could be used and that it was up to States to determine whether their needs could be met by its content. He pointed out that it would also be useful to know what information is missing from the inventory. He noted that there was a need to sensitize administrators and politicians on issues they need to think about in relation to the ocean.

Part 2

42. Ms. Francesca Santoro, Lead Programme Specialist in ocean literacy, IOC, gave a presentation on "The Global Ocean Science Report (GOSR) as a tool to assess global and regional capacity in ocean research and the IOC activities on Ocean Literacy". Ms. Santoro, in her presentation, highlighted the purpose, key findings and the way forward to the second edition of the Global Ocean Science Report, which is currently under production. She further presented the IOC Capacity Development Strategy and the IOC's activities aimed at increasing ocean literacy. In particular, she highlighted the "Ocean Literacy for All" toolkit, the holding of the first Ocean Literacy Conference, and the launching of the Ocean Literacy Portal (https://oceanliteracy.unesco.org/). She further noted that while ocean literacy started as a tool for educators, it is also a tool for stakeholders, including to engage policymakers, decision-makers and the private sector. She noted that IOC had recently organized a workshop to identify what are the priorities in terms of ocean literacy for multi-stakeholder processes, using spatial planning as an example. She stressed that the purpose of ocean literacy was not only to increase knowledge, but also to empower stakeholders to take wise decisions.

43. Ms. Fernanda de Oliveira Lana, Post-Doctoral Researcher in Marine Biology and Coastal Environments, Federal Fluminense University (UFF), Brazil and National Focal Point of Brazil for the Regular Process presented on "Sustainable Fisheries and climate change data through international cooperation regional priorities: past, present and future". Ms. Lana's presentation considered the Fisheries Monitoring Project (PMAP), which has been implemented in several states in Brazil, as a tool to support the monitoring, analysis and evaluation of impacts on fisheries in areas where oil and gas exploration and production activities are taking place. She noted that the fishery statistics collected provided the necessary information to assess the actual and potential interactions between the two industries, and have been used to guide strategic decision-making and policy elaboration. She stressed that the observations were an unprecedented contribution to the evaluation of baselines for marine fauna which could enable later comparisons.

44. Ms. Nguyen Thanh Thao, Deputy Director, Department of Science, Technology and International Cooperation, Viet Nam Administration of Seas and Islands, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, gave a presentation on "International cooperation and coordination, for key environmental issues in Viet Nam". Ms. Nguyen, highlighting some key environmental challenges that Viet Nam is facing, shared some of Viet Nam's experiences with regard to North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation in the areas of climate change and the marine environment. She noted that in both areas, North-South cooperation has had a long history and has been highly important for economic growth. She stressed that while South-South and triangular cooperation efforts were more

recent, these are becoming vital for regional and global cooperation. Noting that currently, North-South and South-South cooperation can sometimes be less effective, she proposed that these efforts could be transformed into triangular cooperation to improve the cooperation architecture.

45. Mr. Wahid Moufaddal, Remote Sensing Expert, Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) presented (remotely) on the "Role of near real-time satellite data acquisition and web-based monitoring in regular assessment of state of the marine environment". Mr. Moufaddal, noting the advantages of using remote sensing technologies, highlighted the primary types of ocean measurements that could be made, and their use for mapping and studying the sea bed and major benthic habitats. Using ROPME as an example, he noted the advantages for managers, of receiving satellite data in real-time, including to monitor short-term threats, such as harmful algal blooms and land-based pollution, and longer-term threats, such as coastal development, land reclamation, and cyclones and other storms. He further noted the increase in ocean satellite data providers sharing data on oceans through user-friendly portals, and that this is likely to cause a revolution in the use of and benefit from such data.

Interactive discussion/dialogue

46. A participant noted the importance of ocean literacy for children and asked whether the IOC programme factored in any evaluations or feedback from educators who would implement the programme. Ms. Santoro, in response, noted that the ocean literacy toolkit included a questionnaire for teachers to provide feedback on methodology and the lesson plans they had proposed, which includes a number of approaches, and that IOC is interested in discovering whether ocean literacy would stimulate interaction among teachers. Regarding the importance of cooperation in managing movement of fish stocks, a participant sought further information on how to adapt the ocean literacy programme for different schools. In response to this, Ms. Santoro noted that the toolkit includes 14 lesson plans classified by age and could be adapted for younger children as well as for different regions. In response to a query regarding partnerships in ocean literacy, Ms. Santoro highlighted the partnership of IOC with SkyNews to teach children how to make news articles on oceans, and how to identify fake news (Sky Academy), as well as partnerships to develop training for journalists to be able to report on ocean topics. A participant noted that InterManager's "Adopt-a-ship programme" had been running for 13 years and that there were observable increased levels of awareness which had generated more interest in the programme from teachers. The Programme was adaptable to other schools. An assessment questionnaire for teachers was found to be useful for monitoring and assessment of progress in learning. The programme had wide-ranging content from global assessments to videos to games, as well as free digital world maps and was capable of being adapted by teachers for different age groups.

47. A participant noted with regard to the presentation on the Fisheries Monitoring Project in Brazil that paleo evidence is very useful and asked what challenges were encountered in accessing this evidence and ensuring that it was relevant and precise. Another participant, noting that the accuracy of information depends on the quality of evidence, sought to understand the relevance of proxy evidence and what the challenges were in assessing evidence, as well as the measures in place

to ensure the conclusions were accurate and precise. In response to these questions, Ms. Lana noted that the quality of the data since collection started in 2008 was good and was actually improving, including through monitoring across the different states it was being collected in. A participant noted the relevance of South-South cooperation as a tool for building capacity. In response to another query as to whether the Fisheries Monitoring Project could be replicated, Ms. Lana noted that such project existed for ten years and was expanding across a number of Brazilian states. She noted that although the simple results were available and were still being processed in the database, the final results would only be available later, following which it would be possible to determine the applicability of the model to other Latin American countries.

