



**JAMAICA**

**INTERVENTION BY**

**MRS. DIEDRE MILLS  
DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE**

**WORKING GROUP ON CAPACITY-BUILDING AND THE TRANSFER OF  
MARINE TECHNOLOGY**

**SECOND 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**

**UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK  
2 April 2019**

Madam Facilitator,

Let me begin by stating my delegation's pleasure at seeing you once again in the Chair guiding our deliberations. Please be assured of Jamaica's full support.

We would like to thank the President for the very fulsome manner in which she has sought to deal with the issue of capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology. The level of detail provided is indicative of the very rich discussions that we have had to date.

With this in mind and with the focus on more effective operationalisation, Jamaica would wish to provide the context for its preference for a number of the Options in the President's Aid to Negotiations, in particular under 6.2 "*Types of and modalities for capacity-building and transfer of marine technology.*" Before doing so, I wish to align with the points made by the G77 and China, AOSIS and CARICOM.

First and because we believe that more needs to be done to improve the prospects for enhanced capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology, we would not support the options that suggest that text should not be elaborated throughout this section of the Treaty. As stated earlier, we accept that there is need under this section, as obtains under other parts of this document, to ensure that the appropriate level of information is provided in the Implementing Agreement to allow for effective implementation upon entry into force and to give greater effect to the operationalising of the capacity-building and technology transfer provisions initially envisaged under UNCLOS. Capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology should be sufficiently varied, both in terms of its scope and content, to provide for the range of opportunities that can be maximized and to respond to the different needs as will emerge under the respective elements of the package.

There should be sufficient hooks in any elaborated framework for this to happen. For this reason, we join in reiterating support for Option I regarding the types of capacity-building to be facilitated by the Implementing Agreement. We see merit in several of the sub-points elaborated therein and will be reviewing with a mind to any further streamlining that can be undertaken.

We support the call for language in the Treaty that recognises the interplay that has to take place for capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology to be effective, namely that it has to be needs driven, it must correspond to specific demands and it must be underpinned by a sense of cooperation and partnership. For that reason, we are attracted to the options that convey or which have the potential to convey this idea. The key is to ensure that this doesn't become a medium through which top-down approaches are facilitated. Building on lessons learnt to date would also be critical, bearing in mind that there are a range of institutions already support capacity-building. Against this background, we support Option II under "modalities."

One observation we have is in respect of our reluctance to have language that purports a reliance only on voluntary mechanisms or frameworks for capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology. We also read point number 10 under Option II (modalities) and sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) under Option II as options with useful elements that could be merged. It is also not clear what is intended by point number 11 on capacity-building measures that closes the section

on modalities that proscribes that these measures shall be open to States parties and all stakeholders, and believe that the language could be improved to distinguish who would be the beneficiaries of capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology and who would be required to provide support in facilitating capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology. We are challenged in our understanding of how this would be achieved.

The above position also informs our approach to general objectives and the clearing house mechanism that there is a natural synergy that flows across these issues.

Thank you, Madam Facilitator.