



HAL
open science

Contributions of marine area-based management tools to the UN sustainable development goals

Elena Gissi, Frank Maes, Zacharoula Kyriazi, Ana Ruiz-Frau, Catarina Frazão Santos, Barbara Neumann, Adriano Quintela, Fátima Alves, Simone Borg, Wenting Chen, et al.

► To cite this version:

Elena Gissi, Frank Maes, Zacharoula Kyriazi, Ana Ruiz-Frau, Catarina Frazão Santos, et al.. Contributions of marine area-based management tools to the UN sustainable development goals. 2024. hal-04464031

HAL Id: hal-04464031

<https://hal.science/hal-04464031>

Preprint submitted on 17 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Contributions of marine area-based management tools to the UN Sustainable Development Goals

Elena Gissi^{1,2,3*}, Frank Maes⁴, Zacharoula Kyriazi⁵, Ana Ruiz-Frau⁶, Catarina Frazão Santos^{7,8}, Barbara Neumann⁹, Adriano Quintela¹⁰, Fátima L. Alves¹⁰, Simone Borg¹¹, Wenting Chen¹², Maria da Luz Fernandes¹⁰, Maria Hadjimichael¹³, Elisabetta Manea², Márcia Marques¹⁰, Froukje Maria Platjouw¹², Michelle E. Portman¹⁴, Lisa P. Sousa¹⁰, Luca Bolognini¹⁵, Wesley Flannery¹⁶, Fabio Grati¹⁵, Cristina Pita^{10,17}, Nataşa Văidianu^{18,19}, Robert Stojanov²⁰, Jan van Tatenhove²¹, Fiorenza Micheli^{1,22}, Anna-Katharina Hornidge²³, Sebastian Unger⁹

1 Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA

2 National Research Council, Institute of Marine Science, CNR ISMAR, Arsenale, Tesa 104 - Castello 2737/F, 30122 Venice – Italy

3 University IUAV of Venice, Santa Croce 191, 30135 Venezia, Italy

4 Faculty of Law and Criminology, Maritime Institute, Ghent University, Universiteitstraat 6, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

5 Interdisciplinary Centre of Marine and Environmental Research (CIIMAR), University of Porto, Terminal de Cruzeiros de Leixões. Av. General Norton de Matos s/n, 4450-208 Matosinhos Portugal

6 Department of Marine Ecosystem Dynamics, IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB), Miquel Marqués, 21, 07190, Esporles, Spain

7 Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Avenida Nossa Senhora do Cabo 939, 2750-374 Cascais, Portugal

8 Environmental Economics Knowledge Center, Nova School of Business and Economics, New University of Lisbon, Rua da Holanda 1, 2775-405 Carcavelos, Portugal

9 Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS), Berliner Str. 130, D-14467 Potsdam, Germany

10 CESAM-Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies, Department of Environment and Planning, University of Aveiro, Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

- 28 11 Department of Environmental and Resources Law, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta
- 29 12 Norwegian Institute for Water Research, Gaustadalléen 21, NO-0349 Oslo, Norway
- 30 13 Independent Researcher, Nicosia, Cyprus
- 31 14 Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Kiryat HaTechnion, Haifa 32000 Israel
- 32 15 National Research Council (CNR), Institute of Marine Biological Resources and Biotechnologies (IRBIM),
33 Largo Fiera della Pesca 1, 60125 Ancona, Italy
- 34 16 School of Natural and Built Environment, David Keir Building, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, BT9
35 5AG, United Kingdom
- 36 17 International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), 235 High Holborn, Holborn, London WC1V
37 7DN, U.K.
- 38 18 Faculty of Natural Sciences and Agricultural Sciences, Ovidius University of Constanța, Aleea Universității 1,
39 900470, Constanța, Romania
- 40 19 Interdisciplinary Center for Advanced Research on Territorial Dynamics, University of Bucharest, Regina
41 Elisabeta 4-12, 030018, Bucharest, Romania
- 42 20 Faculty of Business and Economics, Mendel University in Brno, Zemědělská 1, 61300 Brno, Czech Republic
- 43 21 Centre for Blue Governance, Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14, 9000 Aalborg,
44 Denmark
- 45 22 Stanford Center for Ocean Solutions, 120 Ocean View Blvd, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA
- 46 23 German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Tulpenfeld 6, D - 53113
47 Bonn, Germany
- 48
- 49 * Corresponding author: Elena Gissi, Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950,
50 USA, tel: +1 831 655 6200; e-mail address: elena.gissi@ismar.cnr.it

