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Position of Monaco

The Principality of Monaco congratulates the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and Grenada to the United Nations for their appointment and thanks them for their letter circulated on 10 January 2022 with regards to the informal consultations on the Declaration of the Lisbon Conference, to be held in June 2022.

Monaco fully supports the Co-Chairs’ approach and also considers that the draft text from April 2020 is the best basis to resume our work. Our general support for the text has not changed.

We continue to welcome the theme of the Conference and recognize the emphasis put on science-based and innovative areas of action in the draft Declaration.

We also continue to welcome the sentence stating that “greater ambition is required at all levels to address the dire state of the ocean”, which is a valuable addition to the 2017 Declaration.

As recognized by the Co-Chairs, developments that occurred in the past two years could be added to the Declaration.

Monaco strongly believes in the science-policy interface and in the role of the best available science for decision-making. In this regard, we consider that the 2021 IPCC report on the physical science basis contains the best, most recent available scientific information, including findings on ocean warming; ocean acidification; decrease in Arctic sea ice, Greenland ice sheet and Antarctic ice sheet; sea level rise; marine heatwaves; tropical cyclones; deoxygenation; and ocean carbon sinks. We agree that climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time and we believe that a mention to this report should be included in the Declaration.

COP 26 of the UNFCCC in Glasgow as mentioned in the Co-Chairs letter, could also be included, alongside other possible similar meetings.

We also have to note that the targets maturing in 2020 have unfortunately not been reached. The COVID-19 pandemic of course posed significant challenges on the whole 2030 Agenda, but this situation should not be ignored in the Declaration. The way to reflect that those targets were not reached should nevertheless be as factual and neutral as possible.

Please, kindly find hereafter more detailed comments and drafting suggestions.

We welcome paragraphs 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13 and 14 without change.
In paragraph 3, the listing of the third sentence could be completed with the words “human health” after “nutrition” (third line). Indeed, we believe that the ocean’s health is clearly linked to human health. For example, mercury pollution damages children’s developing brains, increases risks of cardiovascular diseases and accelerates cognitive decline; toxic chemicals can be fixed on plastics in the ocean and enter the food chain; waste discharges into the ocean can trigger algal blooms as well as fish and shellfish poisoning.

In paragraph 4, we welcome the list of issues contained in the draft (i.e. sea level rise, ocean warming, ocean acidification, plastic pollution, overexploitation and loss of corals). The fact that Arctic sea ice and Greenland ice sheet are decreasing could nevertheless also be mentioned. Information on such phenomenon can be found in the latest IPCC report.

In paragraph 5, we suggest reintegrating the adverb “particularly” that was included in 2017. Indeed, as the situation has not improved since 2017, we are afraid that taking the adverb away could send a contradictory signal to someone comparing the two Declarations. We suggest saying at the end of the first line: “[...] and are still particularly alarmed by the adverse effects of [...]”.

In paragraph 5 too, we suggest reintegrating the “decrease in polar ice coverage”, which was included in 2017, in the listing of the first sentence (possibly after the mention of sea level rise). In addition, the reference to the 2021 IPCC report on the physical science basis should also be added to this paragraph.

In paragraph 8, we welcome the reference to the BBNJ work. In addition to what is currently in the text, we suggest adding a second sentence to say that “we call for the timely conclusion of the work of the Intergovernmental Conference and for an ambitious Instrument” (or something along those lines). This kind of neutral language would not pre-judge the date not the content of the final Instrument, but it would serve as a reminder of the urgency to conclude the negotiations and break the status quo.

In paragraph 9, we suggest adding that “we welcome the launch of the Decade”, as this happened since the current text was originally drafted.

In paragraph 10.a, we suggest replacing “the impact of cumulative human activities” (in the second line) by “cumulative impacts of human activities” (this is a purely editorial suggestion).

In paragraph 10.c, we suggest saying “as well as from sea-based activities such as, including noise ...” (editorial suggestion).

In paragraph 10.e, we support saying the “precautionary principle” instead of “approach”.

Thank you Co-Chairs.