C. Segment 3: Multi-stakeholder discussion on opportunities, best practices and lessons-learned for enhancing the science-policy interface

48. In Segment 3, which was divided into three parts, panellists provided examples of successful efforts to integrate scientific data into policy-making, and shared perspectives and lessons learned with regard to cooperation and coordination efforts, including capacity-building. Parts 1 and 2 were moderated by Ms. Doris Oliva Ekelund, Director, Institute of Biology, University of Valparaiso, Chile, and member of the Pool of Experts. Part 3 was moderated by Ms. Karen Evans, Senior Research Scientist, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere and member of the Group of Experts.

Part 1

49. Ms. Veronica Koroma, Senior Environment Officer, Environment Protection Agency, Sierra Leone, gave a presentation on "The preparation of the First State of the Marine Environment report for Sierra Leone: the pathway to improved marine and coastal zone management in West Africa". Ms. Koroma noted that the State of the Marine Environment (SoME) report (2015) was prepared as part of Sierra Leone's obligation as a contracting party to the Abidjan Convention. Ms. Koroma noted that the assessment analysed the condition of the marine and coastal ecosystems, and assessed the environmental and socioeconomic impacts in all the coastal waters of Sierra Leone. The process included peer-review as well as the development of possible communication scenarios for the identified target audience at each level of the process. It was noted that data, funding and lack of interest were among the major challenges of this process. She also noted that, as a result of the successful production of the SoME report, the Environmental Protection Agency of Sierra Leone (EPA-SL) was designated as a centre of expertise, which led to a memorandum of understanding between GRID-Arendal and EPA-SL for cooperation on advancing science for conservation and sustainable use in the marine and coastal domain.

50. Ms. Iryna Makarenko, Pollution Monitoring and Assessment Officer, Permanent Secretariat of the Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution (Black Sea Commission) and member of the Pool of Experts, gave a presentation on the "Role of the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans in the Regular Process, preparation of integrated assessments and capacity-building activities". She noted that Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (RSCAPs) had been instrumental in the conduct of integrated assessments,

including the first World Ocean Assessment. With regard to the second cycle of the Regular Process, Ms. Makarenko noted the active and constant engagement of RSCAPs, as well as other relevant stakeholders in the second round of regional workshops in 2018. She highlighted the role of UNEP in recommending experts with the requisite areas of expertise to the Pool of Experts of the Regular Process, as well as the role of RSCAPs in making inputs on important regional issues, including the identification of regional sources of information, which could inform the preparation of the second world ocean assessment. Among the main challenges in capacity-building, she highlighted the issue of geographical fragmentation, as well as the lack of implementation, capacities, coordination between entities and harmonization of scientific assessments, and the need to strengthen monitoring and data/information sharing. In conclusion, she noted that the coordination work undertaken within the framework of the United Nations system is providing opportunities to discuss relevant issues on a regular basis, to coordinate efforts and to deepen collaboration. She highlighted that representatives of RSCAPS had participated in nearly all the workshops held during the second round of regional workshops in 2018 in support of the second cycle of the Regular Process, and were committed to contributing to the second world ocean assessment and sharing relevant regional data.

51. Mr. Miguel Iñiguez, Alternate Commissioner (scientific) of the International Whaling Commission and member of the Pool of Experts gave a presentation on the "Capacity-building projects on the topic of tourism and whale watching in the framework of South-South cooperation". In his presentation, Mr. Iñiguez emphasized the importance of having whale-watching founded on science and having a monitoring component incorporated in it, as well as the importance of education on responsible whale-watching, including for local communities to be able to benefit from this activity, noting that it had allowed the development of several coastal communities. Mr. Iñiguez noted that the Fundación Cethus together with the Whale and Dolphin Conservation had been developing training activities on responsible whale watching since 1997, delivering workshops aimed at training government representatives and future operators of responsible whale-watching in the management of the activity, minimizing the potential threats to the cetacean populations and benefiting the coastal communities. It was noted that such workshops also included safety at sea issues and highlighted the importance of regulating the activity from the beginning in order to protect the cetacean populations.

Interactive discussion/dialogue

52. A participant underscored the need for increased awareness of the work carried out under the Regular Process, including the preparation of integrated assessments. Capacity-building, especially regarding the use of data, was mentioned as a major area requiring attention. Ms. Koroma noted the importance of gathering as much information as possible on what is happening in the marine environment in the West African region, especially given the paucity of regional data. In this regard, the importance of real time data recorded in a user-friendly manner was stressed. Additionally, Ms. Makarenko emphasized the need to harmonize data. Another participant, while noting the importance of identifying what data should be collected, sought to understand whether scientific research on whales could constitute an indicator of the state of the marine environment. In response to this, Mr. Iñiguez confirmed that whales could be an indicator of the

state of the ocean. In this regard, he noted that some loss of species had been observed where pollution was extremely high, hence any changes found in whale populations could be an indicator of the state of the marine environment around them.

53. A participant sought clarity regarding the expectations from the second world ocean assessment, in particular what areas of work panellists would hope to receive more information on. Ms. Makarenko noted that in preparing the second world ocean assessment, there would be more awareness-raising to publicize its findings as well as the Regular Process. It was also noted that the second world ocean assessment would be much shorter than the WOA I, which could present a challenge because of the need to reflect all the relevant issues in a concise manner. Mr. Iñiguez highlighted the fact that the second world ocean assessment would support the development of policies for communication aimed at raising the awareness of protecting the marine resources and would help States and other stakeholders in identifying where the gaps in information are with respect to various issues. He noted the importance of collaboration between States, academia and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Part 2