51

52

53 **Abstract**

54 Area-Based Management Tools (ABMTs) are spatial instruments for conservation and managing different
55 forms of ocean use. A multitude of ABMTs exists in marine areas within and beyond national jurisdiction,

56 ranging from tools for the regulation of specific human activities (e.g. fisheries, shipping, or mining) to
57 cross-sectoral tools (e.g. such as marine protected areas, MPAs, and marine spatial planning, MSP). By
58 applying expert elicitation and reviewing scientific and grey literature we evaluate the contribution of
59 ABMTs to sustainable development goals (SDGs) as set out under the United Nations 2030 Agenda for
60 Sustainable Development, including for SDG 14 that directly addresses the conservation and sustainable use
61 of oceans, seas, and marine resources. We find that fisheries-related and conservation-related ABMTs, and
62 MSP offer the greatest potential contributions to SDG 14 and to SDGs in general. Moreover, there is high
63 complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most SDG 14 targets and other SDGs, with the
64 exception of SDG target 14.6 *Prohibit fisheries subsidies* and SDG 7 *Affordable and clean energy*. We find
65 that some ABMTs contribute directly to goal attainment, while others contribute in more nuanced or even
66 unexpected ways. Furthermore, context-specific factors that relate to political and legal factors,
67 enforceability, transparency, governance, and inclusivity are crucial for unlocking the full potential of
68 ABMTs of attaining multiple SDGs, as shown through examples. The major challenge to face in the next
69 decade is ensuring durable and equitable outcomes from ABMT implementation by coordinating ABMT
70 initiatives established by different organisations and responsible authorities. It is also critical that outcomes
71 are monitored and evaluated across environmental, social, economic, governance, and health dimensions,
72 with indicators addressing management effectiveness and not only ABMT area coverage.

73

74 **Keywords:** area-based management, marine/maritime spatial planning, ocean governance, cooperation
75 mechanisms, areas beyond national jurisdiction, biodiversity, conservation, sustainable development.

76

77 **1. Introduction**

78 The United Nations (UN) 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015), henceforth the
79 2030 Agenda, is a holistic, inclusive and coherent strategy encompassing a set of 17 “integrated and
80 indivisible” Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One of these goals, SDG 14 *Life below water*, focuses
81 specifically on the conservation and sustainable use of the ocean and its resources. It builds on commitments

82 and requirements as set out in different, yet related legal instruments or international declarations. For
83 example, the target to conserve at least 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020 (SDG 14.5) was based on
84 the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Target 11 (Convention on Biological Diversity,
85 2010). The ‘zero draft’ proposal for the CBD post-2020 global biodiversity framework now recommends the
86 protection of at least 30% of the ocean by 2030 (UNEP, 2020). Achieving conservation outcomes in the
87 ocean while supporting other SDGs is critical, especially in light of the recent and rapid “blue” acceleration
88 in marine resource exploitation (Jouffray et al., 2020), and major challenges in achieving sustainable blue
89 growth (Laffoley et al., 2020; Rilov et al., 2020a; Winther et al., 2020). Furthermore, the ocean is a
90 continuum, with currents and species moving across multiple zones (Popova et al., 2019) and ecosystems
91 being affected by transboundary anthropogenic pressures that cannot be controlled through protected zones
92 alone (Menegon et al., 2018; Reusch et al., 2018). Whilst there is a growing body of literature on the nature
93 of interlinkages between sustainability goals and targets in the ocean (Nash et al., 2020; Nilsson et al., 2016;
94 Obura, 2020; S. Schmidt et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2018), there is limited comprehensive evaluation of the
95 contribution of specific management tools to attaining SDGs.


96 Area-based management tools (ABMTs) are globally applied, purpose-orientated instruments used in the
97 planning and management of marine and coastal areas. By definition, ABMTs entail the implementation of a
98 system of rights and duties in a particular management area, under the responsibility of a designated
99 authority, and tend to afford high levels of protection (Roberts et al., 2010; UNGA, 2007). Taking into
100 account the legal status of the different maritime zones under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea
101 (UNCLOS), ABMTs range from sectoral spatial instruments designed to manage a particular human activity
102 (e.g., fisheries, shipping, or mining) to cross-sectoral tools for managing multiple uses, such as marine
103 protected areas (MPAs), and marine/maritime spatial planning (MSP) (Muraki Gottlieb et al., 2018).

