

**TEMPLATE FOR SUBMISSION OF TEXTUAL PROPOSALS
DURING THE 29TH 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:

President's Text

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

Submitted by Nauru Ocean Resources Inc., Tonga Offshore Mining Ltd. and Blue Minerals Jamaica Ltd.

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

Draft Regulation 93ter.Alt (3)(c)

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.

Regulation 93 ter Alt.

Consultations with coastal States

[...]

3. Consultations between Contractors and potentially affected coastal States should be organised as follows:

[...]

~~(c) The Secretary-General shall inform the Contractor and all States of the coastal States that have communicated their position that they qualify as potentially most affected coastal States. Contractors and States are required to raise an objection, if any, to a notification of a State that it considers itself to qualify as a potentially affected coastal State within [21] Days, absent which the State in question should be deemed to qualify as potentially affected coastal State. If such an objection is raised, the Council shall determine whether the State in question qualifies as a potentially affected coastal State;~~

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

- We support undertaking consultations with potentially affected coastal States and consider it sufficient for such States to identify themselves on the basis of the criteria in Draft Regulation 4.
- We do not see the need for an objections process or to allow others to contest a State's self-identification as a potentially affected coastal State. This would only serve to potentially limit the transparency and value of the consultations. It would also create

additional administrative overhead and delay to the consultation process, and also potential impact upon the time available for the consultations themselves to be done. As such, we propose deleting Draft Regulation 93ter.Alt(3)(c).