

## Summary of Progress Made on Ocean Commitments from the 1992 Earth Summit and 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, and Next Steps Emanating from the Rio+20 Outcome Document

Prepared by Marisa Van Hoesen, Global Ocean Forum

The following section is a summary of (1) progress made on ocean commitments from the 1992 Earth Summit and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development; and (2) major ocean-related goals emanating from the Rio+20 Conference. The summary addresses the following issue areas: Integrated, Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM/ICM); Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities; Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM); Biodiversity and Marine Protected Areas; Small Island Developing States (SIDS); Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture; Addressing Critical Uncertainties for the Marine Environment; Coordination of UN Activities; Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment; and Capacity Development

The summary of progress made on past ocean commitments (including the report cards) is based on the Global Ocean Forum report, "*Oceans at Rio+20: How Well Are We Doing in Meeting the Commitments from the 1992 Earth Summit and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development?*", which is available at: <http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/Rio20SummaryReport.pdf>.

The following text provides a brief summary of the Global Ocean Forum analysis in each issue area, as well as an overview of the ocean-related commitments made in the Rio+20 outcome document, *The Future We Want*, available at: <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/futurewewant.html>

### Ecosystem-Based Management/Integrated Coastal Management

Effort	Progress	Timing
Medium	High	Some Delay

Use of EBM/ICM has been widely accepted by the international community and has been implemented by a growing number of countries, as well as at the regional level, including through the Large Marine Ecosystem programs. Despite the increase in the scope of implementation, there is a need for further expand implementation of EBM/ICM, supported by improvements in institutional decisionmaking processes, at both the national and regional level, improve integration in the UN system to achieve more coherence, and apply EBM/ICM in areas beyond national jurisdiction. Effective EBM/ICM has been hampered by lack of data regarding ecosystem structure and function, lack of effective decisionmaking frameworks and legal competence, and limited funding to support scientific and management institutions.

The Rio+20 outcome document stressed the importance of an ecosystem approach to the management of activities impacting the marine environment.

### Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities

Effort	Progress	Timing
Medium	Medium	Some Delay

Since its establishment in 1995, the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment (GPA) has focused on providing guidance and supporting implementation at the national level in the reduction of marine pollution from land-based sources. Over 70 countries have developed National Programmes of Action through the GPA, and regional programmes to mitigate marine pollution have been advanced through the Regional Seas Programmes. Success has been mixed, and some of the most serious sources of marine degradation have not been adequately addressed, including sewage, nutrients, marine litter, and physical habitat alteration and degradation. Challenges include the lack of public education and awareness, limited political will, financial and human resources, and fragmentation of legal and institutional arrangements, as well as lack of compliance, enforcement, and reporting. The goal of achieving substantial progress by 2006, as stated in the Montreal Declaration, has not been achieved.

The Rio+20 outcome document called for States to take action to reduce the incidence and impacts of marine pollution, including through the implementation of the relevant conventions of the International Maritime Organization and through the GPA, and called for significant reduction in marine debris to prevent harm to coastal and marine environments by 2025.

### **Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM)**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Medium	Medium	Some Delay

According to a report by UN-Water, developed countries have advanced Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) in all major issue areas, while developing countries have seen improvements in the IWRM planning process. As a whole, the percentage of countries with IWRM plans that have been completed or are in the implementation phase has increased. A set of indicators and a Roadmap have been developed by UN-Water and GWP to provide guidance in IWRM. Despite this progress, there are a number of key areas that must be addressed to improve IWRM, including increased public awareness, gender mainstreaming, addressing implementation gaps, and more effective and consistent development and application of tools across regions. In addition, more effective water efficiency plans are needed.

The Rio+20 outcome document highlighted the need to implement IWRM planning at all levels, address flood-related impacts, water scarcity, and imbalances between water supply and demand, and to consider non-conventional water sources. As well, mobilization of resources, capacity building, and technology transfer were recognized as essential to implementing effective IWRM. There was also support for national action to better manage key ecosystems that play a role in maintaining water quality and quantity. There was a further commitment to reduce water pollution, improve water quality, and improve wastewater treatment and efficiency. The need for international cooperation and assistance was stressed in this regard.

