

**TEMPLATE FOR SUBMISSION OF TEXTUAL PROPOSALS DURING THE 28TH SESSION:
COUNCIL - PART I**

Please fill out one form for each textual proposal which your delegation(s) wish(es) to amend, add or delete and send to council@isa.org.jm.

1. Name of Working Group:

Protection and Preservation of the Marine Environment

2. Name(s) of Delegation(s) making the proposal:

The Pew Charitable Trusts

3. Please indicate the relevant provision to which the textual proposal refers.

DR 45

4. Kindly provide the proposed amendments to the regulation or standard or guideline in the text box below, using the “track changes” function in Microsoft Word. Please only reproduce the parts of the text that are being amended or deleted.

- **Red font** are proposed amendments by the Facilitator in this revised text.
- Our proposed amendments and our questions or comments regarding the facilitator’s remarks are indicated as in-line edits in **blue**. Proposed deletions of text proposed by the facilitator appears in strikethrough and **bold**.

1. The Commission shall **only** consider an application for a Plan of Work ~~[if a]~~ ~~[based on the adopted]~~ if a Regional Environmental Management Plan ~~[has been adopted]~~ **has been adopted** by the Council for the particular area and type of resource concerned.
2. ~~[In the event that an application for a Plan of Work is submitted for an area where no such Regional Environmental Management Plan exists, the drafting of a Regional Environmental Management Plan applicable to the area in concern shall be prioritised and adopted without any undue delay, taking into account Section 2, Article 15 b/c of the 1994 Agreement.]~~

5. Please indicate the rationale for the proposal. [150-word limit]

As mentioned by most member States on the floor, we strongly oppose the proposed amendments to paragraph 1, which would no longer require the adoption of a REMP prior to the consideration of a Plan of Work.

There numerous other important obligations in the Regulations that cross-refer to the relevant REMP, which would be rendered obsolete if plans of work are considered for some areas without REMPs. It would also not present a ‘level playing field’ for all contractors.

For paragraph 2, should this be retained we would not support the insertion of a set timeline for the adoption of REMPs.