

CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2 OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 72/249, INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS, AT THE SECOND SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE ON AN INTERNATIONAL LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA ON THE CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF MARINE BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF AREAS BEYOND NATIONAL JURISDICTION, 3 APRIL 2019 (PM)

mechanisms where possible and to only establish new ones where they were necessary and cost-effective. We also agree with the form follows function principle. Many of these decisions on institutional arrangements are therefore contingent on the substantive content of the Instrument. We do also recognise that subsidiary bodies under the Instrument can and should, if required, be established subsequently.

With respect to text itself, my delegation aligns with the interventions made by Palestine on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and by Belize on behalf of AOSIS.

I will go into three specific points in this intervention.

The first relates to **the decision making body/forum**. In particular, in sub-section (2), we are in favour of Option I and specifically on sub-paragraph (f), our preference is for Option A which is the establishment of processes for cooperation and coordination. This is actually wider than Option B which seems only to be limited to the conduct of cooperation programmes.

Turning to sub-paragraph (k), we also have the same reservations as expressed by others in relation to the ability to institute proceedings on behalf of the States parties in cases of non-compliance. We should consider if it makes more sense to simply use the

