Addressing Commonalities between *Turning the Tide* and *Defying Ocean’s End*

*Defying Ocean’s End* is the result of an ‘invitation only’ conference that took place in June 2003 in Los Cabos, Mexico. Funded by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, this meeting brought together 150 experts from 20 different countries in the areas of ocean science, policy, economics and conservation, along with a select number of representatives from government, industry and the media. The conference itself was split up into five case studies, primarily regional, and seven thematic groups. Along with the thematic groups there was also a business team on hand lead by Goldman Sachs of New York City. This team assigned costs and priorities to all the recommendation lead-outs by the experts. The final cost for a ten-year global action plan for the oceans was estimated at $18.63 Billion. This may sound like a daunting figure, especially to those from the NGO and academic communities; however, when you consider that *Turning the Tide* quoted £16 Billion per year are put into perverse subsidies for fisheries, it becomes less daunting, and you think about how these economics could be reversed and distributed globally.

Comparing *Defying Ocean’s End* with *Turning the Tide*
The focus of *Turning the Tide* was primarily on the OSPAR region (North-East Atlantic), but the recommendations are applicable globally and the findings are also similar to what you would find in any region of the globe if you were to look. Additionally, the focus was primarily on fisheries, whereas *Defying Ocean’s End* looked at a broad range of threats to the ocean, including pollution, coastal development and ocean commerce. Surprisingly, however, even though *Defying Ocean’s End* had a broader view, some of the high level recommendations are shockingly similar (or maybe not shockingly similar) to *Turning the Tide*. For example, both reports basically say that we need to move away from opportunistic and *ad hoc* MPAs and instead move towards well-planned networks of MPAs in a globally represented system. Also, we need to move away from single species, or single sector management and into ecosystem based management, especially on the scale of large marine ecosystems. Further, they both state that instead of subsidizing fisheries we need to use economics to reform fisheries and bring fishing efforts into sustainable levels. Finally, both sets of recommendations highlighted deep-sea bottom trawling as a terribly destructive practice, especially on the high-seas and seamounts and in other areas where coldwater corals are found. Both reports noted that this practice by all means needs to stop - it is unnecessarily destructive.

Notably, it is not just *Defying Ocean’s End* and *Turning the Tide* that are coming up with similar recommendations - the United States recently published two reports that said very similar types of things; one led by the Pew Oceans Commission and the other, the US Commission on Ocean Policy, of which Marc Hershman, here with us today, is a member. Although there are differences between all four of these reports there are more similarities than differences. What this is telling me is that as a global community we
know the problems and we have a good idea of how to solve them - but for some reason we are not doing this. There are current systems of governance and economics that are stopping us from putting these recommendations into broad practice.

Moving Forward in Partnership
There is some good news. Some of these recommendations are underway - surprisingly it is not in the developed states where these recommendations have their origins, it is in the developing states. Countries such as Indonesia, the Bahamas and Madagascar have all made outstanding commitments for the expansion of protected areas within their territorial waters. I would like to highlight one such country, Costa Rica; it is like ‘the little engine that could’ story. Due to the location of Cocos Island off its shores, Costa Rica has an exclusive economic zone (EEZ) that is approximately four times the size of its terrestrial area. In the past year alone, Costa Rica has brought together the countries of Colombia, Panama and Ecuador to sign the San Jose Declaration. This is a treaty between the four nations to co-manage the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean as one large marine mega-corridor. Since that time, in June 2004 they have unilaterally made a commitment to put 25% of their EEZ under some form of protection. Also in June 2004, Costa Rica went before the United Nations Informal Consultative Process for the Oceans and the Law of the Sea - UNICPOLOS V - and proposed a global moratorium on high-seas bottom trawling. This Costa Rica proposal was later carried forth to the UN General Assembly and it became one of the most hotly debated issues of this past General Assembly, and continues to be a major issue in international circles. Finally, this past February (2005) the Costa Rican senate unanimously voted for a new fishing law that banned shark finning in their waters and also required all trawlers to use TEDs (turtle exclusion devices).

Unfortunately, despite these great efforts by some of these smaller developing nations, it is not enough that Costa Rica is doing this. We need countries such as the United States, Canada, Australia and Brazil, (large countries with large economies), to put these same practices into play. We need to figure out how to do this together - we need to look at how NGOs can work with academia, how academia can work with governments, how local governments can work with national governments, and how we can all work together with industry.