

TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS

Contact Information		
Surname	Washburn	
Given name	Travis	
Government (if applicable)		
Organization (if applicable)		
Country	Japan	
Email	Travis.washburn@aist.go.jp	
General Comments		
<p>When preparing the general comments, stakeholders are invited to consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The structure and layout of the draft REMP. 2) The level of detail of the draft REMP, while avoiding being too prescriptive. 3) The goals and objectives in the draft REMP in providing for long-term, effective protection of the marine environment in the Area of the northern Mid-Atlantic Ridge. 4) The management measures and their ability to achieve the goals and objectives in the draft REMP. 		
Specific Comments		
Page	Line	Comment
11	292-293	There is really no detail on why these 3 AINPs were chosen. They are over fracture zones, but why are fracture zones (and these particular 3) the only regional-scale features that need protecting in the MAR? What are the reasons for the size of each AINP here? For APEIs they identified a clear productivity gradient in the area which drove benthic communities and placed regional protected areas to capture this gradient. The size was also clearly explained. In the Northwest Pacific they are trying to capture representative seamount and abyssal habitats in their AINPs. However, I don't see any real rationale as to why these three areas would capture the biodiversity in the region (besides very broad statements), why it is not a problem that AINP's are 1000-2000 km apart, how an AINP less than 100 km in distance latitudinally (based on coordinates for Kane Fracture Zone) is sufficient to provide any buffer from mining nearby, why the southern AINP needs to be several times bigger than the other 2, etc.

12	313-315	Why are only active vents considered sites in need of protection? Are there really no other sites along the MAR that warrant protection besides this one habitat?
----	---------	---