54. Ms. Monika Stankiewicz, Executive Secretary, Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) and member of the Pool of Experts, gave a presentation on "The Baltic Sea as a time machine for the future coastal ocean". In her presentation, she noted that due to the unique features and natural characteristics of the Baltic Sea, the input of pollution could affect, and become visible, much faster than in other areas. She noted that regional cooperation and a strong emphasis on the use of the best available science had been key to the success of the Commission's work. Ms. Stankiewicz noted that the preparation of HELCOM's second integrated assessment, the "State of the Baltic Sea" report, involved more than 300 experts and managers from all coastal countries. The report generally indicated that most ecosystem components of the Baltic Sea were still not in a healthy state. However, there were also signs of improvement, such as reduction in input of nutrients and the improvement of several seal populations. Among the lessons learned, Ms. Stankiewicz noted, inter alia, that policy relevance should be a major consideration when preparing assessments; there should be frequent interactions between scientists and managers; coastal countries should be involved in regionally coordinated activities; continuous and incremental development of indicators and assessment methods should be foreseen; climate change and its potential effects on these areas should be taken into consideration; and regional discussions should be held in order to translate global requirements to national implementation.

55. Mr. Kedong Yin, Professor, School of Marine Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University gave a presentation on "Science-Driven Management Decision Making in Formulating Sewage Treatment Strategy". In his presentation, he noted that coastal eutrophication and climate change are among the multiple stressors affecting the ocean. He highlighted the importance of nutrient control strategies in reducing the environmental impacts on ecosystems without substantial economic costs. Mr. Yin also noted that increased input of nitrogen (including from fertilizers) was contributing to hypoxia and green algal blooms, thus affecting water quality. He noted that nutrient pollution control aimed to minimize

the eutrophication impact on the receiving waters, which in turn determined the type and level of sewage treatment. Mr. Yin provided, as an example, the case of the government of Hong Kong, which had to upgrade the domestic sewage facility to biological treatment and the scientific question it had to solve regarding which nutrient should be removed, which in turn would guide the management decisions as to what type of facility should be built. Mr. Yin also stressed the importance of the ecosystem approach for ensuring the sustainable use of coastal waters.

56. Mr. Ivar Baste, Bureau member and Co-Chair of the Capacity-building task force, Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) gave a presentation entitled "Enhancing the science-policy interface: lessons learned". In his presentation, Mr. Baste noted that IPBES assesses the state of knowledge on the interactions between human societies and the terrestrial and marine natural world, and provides policy support by identifying, using and developing policy-relevant tools and methodologies. Mr. Baste noted the active engagement of IPBES in providing knowledge in policy processes, including through the four regional assessments approved in March 2018, as well as the forthcoming global assessment. The global assessment (which involves several experts involved in the preparation of WOA I) is meant to assess how changes in human quality of life are linked to the trends in ocean uses and ocean biodiversity documented in WOA I). Mr. Baste noted that IPBES works to develop the capacities of individuals and institutions on priority needs through its Capacity-building Rolling Plan. He noted the focus areas of the various Strategies under the Rolling Plan, such as learning and engagement, facilitating access to expertise and information, and strengthening national and regional capacities. Regarding the continued operationalization of capacity-building under the Regular Process, Mr. Baste suggested documenting/codifying approaches in the form of processes, policies, frameworks, plans, catalogues and guides (drawing on material from IPCC, IPBES, GEO and others), and the consideration of a technical support unit working with the secretariat in supporting the Regular Process in capacity-building.

Interactive discussion/dialogue

57. In response to a comment about accessibility to data, Mr. Baste noted the importance of access to data in all assessment processes, as well as building capacity for data gathering and increasing the availability of new data. He observed the need of working with relevant partners that deal with management of data accessibility. In response to another question about strengthening linkages between the assessment processes at the national and regional level, Ms. Stankiewicz noted that regional platforms, including RSCAPs, could facilitate the work on a national level by working together and pooling resources.

58. A participant, while noting the complexity of the impacts on the environment as well as the fact that the corresponding green technology should cover the entire process of planning, design, construction, operation and maintaining of human activities, sought to understand how the valuation for the Baltic Sea was undertaken. In response, Ms. Stankiewicz clarified that the figures illustrated in her presentation, which were derived from the region-wide projects, represented the cost to the society due to the poor state of the marine environment, that is the losses incurred annually, and thus the potential benefit to society if the state of the marine environment were to be improved. She noted that the figures provided

another perspective on the protection of the marine environment, and its relation to the economy. With regard to cumulative impacts, she noted that these results were of interest to marine spatial planners, and could serve to connect different policies and facilitate dialogue among ministries on other sectoral activities.

59. A participant noted that some pressures also accumulate on certain ecosystem components and sought clarification as to whether there are sufficient tools to address cumulative impacts. In response to this, Mr. Baste noted the increased anthropogenic impacts on the marine environment, which generated a multitude of interconnected changes, and the role of the various assessments, through inter-disciplinary research, in developing scenarios and tools to address the changes.

60. With regard to the presentation delivered by IPBES on the assessment cycle, a participant sought clarification as to the extent to which IPBES assessments results generally inform the next assessment cycle. In response to this, Mr. Baste noted that IPBES has produced several thematic assessments, which together assist in formulating the "bigger picture". He noted that IPBES also conducted four regional assessments for Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe and Central Asia. He further noted the importance of these assessments and their input towards the preparation of the IPBES global assessment (which is about to be finalized). Mr. Baste also emphasized the importance of capturing information about the value of oceans to people. Regarding water quality assessment, Mr. Yin noted that in China, multi-stakeholder meetings had been conducted to agree on an acceptable level of water quality to be used as a reference point for the related assessments, which in turn would support the development of analysis techniques to measure compliance.