### **Biodiversity and Marine Protected Areas**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Medium	Low/Medium	Significant Delay

While there has been growing recognition of the value of biodiversity among the public and policymakers, including new studies that look at the socio-economic value of marine biodiversity, the global goal of 10% MPA coverage by 2012 has not been met, and the trend in biodiversity loss has continued. Many countries have

established networks of marine protected areas, and there have been improvements in multilateral cooperation through the Regional Seas and LME Programmes. However, management of area-based approaches must be improved and embedded within broader EBM frameworks to improve their effectiveness. Challenges to more effective management include the lack of standardized data and reporting, as well as the lack of understanding of the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem services.

The Rio+20 outcome document reaffirmed a number of commitments from the 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the CBD, including the recent commitments under the Aichi Targets and Nagoya Protocol. There was recognition of the importance of area-based measures, including MPAs, to conserve biodiversity, and calls for wider application of traditional knowledge and engagement of local communities in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. It also called for the mainstreaming of the socio-economic benefits of biodiversity, and supported initiation of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services to provide improved information to decision-makers. With regard to areas beyond national jurisdiction, the Rio+20 outcome document called for a decision on the development of an international instrument under UNCLOS for conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ before the end of the 69<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly in 2014.

### **Small Island Developing States**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Medium	Medium	Some Delay

The special circumstances, vulnerabilities, and needs of SIDS have been recognized by the international community through the Barbados Plan of Action (BPoA) and the Mauritius Strategy of Implementation (MSI), yet implementation of important commitments related to SIDS and oceans has lagged, and institutional and financial support has been lacking. While SIDS have increasingly invested in the protection of their natural marine capital, including through designation of MPAs and the use of EBM frameworks at both the national and regional level, they have not been able to equitably benefit from their marine resources, and are in need of the human, financial, and institutional capacity to realize these gains. Despite growing focus at the global and regional levels on the threats posed to SIDS by climate change, these concerns have not resulted in the needed international commitments to reduce emissions, and adaptation funds to address climate change is inadequate.

The Rio+20 outcome document reiterated the commitments of the BPoA and MSI, and called for a third international conference on SIDS in 2014, which will be held in Samoa. It also called for the strengthening of the UN system’s support for SIDS, including support for new and emerging challenges. Rio+20 supported improving national capacity to manage and realize the benefits of sustainable resource use, including through improved market access for small-scale, artisanal, and women fishworkers, as well as indigenous people and communities.

### **Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Medium	Low/Medium	Significant Delay

Despite the fact that 78 nations have ratified the Fish Stock Agreement, over 90% of FAO member states have developed or implemented fisheries management plans and 80% have taken steps to develop or implement plans to address illegal, unregulated, and unreported (IUU) fishing, the number of stocks classified as overexploited, fully exploited, depleted, or recovering from depletion have only increased in recent years, indicating that much more progress is needed. Overcapacity also remains a major problem, even though many states have taken action to reduce overcapacity through the International Plan of Action for the Management of Fishing Capacity. In the high seas, UN General Assembly resolutions aimed at mitigating the impacts of bottom trawling on vulnerable ecosystems have been adopted, but implementation, especially at the regional level and in the high seas is still a major issue. There is a clear need for improved enforcement by flag and port states, as well as expanded efforts to mitigate destructive fishing practices. There is a need to address harmful subsidies and the incentive structures that contribute to overfishing and IUU, and to develop management plans that deal focus on long-term sustainability, not short-term losses.

The Rio+20 outcome document contained a number of commitments intended to reduce overfishing and IUU. It called for the intensification of efforts to meet the 2015 JPoI target to restore stocks to maximum sustainable yield (MSY) levels, within the shortest possible timeframe. Science-based management plans were supported. Management actions to address bycatch and destructive practices were called for, in addition to enhanced actions to protect vulnerable ecosystems, including the use of environmental impact assessment (EIA). Support for implementation of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and the JPoI to address IUU fishing was reiterated, and countries were urged to ratify the Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate IUU Fishing to bring it into force. The outcome document also called for national action to prevent and combat IUU activities, as well as the elimination of subsidies, including the capacity building for improved monitoring, control, surveillance, compliance and enforcement systems. At the international level, Rio+20 called for the conclusion of World Trade Organization negotiations to address fishing subsidies in a manner that considers development priorities. RFMOs were encouraged to undergo independent review to increase transparency and accountability, and to implement the recommendations that emerge from these reviews. Increased market access, and access by subsistence, small-scale, artisanal, women, and indigenous fishers was observed.

