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Madame Facilitator, thank you for this opportunity to speak.

First: Micronesia wishes to contribute to the points raised so far. Like other delegations, Micronesia is of the view that it is necessary to establish a scientific body in the process of establishing an ABMT. This body could either be a global scientific body or regional in nature.

I would like to point out the following points for consideration. The EBSA process through its regional workshops has created knowledge and expertise on the regional level. A scientific body for the ABMT that is of a regional nature can take advantage of synergies. In addition, traditional knowledge on the oceans and their biodiversity exist locally and could be more easily incorporated. For example, in my region, our peoples have travelled the Pacific Ocean extensively, including areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Second: Micronesia stresses the need that the views and interests of adjacent coastal states are taken into special consideration when designing an ABMT. We welcome the views expressed by the European Union that any proposal for a new measure should look at how it interacts with measures that adjacent coastal states have taken nationally. Micronesia takes this one step further and suggests that that the adjacent coastal states must be fully consulted during the whole process. We appreciate the positive sentiments expressed by CARICOM, Australia, Norway and Canada in this regard.
Third: Micronesia is of the view that due consideration should be accorded to the fact that existing conservation measures are in place under existing bodies including RFMOs. Japan alluded to “not undermining the mandate of existing bodies”. In the Pacific region, there are conservation measures to support sustainable use of resources. This international agreement should therefore take advantage of the expertise under existing mandate, and as such, ABMTs for the BBNJ should be compatible with existing measures rather than contradict or undermine them.

I thank you.