Part 3

61. Mr. Andrew Hudson, Head, Water & Ocean Governance Programme, UNDP, gave a presentation on "GEF IW: LEARN and LME: LEARN: South-South and North-South Cooperation for Improved Transboundary Waters Management". Mr. Hudson noted that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) International Waters (IW) focal area included 33 transboundary river basins, 10 lakes, seven aquifers and 23 Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs). He provided a brief description of IW: LEARN and the LME: LEARN,12 defining both projects as the central hub for storing and sharing data and documents from past GEF IW projects. He noted that, while IW:LEARN was developed to strengthen knowledge-management capacity, promote scale-up learning and improve the effectiveness of GEF IW and partner projects, the LME:LEARN was developed with the objective to improve global ecosystem-based governance of LMEs, generate knowledge, build capacity and support South-South and North-South learning. He added that the LME Hub website which aimed at providing information about individual LME projects and progress, including general information about LME habitats, important fisheries and other environmental services they provide, as well as the LME Massive Online Open Course, were among the major results of these projects. In conclusion, Mr. Hudson noted that the aim of both projects was to reach a variety of stakeholders, ranging from country representatives to the business community.

12 International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network and the Large Marine Ecosystems and their Coasts portal.

62. Ms. Vera Agostini, Deputy Director, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), gave a presentation on "The Science-policy interface: linking global to local scales". In her presentation, Ms. Agostini noted that FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI), was the only global inter-governmental forum where major international fisheries and aquaculture problems and issues are examined. She explained that COFI is critical for the science policy-interface, as it allows States, IGOs, NGOs, UN agencies and civil society to discuss issues relating to sustainable fisheries. She added that this was evidenced by the FAO's flagship publication, "The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture" (SOFIA), the Agreement on Port State Measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries, as well as the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Catch Documentation Schemes. Ms. Agostini noted that the EAF-Nansen Programme had been developed with the aim to achieve sustainable fisheries and improve food and nutrition security for partner countries and that the main outcomes of the Programme ranged from ensuring fishery research institutions provide relevant and timely scientific advice for management, to ensuring fisheries management institutions manage fisheries according to the ecosystem approach to fisheries principles and have appropriate human and organizational capacity to manage fisheries sustainably. She further indicated that FAO would be hosting the event "Fisheries Sustainability: Strengthening the Science-Policy Nexus" in November 2019, with the objective of identifying pathways to strengthen the interplay of science and policy in fisheries production, management and trade. Ensuring access to governments, facilitating collaboration between countries, and the difficulty of achieving consensus, addressing a broader scope of needs, and getting the context for application of capacity-building right, were among the main challenges and opportunities she listed.

63. Mr. Ariel Troisi, Chair of the Group of Experts on Capacity Development, IOC, delivered a presentation on "IOC capacity development approach, including in relation to the operationalization of the Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology (CGTMT)". In his presentation, Mr. Troisi noted that the components of capacity include knowledge, skills, systems, structures, processes, values, resources and powers which, taken together, confer a range of political, managerial and technical capabilities, and should happen at individual, organizational and societal levels. He noted that ocean research, observing system/data management, early warning and services, assessment/information for policy, and sustainable management and governance are the five elements which define capacity-building. He also noted that IOC had adopted a mid-term strategy for capacity-development, which considers different dimensions, ranging from human resources to access to physical infrastructure. This strategy would also need to address resource mobilization, visibility and awareness, and would need to strengthen global, regional and sub-regional mechanisms. Mr. Troisi also provided a brief description of the IOC International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange (IODE) capacity development programme, noting that its major objective is to assist Member States to acquire the necessary capacity to manage marine data and information and become active partners in the IODE network. He also noted that the Ocean Teacher Global Academy had over 2,000 teachers and 300 courses in different languages. Mr. Troisi noted that the Group of Experts on Capacity Development comprises two intersessional task teams:

one aimed at identifying the capacity development needs of States in relation to the IOC Capacity Development Strategy, focusing on SIDS and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and States that are not included in IOC regional bodies; and another working on the implementation of transfer of marine technology, a clearing house mechanism "portal" and related activities.

64. Mr. Luciano Hermanns, member of AOCEANO (Brazilian Oceanographers Association) and of the Pool of Experts, delivered a presentation on "A bridge between Brazilian oceanographers and international institutions". In his presentation, Mr. Hermanns provided a description of the Brazilian Association of Oceanography (AOCEANO), noting that its aim was to bring together its members to undertake actions focused on the ethical and full exercise of the profession of oceanography and the teaching of oceanography, and also to develop initiatives that promote the sharing of information of interest to oceanographers, as well as representing them as a national class entity. He also noted that AOCEANO connects professionals from different institutions and that its membership ranges from graduates and postgraduates, to students that work in the area of oceanography. Mr. Hermanns further noted that the organization had been working on regularization of the profession of oceanographer in Brazil, while at the same time serving as a major platform for knowledge exchange and experience. While noting that AOCEANO conducted several initiatives aimed at building the capacity of professionals working in oceanography, such as congresses, symposia as well as the Brazilian Oceanography Olympiads, he also provided information on some of the ships that Brazilian university students of different institutions would use to carry out marine research. In conclusion, he noted that AOCEANO provides opportunities for the training of oceanographers in different countries and enables oceanographers to comply with national and international law.

Interactive discussion

65. A participant observed that often, when capacity-building is discussed, not all relevant aspects, for example the structures, infrastructure or resources needed, are taken into consideration. For that reason, even when knowledge has been shared, it may be difficult to apply the available knowledge. The participant also observed that the greatest impact could be made in capacity-building if all the different perspectives could be taken into account, and that without this aspect, the simple conduct of trainings and workshops would not make much difference. Another participant sought to understand the obstacles faced in order to implement capacity-building activities. In response to this, Ms. Agostini, while noting that capacity-building is often developed around targeted issues/aspects, noted that issues pertaining to oceans are often interconnected and require diverse expertise. In addition, Mr. Troisi, noted that, in order to achieve sustainable development, marine scientific research needed to be included in decision-making, also ensuring a link with social benefits, coupled with communication and education. He also emphasized the importance of achieving a balance between global, regional and national interests, and noted that different priorities and limited resources were among the main issues to be acted upon in order to strike a balance. Mr. Hudson, also commenting on this, highlighted the general

issue of financing, as well as the importance of ensuring that necessary outreach to the broader community is carried out in order to facilitate their inclusion in activities. Mr. Hermanns, adding to this, noted that apart from communication, the continuous evolution of science also needed to be factored in to ensure valuable capacity-building activities.

