



JAMAICA

INTERVENTION BY

**MS. STEPHANIE FORTE
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL,
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CHAMBERS**

WORKING GROUP ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

**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
1 April 2019**

Good afternoon Mr. Facilitator. As this is the first time that Jamaica is making an intervention we wish to express our appreciation for your guidance to this Working Group thus far and assure you of our delegation's full support.

We align with the views expressed by the Group of 77 and China and CARICOM and will offer two brief comments.

In paragraph 1 of Part 5.6, Jamaica supports Option A, as it reflects the obligation of States under the Convention in respect of environmental impact assessments and the obligation to monitor and supervise the impacts of authorized activities. In line with the intervention by CARICOM, we would want to see express reference to the role of the proponents in this monitoring and reporting of impacts, given the obligations of both States and proponents.

We agree with the suggestion made by the European Union and PSIDS earlier that publication of the reports and the results of subsequent monitoring and review could be done through a dedicated website or registry.

In the section regarding involvement of other States, Jamaica would support Option I and the inclusion of text that makes it clear that "all States and in particular, adjacent coastal States" shall be kept informed of the monitoring, reporting and review process in respect of activities approved under the instrument. In our view, this is consistent with Articles 204-206 of the Convention which speaks to the communication of the results of monitoring to all States.

Finally, while it is true that States would have been given an opportunity to comment during the scoping process, we are of the view that the final provision of Part 5.6 is nevertheless relevant as it speaks to what obtains after the activity is approved. We also note that this information could be shared in a central depository accessible to all States and other persons or through the clearinghouse mechanism.