104 These tools reached particular global resonance in recent years, as part of biodiversity conservation targets
105 and the negotiation of an international legally binding instrument (under UNCLOS) for the conservation and
106 sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) (General
107 Assembly resolution 72/249, United Nations, 2018). In addition to being discussed as a potential measure to
108 achieve BBNJ-related objectives, ABMTs have been identified as a key mechanism for delivering global

109 biodiversity goals and SDG 14 (Reimer et al., 2021). However, due to the great variety of ABMTs, there is a
110 need for a clear understanding of how these tools can contribute – separately and/or combined – to the
111 implementation of the 2030 Agenda as a whole. Given the indivisible and interlinked nature of SDGs
112 delivering on a broad range of objectives, it is vital that implementation considers synergies and trade-offs
113 between different SDGs. Understanding the broad and interconnected nature of SDGs is key to supporting
114 decision-makers, managers and communities in applying ABMTs to maximize policy effectiveness for
115 environmental and societal benefits, as well as addressing challenges and potential trade-offs among goals.

116 Here, we review existing types of ABMTs as stipulated by different international and regional agreements
117 (Fig. 1) and their contribution to achieving SDG 14 and other SDGs. Drawing on expert opinion, we first
118 assessed the potential range of ABMTs' contributions to achieving the different targets of SDG 14, together
119 with several other interlinked SDGs with strong implications for ocean-related transformations towards
120 sustainability, i.e., SDGs 1, 2, 5, 7-13, 16, and 17 (see section 2.2 below). We then explored constraining and
121 enabling factors of ABMTs implementation through existing cases and evidence from literature. Finally, we
122 discussed the potential multiple contributions of ABMTs to sustainable development in both areas beyond
123 national jurisdiction (ABNJ) and areas under national jurisdiction, and we outlined pathways towards more
124 effective SDGs achievement – acknowledging the multiplicity of social, environmental, economic, political,
125 and institutional challenges, as well as opportunities that come with ABMTs implementation.

Legend



126

127 **Figure 1: Area-based management tools (ABMTs) identified in international and regional conventions**
 128 **and agreements.** ABMTs are grouped according to the specific sector/purpose they target (expressed by the
 129 colors of the horizontal bars). Legal sources are reported, with the region/area of application and the year of
 130 adoption into brackets, while the year of entry into force is reported outside brackets. Maritime zones are
 131 split in areas under national jurisdiction (including the Exclusive Economic Zone) and areas beyond national

132 jurisdiction (ABNJ), indicating in which maritime zone the ABMTs classified by the colored rectangles can
133 or could apply. “High Seas” is just the water column in ABNJ. The sea floor is the “Area” (International
134 Seabed Authority ABMTs apply there). Both can be taken together as ABNJ. The colors of the rectangles
135 represent the sector or cross-sectorial group to which the ABMTs belong. The vertical marine domain
136 subdivisions indicate the scope of the ABMTs, such as air, water, seabed, and are shown by different icons.
137 For detailed descriptions of each ABMT see Table A.3; APEI=Areas of Particular Environmental Interest,
138 ASMA=Antarctic Specially Managed Area, ASPA=Antarctic Specially Protected Area, BBNJ=Biodiversity
139 Beyond National Jurisdictions, EBSA=Ecologically and Biologically Significant Area, ECA=Emissions
140 Control Areas, FRA=Fisheries Restricted Areas, GES=Good Environmental Status, MPA=Marine Protected
141 Area, MSP=Marine/Maritime Spatial Planning, OECM=Other Effective area-based Conservation Measure,
142 PA=Protected Areas, PSSA=Particular Sensitive Sea Areas, SAC=Special Areas of Conservation, SCI=Site
143 of Community Importance, SECA=Sulphur Emissions Control Areas, SPA=Specially Protected Areas,
144 TURF=Territorial Use Rights in Fisheries, VME=Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems; for the acronyms of the
145 International and Regional Agreements see Table C.1.

146

147 **2. Material and methods**

148 The assessment conducted in this study is structured around two main steps: i) the descriptive analysis of a
149 vast set of ABMTs with respect to their scope, mandate, responsibilities, spatial extent, and single/multiple
150 sector-based objectives; and ii) the qualitative assessment of the potential contribution of selected ABMTs to
151 ocean-related SDGs of the 2030 Agenda.

152

153 **2.1. Descriptive analysis of ABMTs (Step 1)**

154 An initial list of 47 ocean-related international agreements (at global and regional levels) was compiled, with
155 respect to shipping, fisheries management, deep seabed mining in the Area, underwater natural and cultural
156 heritage, environmental conservation, and marine spatial planning (Step 1). We screened them and compiled
157 a list of ABMTs mentioned by the respective legal sources and related tools. ABMTs were selected along

158 two criteria: i) implementation in practice; and ii) existing specific, identifiable geographical scope for
159 zoning. We recorded how legal sources at the international level have shaped ABMTs with regard to spatial
160 scope, mandate and responsibilities, and single/multiple sector-based objectives (protocol in Table A.1).
161 ABMTs were analyzed (Table A.2) with respect to: i) their objectives; ii) authorities responsible for
162 delivering such objectives; iii) the system of management and planning entailed in the ABMT forms; and iv)
163 the specific spatial domain ABMTs refer to (both vertical depth and horizontal).