66. In response to another query about possible solutions to ensure the proper conduct of capacity-building, Ms. Agostini noted the importance of knowing where and what exact capacity-building were needed and emphasized the importance of the involvement of government and key partners in the implementation of capacity-building activities. Mr. Troisi stressed the needs and requirements of the end users, highlighting the importance for the end users to appreciate the opportunities they have. He also noted that the concept of a clearing-house mechanism could be adapted and expanded to other regions or subjects. Another participant sought to understand how to move towards alignment between all the respective science and policy initiatives. In response to this, Mr. Troisi noted that UN-Oceans is an example of a coordinated interagency approach to deal with ocean-related issues. He observed that the Decade is an example of an initiative that will provide all stakeholders the opportunity to work together towards the achievement of the SDGs. Mr. Hudson agreed on the need to improve the alignment of the various ocean-related initiatives, and in this regard, noted that there could be a role for UN-Oceans in contributing to the mapping of the wide range of capacity-building activities. A participant noted that most of the capacity needed is in public administration and that translating science into meaningful advice and understanding the actual needs of countries are key aspects for ensuring meaningful capacity-building activities. Mr. Hudson questioned whether the issue that scientific advice often did not translate into effective policy-making was due to a lack of proper communication. He further noted that good science, if translated into policy advice, would ensure the most effective decision-making and implementation of decisions. Another participant, noted that normally, in a traditional development process of an activity, 20 per cent is devoted to its development and about 80 per cent to its implementation, and that more synergy in the implementation part and effective distribution should be achieved.

D. Segment 4: Way forward

67. In Segment 4, the Co-Chair, Ms. Babb-Riley, presented the possible conclusions emanating from the presentations, discussions and dialogue during the Event, and moderated the interactive discussions that followed. The consolidated conclusions are attached (Annex 2). Ms. Babb-Riley noted that the Event had been useful because of the opportunity to learn about other processes, and because of the level and range of participation and diversity of participants.

68. Participants generally expressed appreciation for the conclusions as a concise reflection of the discussions. A participant observed that the Event had underlined the need to continue analysing how the Regular Process fits into the various actions and initiatives that currently exist with regard to the state of the oceans, from the point of view of capacity-building and national policies, and emphasized the importance of bringing this to the attention of Member States, with a view towards having the Regular Process working as the platform to coordinate such activities and initiatives. Mr. Simcock observed that the General Assembly had,

since the beginning, considered that there should be a coherent capacity-building programme for the Regular Process. In his view, the draft conclusions included a role for the Regular Process, the Group of Experts and the Pool of Experts in developing such a programme. He expressed his hope that future discussions would focus on how to bring the conclusions forward.

69. The importance of improving communication and outreach to the public was highlighted. In that regard, the need to improve the readability of information materials, to ensure that they reach a wider audience and the groups targeted, and achieve the aims set for the materials, was stressed. The importance of the Regular Process for the BBNJ process was noted. The need for broader structural programmes was noted to be an important aspect of capacity-building, including in the context of the ongoing BBNJ negotiations.

70. The Co-Chair, Mr. Auväärt, noted the call for awareness-raising regarding the Regular Process, and expressed his appreciation to those States that had already appointed a National Focal Point, and encouraged further appointments of National Focal Points. He further encouraged the States present to discuss the Regular Process with their neighbours and explain the benefits of such an appointment.

71. A proposal was made to highlight the development of capacities to use and access databases. A participant noted that capacity development should be connected to needs, and in this regard stressed the importance of capacity-building to carry out needs assessments. The need to overcome sectoral silos in marine research was underlined, and in this regard, it was noted that every opportunity for coordination and cooperation should be taken, and that the regional seas conventions could play a key role in this regard.

72. A participant stressed the importance of strengthening capacities to manage activities, highlighting in this regard, the importance of laws, regulations and standards, and the need to share experiences in this area.

ANNEX 1: Agenda for the Multi-stakeholder Dialogue and Capacity-building Partnership Event

Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects (Regular Process)
Multi-stakeholder Dialogue / Capacity-building Partnership Event

24 – 25 January 2019

Conference Room 3, United Nations Headquarters, New York

Agenda

Day 1

10 am - 1pm

Opening

1. Mr. Gert Auväärt and Ms. Juliette Babb-Riley, Co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process.

2. Ms. Gabriele Goettsche-Wanli, Director, Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, Office of Legal Affairs.

Keynote address

3. Mr. Ariel Troisi, Chair of the Group of Experts on Capacity Development, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.

Segment 1: The importance of integrated assessments for decision-making

Moderator: Ms. Judith Gobin, Head, Department of Life Sciences, University of the West Indies

4. Panel presentations:

    a. Mr. Julian Reyna, Dean, College of Maritime Studies and Environmental Sciences, Universidad Del Pacifico, Guayaquil, Ecuador: "The importance of integrated assessments for decision-making (science and policy perspectives) – two successful examples".

    b. Mr. Murray Roberts, University of Edinburgh; ATLAS project: "Creating partnerships for capacity building in ecosystem assessment at ocean basin scale – case studies from the Atlantic".

c. Mr. H.M.K.J.B. Gunarathna, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and Development and Rural Economy, Sri Lanka: “An integrated approach for Master Plan Development - Project to increase aquaculture production through conservation and development of the aquatic eco-systems associated with lagoons and inland waters of Sri Lanka”.

d. Ms. Joana Akrofi, Programme Management Officer, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP): “The importance of integrated assessments for decision making (science and policy perspectives)”.