### **Addressing Critical Uncertainties for the Management of the Marine Environment and Climate Change**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
High	Medium/High	Some Delay/Significant Delay

There has been a mobilization of scientific effort to adapt scientific priorities to address pressing environmental concerns related to climate change. As a whole, improved sampling systems and networks of monitoring sites has resulted a deeper understanding of ecosystem processes. However, more effective monitoring and reporting, and improved global coverage, as well as implementation of the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) is required. The cumulative impacts of human activities need to be addressed in a multi-sectoral, multi-dimensional approach, and there is a need for systematic environmental data exchange between nations and the international community. The challenges of lack of capacity in developing countries, including technology transfer, education and training, and limited financial capacity has hampered implementation.

The Rio+20 outcome document called for states to consider the findings of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment following its completion. The outcome document also stressed the need to consider the precautionary approach in ocean fertilization activities.

Although not ocean-specific, the Rio+20 outcome document also called on states to improve early warning systems for disaster risk reduction, including capacity building, and called for the strengthening of risk assessment and risk reduction instruments, including integration with climate change adaptation strategies.

### **Coordination of UN Activities on Oceans**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Low	Low	On Time

UN-Oceans has been operating since 2005 on a regular basis, and with transparency. Work has been carried out through task forces, and has provided a forum for communication between UN agencies. However the activities of UN-Oceans has been limited, largely due to the lack of a lead authority, secretariat, staff or funding support, including through the individual agencies to support group activities. The different governing bodies, processes, timelines, and budgets for each of the UN agencies involved makes coordination difficult. Actions have been time bound, and there has been limited NGO involvement. A clear lead authority, a position at a higher level within the UN system, as well as specific funding is required to make UN-Oceans more effective.

The Rio+20 outcome document did not mention UN-Oceans, nor did it reference inter agency cooperation in relation to oceans.

### **A Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socio-economic Aspects**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Medium	High	Significant Delay

The Regular Process was established as an international process guided by international law, including UNCLOS and other relevant international instruments, though the scope and scale of establishing it was slow and hampered by a lack of resources to carry out the start-up phase. The Assessment of Assessments, which synthesizes information from existing assessments on the state of the marine environment was recently completed and was widely accepted by the research community, although the assessments gave less attention to areas beyond national jurisdiction and economic and social factors. The first cycle is underway, and is expected to be completed in time for review in 2014. While there has been improved participation by developing countries, the management of the Regular Process by States has limited the involvement of other key actors and the resources they could provide.

The Rio+20 outcome document called on states to consider the findings of the Regular Process following its completion in 2014 and subsequent review by the assembly.

### **Capacity Development**

<b>Effort</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Timing</b>
Low/ Unavailable	Low	Significant Delay

Capacity development was a major focus of Chapter 17 of Agenda 21 (the outcome document of the 1992 Earth Summit), and continues to be a major area of importance. There have been many efforts since 1992 to respond to the capacity development needs expressed at UNCED and at the WSSD on the part of various entities: educational institutions, UN agencies, multilateral and bilateral donors, NGOs, but there is currently no entity tracking effort and expenditures, aggregate impact, effectiveness, or extent to which current and emerging needs have been met, making assessment of effort difficult in this area. The absence of strategies and guidance at the international level, as well as a lack of indicators and timelines at the national level has slowed capacity development. Funds are limited, there are no tracking mechanisms for funds that have been provided, and there is no integration among the many actors that assist in capacity development. Capacity building efforts need to be integrated into long term development strategies, and will need to include human and institutional capacity building in addition to public education.

In the Rio+20 process, developing countries identified the lack of capacity development as one of the major gaps at the international level. In the outcome document, capacity building for oceans, coasts, and SIDS was highlighted to enable developing countries to implement their global commitments and to benefit from the conservation and sustainable use of their resources, including technology transfer, to provide support for monitoring, control, surveillance, compliance and enforcement systems to prevent and combat IUU fishing, to improve implementation of integrated water resource management. Support for sustainable tourism was also included in the outcome document, though this was not specific to coastal tourism.

### **References**

Biliana Cicin-Sain, Miriam Balgos, Joseph Appiott, Kateryna Wowk, and Gwénaëlle Hamon. 2011. Oceans at Rio+20: How Well Are We Doing in Meeting the Commitments from the 1992 Earth Summit and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development? Summary for Decision Makers. Global Ocean Forum. Available at: <http://www.globaloceans.org/content/rio20>

UN Resolution 66/288. "The Future We Want" 11 September 2012, available at: <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/futurewewant.html>