GROUP A DISCUSSION MANDATE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COORDINATING MECHANISM

MANDATE

Key questions. Is it appropriate? Should it be shortened/reduced or should it be broadened?

- Replace facilitating with supporting in the mandate. This softens the mandate so one would not think the intention of the Coordinating mechanism is to dictate.
- Remove policy and leave programmes, or if policy remains, it must be clarified. There needs to be a common understanding of how the coordination mechanism works not only for those involved, so that everyone is on the same page with regards to the understanding of what the coordinating mechanism will do.

MANDATE

Key questions. Is it appropriate? Should it be shortened/reduced or should it be broadened?

Recommendations Continued

- Removing "a" from the part of the mandate that says "including strategies for a sustainable ocean-based economy/blue economy" in order to add flexibility.
- "Strategies for a sustainable ocean-based economy/blue economy and disaster risk reduction strategies" were highlighted however the group proposes that these are removed and the mandate ends with "ocean based sustainable development". This is so that it does not appear as though the sole focus is the strategies highlighted.

MANDATE

Geographic scope

- There was concern that the inclusion of the Gulf of Mexico would expand the geographical scope. This may result in reduced effectiveness of the Coordinating mechanism.
- Other issues raised was the possibility that another LME project also exists for the Gulf of Mexico, and the nature of existing governance agreements between Mexico and the US.

Geographic scope

-Recommendation is that there is coordination with the mechanism that already exists for the Gulf of Mexico without including it. It was noted that some of the IGOs already have mandates in the Gulf of Mexico therefore the group proposes that recommendations from the Coordinating mechanism can be made, then the IGOs with the geographic mandates for the Gulf of Mexico can take up the necessary actions.

-It was noted that at the end of the day, the Coordinating mechanism should be as inclusive as possible but the operationalization must not infringe on the work of IGOs.

FUNCTIONS

- Include science-policy interfaces as a core function.
- Consolidate communication and stakeholder engagement into one core function. Stakeholders in this context would be at the regional level to avoid the appearance that the Coordinating mechanism is in conflict with IGOs that engage stakeholders at the national level.
- Possibly add Support National Ocean Governance to the list of core functions. This can include capacity support, resource mobilization etc.

FUNCTIONS

- Change policy coordination and consolidation to institutional coordination. This is seen clearly in bullet points 1,2 and 4. Bullet point 3 can then be relocated to communication and stakeholder engagement, and bullet point 5 can be added to the proposed core function "Support national ocean governance"
- Emerging issues should not be a core function but it should be recognized in the executive group and possibly taken up later.

FUNCTIONS

- Add Sustainable financing and resource mobilization to the list of core functions. It was recognized among country representatives that this is the main function that will attract policymakers, so it should be included as a core function. Resource Mobilization in this case can be linked to joint programme development.
- Promote ownership by linking specific functions to IGOs as well as countries. If any expertise exists within an IGO or country in any of the proposed functions then they can execute specific support functions on behalf of the Coordinating mechanism. This can be their in-kind contribution to the Coordinating mechanism.