

Thank you, Madam President.

This morning Mr Chris Brown observed that there appeared to be a consensus that seabed exploitation should not take place in any region not yet covered by a REMP. He then speculated that there might be an emerging consensus that no exploitation contract should be approved in any area not covered by a pre-existing REMP.

We think that the latter formulation is better. We support Germany, Belgium, Norway, Australia, Canada, and the Netherlands: Not just No REMP / No Mining. Instead: No REMP / No Contract. The Legal and Technical Commission should be instructed by this body that no exploitation contract should be approved unless the applicant's Plan of Work demonstrates its understanding of, and capacity to comply with, the REMP in question. And we would also agree that the proposition of Japan and Jamaica -- that *all* geophysical regions should have approved REMPs prior to exploitation in any one of them -- deserves serious consideration.

As a member of the informal REMP Advisory Committee that presented suggestions to the Secretariat earlier this year, it is gratifying to see many of our recommendations have informed the REMP papers recently developed by the Secretariat. Practically speaking, however, I think it unlikely that a careful REMP process – one like the model proposed by Germany – could be completed for every bioregion before the end of 2020. That the Council drew a road map in which the exploitation regulations were to be approved by next Summer should not oblige REMP-writing to take place in tandem.

Finally: In reference to the REMP for the Clarion-Clipperton Zone, that “work-in-progress” described by the Italian representative: during lunchtime tomorrow (Wednesday) three scientists will describe recent data and findings from the CCZ and how those new data might influence the character and breadth of a revised CCZ REMP. You are most cordially invited.

Thank you, Madam President.