5. Interactive discussion/dialogue.

3 - 6pm
Segment 2: Capacity gaps and needs related to the conduct of integrated assessments

Moderator: Mr. Osman Keh Kamara, member of the Group of Experts of the Regular Process

6. Panel presentations, Part 1:
    a. Mr. Alan Simcock, Joint Coordinator of the Group of Experts of the Regular Process: “Synthesis of gaps and needs identified for enhanced participation in, and use of the assessments and other outputs of, the Regular Process”.

    b. Ms. Caridad Canales Davila, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific: “Assessment of capacity development needs of the countries in Asia and the Pacific for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14: a regional perspective”.

    c. Ms. Karen Evans, Senior Research Scientist, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere and member of the Group of Experts of the Regular Process: “Capacity and capability gaps: needs for marine assessments”.

    d. Mr. Roger Wang, “The imperative for multi-level cooperation in adapting to sea-level rise: a case study in San Francisco Bay”.

    e. Mr. Maruf Hossain, Professor, Institute of Marine Sciences, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh: “Status and the Needs to Meet the Goals and Commitments of SDG-14 (Life Below Water) and Global Marine Assessment-2 (Regular Process) by UN: Bangladesh Perspective”.

7. Interactive discussion/dialogue.

8. Panel presentations, Part 2:
    a. Ms. Francesca Santoro, Lead programme specialist in Ocean Literacy, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission: “The Global Ocean Science Report (GOSR) as a tool to assess global and regional capacity in ocean research and the IOC programme on Ocean Literacy.”

b. Ms. Fernanda de Oliveira Lana, Federal Fluminense University (UFF) and National Focal Point of Brazil for the UN Regular Process: “Sustainable Fisheries and climate change data through international cooperation regional priorities: past, present and future”.

c. Ms. Nguyen Thanh Thao, Department of Science, Technology and International Cooperation, Viet Nam Administration of Seas and Islands (VASI), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE): “International cooperation and coordination, for key environmental issues in Viet Nam”.

d. Mr. Wahid Moufaddal, Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME): “Role of near real-time satellite data acquisition and web-based monitoring in regular assessment of state of the marine environment”.

9. Interactive discussion/dialogue.

Day 2

10 am - 1pm

Segment 3: Multi-stakeholder discussion on opportunities, best practices and lessons-learned for enhancing the science-policy interface

Moderator: Ms. Doris Oliva Ekelund, Director, Institute of Biology, University of Valparaiso

10. Panel presentations, Part 1:
    a. Ms. Veronica Koroma, Senior Environment Officer, Environment Protection Agency, Sierra Leone: "The preparation of the First State of the Marine Environment report for Sierra Leone: the pathway to improved marine and coastal zone management in West Africa".

    b. Ms. Iryna Makarenko, Black Sea Commission: “Role of the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans in the Regular Process, preparation of integrated assessments and capacity building activities”.

    c. Mr. Miguel Iñiguez, Argentina, Alternate Commissioner (scientific) of the International Whaling Commission and Member of the Pool of Experts: “Capacity building projects on the topic of tourism and whale watching in the framework of south-south cooperation”.

11. Interactive discussion/dialogue.

12. Panel presentations, Part 2:
    a. Ms. Monika Stankiewicz, HELCOM Secretariat: “The Baltic Sea as a time machine for the future coastal ocean”.

    b. Mr. Kedong Yin, Professor, School of Marine Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University: “Science-Driven Management Decision Making in Formulating Sewage Treatment Strategy”.

    c. Mr. Ivar Baste, IPBES bureau member and co-chair of the IPBES capacity-building task force: “Lessons learned for enhancing the science-policy interface”.

13. Interactive discussion/dialogue.

3 – 6pm

Segment 3: Multi-stakeholder discussion on opportunities, best practices and lessons-learned for enhancing the science-policy interface (cont.)

Moderator: Ms. Karen Evans, Senior Research Scientist, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere and member of the Group of Experts of the Regular Process

14. Panel presentations, Part 3:
    a. Mr. Andrew Hudson, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): "GEF IW: LEARN and LME: LEARN: South-South and North-South Cooperation for Improved Transboundary Waters Management".

    b. Ms. Vera Agostini, Deputy Director, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: "The Science-policy interface: linking global to local scales".

    c. Mr. Ariel Troisi, Argentina, Chair of the Group of Experts on Capacity Development, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission: "IOC capacity development approach, including in relation to the operationalization of the Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology (CGTMT)".

    d. Mr. Luciano Hermanns, AOCEANO (Brazilian Oceanographers Association): "A cooperation bridge between Brazilian oceanographers and international institutions".

15. Interactive discussion/dialogue.

Segment 4. Way forward

16. Ms. Juliette Babb-Riley, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process.

17. Interactive discussion/dialogue on the way forward, opportunities and challenges.

Closing

18. Mr. Gert Auväärt, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Whole on the Regular Process.

ANNEX 2: Consolidated conclusions from the Multi-stakeholder Dialogue and Capacity-building Partnership Event

Way forward: Conclusions from the Multi-Stakeholder dialogue and capacity-building partnership event

1. There is a need to raise public awareness, in particular through "ocean literacy". Enhanced ocean literacy across all parts of society is necessary to underpin the provision of funds and resources for capacity-building. In addition, improved ocean literacy among policy-makers and other significant decision-makers is particularly needed as a basis for developing measures to achieve SDG 14. Increasing ocean literacy at the national level is a foundational element to enable capacity- and capability-building in the national marine science sector. There is a need to step up ocean literacy particularly for children to ensure a better understanding and management in coastal communities.

2. Significant activities are already under way in many parts of the world to promote ocean literacy. Examples highlighted at the Event are the programmes of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the work of Intermanager with schools about shipping, and the initiatives of the European Union, particularly on marine debris. Such activities should be welcomed and extended, and new activities should be identified and encouraged.

3. It will be important to develop a coherent programme for capacity-building for conducting marine assessments, and particularly integrated assessments.

