

# Auszug aus dem OSPAR Summary Record,

OSPAR 22/12/1

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic

Meeting of the OSPAR Commission (OSPAR)

Copenhagen: 20-24 June 2022

---

## Summary Record

### Agenda Item 6 – International Engagement

- [...]
- Arctic Engagement
- [...]
- 

#### Arctic engagement

6.8 The Secretariat presented (OSPAR 22/6/3) on how to take forward OSPAR engagement in relation to the Arctic. The document included a report of discussions from a pre-HOD meeting in May and a draft Roadmap setting out the steps which OSPAR could take to achieve its objectives as set out in the Cascais Ministerial statement and NEAES 2030. It was made clear that the Roadmap was a draft and which would require input from Contracting Parties before it could be agreed.

6.9 OSPAR noted the report of the discussions at the pre-HOD meeting as set out in Annex 1 of the document and considered the draft roadmap in Annex 2 of the document. It was also noted that Terms of Reference would be needed for the Working Group and that these could be developed once the Roadmap had been agreed.

6.10 During discussions in plenary the following comments were made:

- a. several Contracting Parties and Observers considered that while welcoming the establishment of a working group and the draft Roadmap they did not consider that the Roadmap was explicit enough nor did it recognise the significant amount of work that had already been undertaken. The Roadmap should explicitly state that the previous work on the 2016 designation proforma should be a starting point for the work of the Working Group. Many of the same Contracting Parties noted the many existing OSPAR commitments, in particular the North-East Atlantic Environment Strategy 2030, as well as other commitments e.g. EU and CBD, on protection of the Arctic and the mandate of OSPAR in this region. These Contracting Parties held the view that in fact the scientific case for the establishment of a high seas MPA in Region I was already available since 2016. They therefore considered that there should be a more explicit reference to the desired outcome, for example the designation of an MPA, in the Roadmap. There was also a view that some elements of the Roadmap could be accelerated. Engagement with others was important but should not detract from delivery of OSPAR's objectives or mandate;

- b. other Contracting Parties welcomed the Roadmap as drafted. Their view was that the Roadmap should not prejudge the outcome. They did not rule out an MPA as a possible outcome but the first step should be to decide on what needs protection, what are the pressures and only then to decide on the measures. Many of the issues facing the Arctic were transboundary. OSPAR would need to consider what measures are within its competence and which lie elsewhere. OSPAR needed a rigorous and evidence-led approach if it wanted to maintain its reputation as a frontrunner amongst RSCs. It recognised that the start of the process could be detailed and that future steps would depend on the outcome of those earlier stages;
- c. [REDACTED] highlighted the important role of the Arctic Council and the Arctic States in marine environmental protection in the Arctic Region, and noted important scientific work in the central arctic ocean;
- d. all Parties acknowledged the importance of engaging with the Arctic Council in an appropriate way and the challenges that this posed in the current situation. However, that should not stop OSPAR from trying to engage and to take advantage of the knowledge and information from Arctic States. Other stakeholders including competent authorities would also need to be involved and consulted. It would be important to provide sufficient time for the proposed workshop to be organised whilst also maintaining momentum;
- e. [REDACTED] noted that Central Arctic Ocean Fisheries Agreement (CAOFA) entered into force in 2021 and covered much of the same area as Region I and reflecting on agenda item 6.2 on the Collective Agreement (CA) asked whether there was work to be done to establish whether CAOFA should be part of the CA as the work of the CAOFA could be relevant to the Arctic Roadmap.

6.13 The Chair thanked the Contracting Parties for their comments and support for the Working Group. He reiterated that OSPAR has the competence and access to scientific expertise to take this work forward but that it would be important to work with others to ensure that we did not repeat the mistakes of the past. It would also be important to seek input from indigenous peoples, on socioeconomic information and the opinions of those states who are not OSPAR members but are Arctic countries. There were lessons that could be learnt from the current NACES MPA roadmap.

6.14 Following work by a drafting group and a further round of comments from Contracting Parties, OSPAR agreed the Arctic Outcomes Roadmap along with Terms of Reference for the Working Group that is tasked with its delivery as in **Annex 9**.