

**SINGAPORE'S INTERVENTION ON AGENDA ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2 OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 72/249, CLEARING-HOUSE MECHANISM, AT THE SECOND SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE ON AN INTERNATIONAL LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA ON THE CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF MARINE BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF AREAS BEYOND NATIONAL JURISDICTION, 4 APRIL 2019 (AM)**

My delegation associates ourselves with the statement delivered by Palestine on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

Under **clearing-house mechanism**, as a general observation, there are specific provisions within this option such as those on EIAs, that are contingent on the landing reached on the substantive issues themselves.

As we have pointed out in an earlier Working Group discussion, we understand the clearing-house mechanism as essentially a repository and platform for the dissemination of information. It is therefore unclear if some of the functions listed in sub-section (3) are rightly sited in the clearing-house mechanism. To take an example, sub-paragraph (f) "*keep track of cumulative impacts with respect to EIAs*", while it might be possible for a disseminator or repository of information to perform this function, this is really contingent on whether the information on each subsequent impact is properly documented. In practice, it may not be easily achieved by a clearing-house mechanism as compared to another institution under the Instrument, assuming that the tracking of these cumulative impacts is required under the Instrument.

Turning to sub-section (7) on the management of the clearing-house mechanism, we would like to keep both Option A and B on the table at this stage. We are considering this question and we do not want to rule out using existing institutions such as IOC-UNESCO at this point.