Japan’s view on Governance and mechanisms to support implementation
Section E: Subsidiary and ad hoc expert bodies

1. Overarching comment
Regarding the title of this section, Japan would like to clarify the difference between “subsidiary bodies” and “ad hoc expert bodies”. We recognize that an ad hoc expert body is a subset of a subsidiary body, and therefore “ad hoc expert bodies” could be deleted from the title while possibility of establishing ad hoc expert bodies and expert groups as such can be mentioned in this section. Stakeholders may wish to recall that the title of Section IX under the current rules of procedure (RoP) is just “Subsidiary bodies”.

Japan is of the view that this section should describe the objective of the subsidiary bodies only and the modality of such bodies should be included in the RoP. The modality can be discussed, with the basis of the current RoP (Rule 23), when considering the RoP of the beyond 2020 instruments.

2. Whether there is a need for subsidiary and ad hoc expert bodies
Japan is of the view that subsidiary bodies are necessary within the beyond 2020 instruments. The typical example of such bodies is the OEWG which provides opportunities to consider the implementation and enhancement of the beyond 2020 instruments, and prepare draft decisions or resolutions for the ICCM.

Ad hoc expert bodies and expert groups will also be essential since it is quite likely for multi-stakeholders to seek experts’ recommendations with third-party perspectives to be agreed at the ICCM regarding scientific knowledge on specific issues, setting and evaluating indicators as such in line with strategic objectives and target. However, it could be only mentioned in an inclusive manner of subsidiary bodies.

3. How such bodies would be established and by whom
Any stakeholders should be able to propose the establishment of subsidiary bodies. The establishment of any subsidiary body should be decided by the ICCM.

4. Who would participate in such bodies
All stakeholders should be able to participate in subsidiary bodies. There may be the cases where the balanced representation is not applied to some ad hoc expert bodies and expert groups according to the nature of such groups if agreed to be established. Stakeholders may wish to recall that Rule 3 of the current RoP reads “...all participants shall be entitled to take part... in sessions of the Conference and any subsidiary body established in accordance with rule 23”. This rule is enough to ensure the full participation of stakeholders and therefore, we do not think that the balanced representation need to be explicitly mentioned in the new OPS.

5. What role would such bodies play
Subsidiary bodies may include the OEWG to prepare for ICCM meetings, ad hoc expert bodies and expert groups to develop indicators and to provide scientific knowledge on specific issues as such. The role of such bodies can be addressed in the forthcoming resolution together with terms of reference, as appropriate. Therefore, Japan proposes not to prejudge the roles of such bodies before the formal adoption of its establishment at the ICCM.

6. What responsibilities would such bodies have and to whom
Same as above.