4. An initial step in preparing such a programme needs to include an encouragement to national and local authorities to analyse what capacity-building needs they have prioritized in their particular contexts. Capacity-development should be tailored to address identified needs. Some States need to be assisted with the formulation of those needs. Where Large Marine Ecosystems have carried out transboundary diagnostic analyses, these can provide a valuable source of information.

5. Building on existing experience, guidance on how to carry out such capacity-building analyses could be developed, including by mapping funding issues and effective use of resources. All forms of cooperation, including North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation, including financial support will be necessary to enable all countries to carry out these analyses.

6. A review is needed of how the needs identified globally, regionally and by such national analyses can be met from processes already identified or to be identified in the inventory of capacity-building activities produced as part of the Regular Process, and how remaining gaps can best be filled. Global processes that have identified needs include the Regular Process and its First Global Integrated Marine Assessment and the Global Ocean Science Report. Needs have also been identified in processes at the regional level.

7. The rapid growth of in-situ and satellite observations of the marine environment has greatly enhanced capacity-building in marine science. The importance of electronic dissemination of data cannot be overemphasized. Open and transparent data availability strongly supports the Regular Process and advances capacity-building in marine sciences. When States share data and information, everyone benefits. Securing a better connection between existing databases is key. Also, capacity-

development for using those existing databases and for facilitating access to those databases is important.

8. There is a need to promote synergies and opportunities for cooperation and coordination with respect to capacity-building initiatives. Enabling regional capacity- and capability-building partnerships, including through the UNEP regional seas conventions framework, is an important way forward to foster coordination and cooperation in marine science across geographical regions encompassing States of varying levels of development.

9. There is a need to develop communication strategies for different targeted audiences within the context of the Regular Process. Products and summaries that can be understood or interpreted by policy and decision-makers are particularly helpful, such as the technical abstracts of the First Global Integrated Marine Assessment, and the IOC-UNESCO Ocean Literacy reports.

10. Human and institutional capacity to carry out integrated assessment need to be strengthened through existing and additional training opportunities including through cooperation projects amongst various stakeholders. The experiences of other organizations as well as the potential of the Regular Process Special Scholarship fund and capacity-building inventory to facilitate such projects should be fully utilized.

11. Regular multi-stakeholder dialogues at the global and regional levels should be promoted, including in the margins of meetings of various organizations that are carrying out integrated assessments. They should focus on best practices and lessons learned, including through case studies. The regional workshops of the Regular Process are an example of a successful multi-stakeholder engagement, in particular in the field of capacity-building.

ANNEX 3: List of Participants

Multi-stakeholder Dialogue and Capacity-building Partnership Event United Nations Headquarters, New York, 24 to 25 January 2019				
#	**Prefix**	**Last name**	**First name**	**Affiliation**
1	Ms.	Agostini	Vera	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); Panellist
2	Ms.	Akrofi	Joana	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Panellist
3	Mr.	Al Busaidi	Ahmed Hamood Faisal	Permanent Mission of Oman to the United Nations
4	Mr.	Altassi	Mohammed	Permanent Mission of Morocco to the United Nations
5	Ms.	Anderson	Ione Oighenstein	Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research (IAI)
6	Ms.	Antunes	Vera	Permanent Mission of Portugal to the United Nations
7	Mr.	Arrocha Olabuenaga	Pablo Adrián	Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations
8	Mr.	Baste	Ivar Andreas	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES); Panellist
9	Ms.	Bebiano	Maria	Member of the Group of Experts (GOE)
10	Ms.	Bing	Qiao	China Waterborne Transport Research Institute, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), China
11	Ms.	Boechat	Barbara	Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations
12	Mr.	Bukoree	Rishy	Permanent Mission of Mauritius to the United Nations
13	Mr.	Carvalho	Sergio	Permanent Mission of Portugal to the United Nations
14	Ms.	Cassar	Francesca	Permanent Mission of Malta to the United Nations
15	Ms.	Catzim	Nellie	Permanent Mission of Belize to the United Nations
16	Mr.	Christofoletti	Ronaldo Adriano	Professor, Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Brazil
17	Mr.	Cuellar Torres	Juan	Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations

18	Ms.	De Oliveira Lana	Fernanda	Federal Fluminense University (UFF), National Focal Point (NFP), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Brazil; Panellist
19	Ms.	De Oliveira Sobral	Maria Paula	NOVA University of Lisbon, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Portugal
20	Ms.	Del Salto	Maria Belen	Instituto Oceanografico de la Armada, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Brazil
21	Ms.	Etuk	Inemesit Arianne	Permanent Mission of The Bahamas to the United Nations
22	Ms.	Evans	Karen	Member of the Group of Experts (GOE); CSIRO; Panellist; Moderator
23	Mr.	Freeman	Peter	Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island, United States of America
24	Mr.	Fuentes	Jaime	Instituto Oceanografico de la Armada del Ecuador, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Ecuador
25	Ms.	Gaines	Sarah Margaret	Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island, United States of America
26	Ms.	Gauci	Daniela	European Commission
27	Ms.	Gobin	Judith	University of the West Indies, Deep-Ocean Stewardship Initiative (DOSI), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Trinidad and Tobago; Moderator
28	Mr.	Gunarathna	Herath Mudiyanselage Kapila Janaka Bandara	Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development and Rural Economy, Sri Lanka; Panellist
29	Ms.	Gunn	Vikki	Seascape Consultants; ATLAS Project
30	Mr.	Halpern	David	National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), United States of America
31	Mr.	Hermanns	Luciano	Associação Brasileira de Oceanografia, Balneário Camboriú (AOCEANO), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Brazil; Panellist
32	Ms.	Hidalgo-Gato	Karina	Sovereign Order of Malta
33	Mr.	Hoagland	Porter	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), United States of America
34	Ms.	Horbachova	Dasha	Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations

