



---

with existing provisions of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), International Seabed Authority (ISA) and other regulators.

Second, . The draft text refers to “planned activities under the jurisdiction and control of a State Party” as the basis for applying jurisdiction. Jurisdiction in any State or court, however, is based on the relationship of a State to a person, whether a corporate entity, partnership or individual, and not to an activity, planned or otherwise. It seems also obvious that if the activity itself takes place outside the jurisdiction of the State, the State would not have control over it. The caveat provision that offers licensing or funding as the nexus would not satisfy the jurisdictional gap. My Delegation therefore believes that further discussion on this issue is necessary, considering that regulating what happens in ABNJ is at the core of the legally binding instrument on which we are working.

Third, . Although the draft offers many provisions regarding coordination and cooperation, as well as ideas regarding consultation with other bodies, these measures should better reflect the legal relationship of and between the States, the proponents of the activities, the activities themselves, and other agreements and regulatory bodies. For example, the point regarding its scope could carefully exclude activities that would not be regulated by the legally binding instrument we are working on. A provision