35	Mr.	Hoyt	George Joseph	International Ship Managers' Association (InterManager)
36	Mr.	Iñiguez	Miguel Angel	Alternate Commissioner (scientific) at the International Whaling Commission (IWC), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Argentina; Panellist
37	Mr.	Ivanov	Yavor Petrov	Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the United Nations
38	Ms.	Jiwon Nam	Jiwon	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
39	Mr.	Jordan	Richard	International Council for Caring Communities, Inc.
40	Mr.	Kaartokallio	Hermanni	Finnish Environment Institute
41	Mr.	Kafle	Nirmal Raj	Permanent Mission of Nepal to the United Nations
42	Mr.	Kamara	Osman Keh	Member of the Group of Experts (GOE); Moderator
43	Ms.	Katholnig	Laura	Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations
44	Mr.	Kawser	Ahmed	University of Dhaka, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Bangladesh
45		Kim	Hyemi	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations
46		Kim	Juyeon	World Information Transfer
47	Mr.	Korbieh	Solomon	Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations
48	Ms.	Koroma	Veronica	Environment Protection Agency, Sierra Leone; Panellist
49	Mr.	Lamin	Paul Abu	Environment Protection Agency, Sierra Leone
50	Mr.	Littfass	Dominik	Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM)
51	Ms.	Llombait	Anne	Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations
52	Ms.	Lorenzo	Elaine	Permanent Mission of Philippines to the United Nations
53	Ms.	Makarenko	Iryna	Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Ukraine; Panellist
54	Mr.	Marani	Fernando Andrés	Permanent Mission of Argentina to the United Nations
55	Mr.	Marc	Richir	European Commission

56	Ms.	Martelo	Laura	Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations
57	Mr.	Martinez-F	Antonio	Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations
58	Ms.	Maxwell	Alexis	International Coastal and Ocean Organization
59	Ms.	Medaduwage	Medhavi Niwanthika	Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Sri Lanka
60	Mr.	Michelén	Carlos Antonio	Permanent Mission of the Dominican Republic to the United Nations
61	Mr.	Miller	Luke	Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations
62	Ms.	Mills	Diedre Nichole	Permanent Mission of Jamaica to the United Nations
63	Mr.	Moffat	Colin Forbes	Scottish Government, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
64	Ms.	Mutendi	Sibusisiwe Melody	Permanent Mission of Zimbabwe to the United Nations
65	Ms.	Mwangi	Susan Wangeci	Permanent Mission of Kenya to the United Nations
66		Naiyaga	Suko	Permanent Mission of Fiji to the United Nations
67	Ms.	Nelson	Kate	Permanent Mission of New Zealand to the United Nations
68	Ms.	Nguyen	Thao Thanh	Viet Nam Administration of Seas and Island; Panellist
69	Ms.	Nyrhinen	Niina	Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations
70	Mr.	Oh	Jae Ryoung	Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology (KIOST), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Republic of Korea
71	Ms.	Oliva Ekelund	Doris Patricia	Instituto de Biología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Valparaíso, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Chile; Moderator
72	Mr.	Osborn	David	International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
73	Ms.	Paiva	Vezua Bula Diogo De	Permanent Mission of Angola to the United Nations
74		Park	Geun-Ha	Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology (KIOST), Republic of Korea
75	Ms.	Philips-Umerurike	Eunice Garos	Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations

76	Ms.	Piiskop	Anneli Leega	Permanent Mission of Estonia to the United Nations
77	Ms.	Ponce	Maria Angela Abrera	Permanent Mission of Philippines to the United Nations
78	Mr.	Ramirez	Juan David	Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations
79	Mr.	Reyna Moreno	Julian Augusto	Universidad del Pacifico, Ecuador, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Colombia; Panellist
80	Mr.	Roberts	J. Murray	ATLAS Project, University of Edinburgh, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Panellist
81	Ms.	Rodriguez Cortes	Liliana	International Ocean Institute (IOI)
82	Ms.	Samaraginghe	Sonali	Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations
83	Ms.	Santoro	Francesca	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (IOC-UNESCO); Panellist
84	Mr.	Schmidt	Jorn	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), Kiel University, National Focal Point (NFP), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Germany
85	Mr.	Sgier	Philipp	Sovereign Order of Malta
86	Ms.	Sigurdardottir	Sesselja	Permanent Mission of Iceland to the United Nations
87	Mr.	Simcock	Alan	Member of the Group of Experts, Joint Coordinator; Panellist
88	Ms.	Stakiewicz	Monika	Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM), Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Poland; Panellist
89	Ms.	Stanley-Ryan	Ashley	Permanent Mission of New Zealand to the United Nations
90	Ms.	Storro	Ingunn	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)
91	Ms.	Strati	Anastasia	Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations
92	Ms.	Tagicakibau	Ro Salaseini	Permanent Mission of Fiji to the United Nations

93	Mr.	Tang	Luke	Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations
94	Mr.	Troisi	Ariel	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (IOC-UNESCO); Panellist
95	Ms.	Vaai	Olive Justine Marrissa	Permanent Mission of Samoa to the United Nations
96	Mr.	Vasiliu	Dan	National Institute for Research and Development on Marine Geology and Geo-ecology, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), Romania
97		Villamore Barrion	Joze	Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations
98	Ms.	Vlahos	Epapante Penny	Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), United States of America
99	Mr.	Walsh	John Patrick	Coastal Resources Center, University of Rhode Island, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), United States
100	Mr.	Wang	Ruo-Qian Roger	Rutgers University, United States of America, Member of the Pool of Experts (China)
101		Wang	Huishihan	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
102	Ms.	Weis	Judith	Rutgers University, United States of America Member of the Pool of Experts (POE)
103	Mr.	Xu	Chi	Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations
104	Mr.	Yakut	Memet Mevlüt	Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations
105	Ms.	Yang	Joan	Permanent Mission of Nauru to the United Nations
106	Mr.	Yin	Kedong	Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Member of the Pool of Experts (POE), China; Panellist