164 We grouped ABMTs according to the focus/sector of each tool into six categories based on Muraki Gottlieb
165 et al. (2018) (Table A.3): i) fishery-related ABMTs; ii) shipping-related ABMTs; iii) ABMTs related to deep
166 seabed mining in the Area; iv) ABMTs related to underwater cultural and natural heritage (UCNH); v)
167 conservation-related ABMTs; vi) MSP initiatives. These categories were further used to perform a
168 qualitative assessment of ABMTs as described below (Step 2). The full list of ABMTs and the analysis from
169 the related legal sources is reported in a database attached to this study.

170

171 **2.2 Contribution of ABMTs towards SDGs (Step 2)**

172 After identifying, analyzing, and grouping ABMTs (Step 1), we selected the SDGs on which to focus the
173 analysis (the SDGs selection procedure is described in the Supplementary methods A.4. We then assessed
174 the contribution of the previously identified ABMTs towards the selected SDGs through expert elicitation.
175 Subsequently, we added elements of existing ABMTs implementation, based on evidence from the literature.

176 We focused on SDG 14 *Life below water* (United Nations, 2020) and its main targets (14.1 to 14.7), as well
177 as on other ocean-related SDGs, at the goal level. These were SDG 1 *No poverty*, 2 *Zero hunger*, 3 *Good*
178 *Health and Well-being*, 5 *Gender equality*, 7 *Affordable and clean energy*, 8 *Decent work and economic*
179 *growth*, 9 *Industry, innovation and infrastructure*, 10 *Reduce inequalities*, 11 *Sustainable cities and*
180 *communities*, 12 *Responsible consumption*, 13 *Climate action*, 16 *Peace, justice and strong institutions*, and
181 17 *Partnerships for the goals*. Accounting for a broader spectrum of SDGs in this analysis is important not
182 only because of the integrated and indivisible character of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs. Also, previous
183 research focused exclusively on SDG 14 with limited attention to the social and economic dimensions

184 (Reimer et al. 2020), which we aim to expand here. With respect to SDG 14, we focused the analysis on the
 185 seven outcome-oriented targets (targets 1-7). We did not address the three targets (targets a-c) that represent
 186 “means of implementation” (namely, science and technology, knowledge-sharing and capacity building, and
 187 implementation of international law) as the latter were recognized to be inconsistently formulated and mainly
 188 qualitative (Bartram et al., 2018).

189 The assessment of the contribution of each ABMT to the SDGs took place according to the protocol reported
 190 in Table 1. The scoring framework developed by Nilsson et al. (2016) and applied by Nilsson et al. (2017),
 191 by McCollum et al. (2018), and by Schmidt et al. (2017) specifically on the case of SDG 14, was applied to
 192 assess the contributions of ABMTs to SDG 14 at the target level, and for the other selected SDGs at the goal
 193 level. The framework (Table 2) employed a seven-point rating scale to identify benefits and trade-offs
 194 between ABMTs and SDGs. It allowed a rapid assessment of relationships among them and highlights
 195 priorities for integrated policy. As the potential contribution of ABMTs towards SDGs is independent from
 196 its application in a specific maritime domain, the assessment of these contribution was conducted jointly for
 197 areas under national jurisdictions and ABNJ.

198

199 **Table 1: Research questions and criteria for the assessment of the contribution of ABMTs towards the**
 200 **achievement of SDG 14 targets and other ocean related SDGs.**

Research question	Field code	Field name	Description	Sources
SDG 14 target or SDG assessed	Q5.1	No. of SDG 14 target or SDG	Number of the SDG 14 target or of the SDG goal for which the assessment was made.	(United Nations, 2015)
	Q5.2	SDG 14 target or SDG	Text of the SDG 14 target or SDG for which the assessment is produced.	(United Nations, 2015)
What is the potential contribution of the ABMT towards the achievement of the respective SDG?	Q5.3	Score	Qualitative scoring that represents the potential contribution of the ABMT to the respective SDG target or SDG goal; the scoring is described in Table 3.	(Nilsson et al., 2017, 2016; Singh et al., 2018)
	Q5.4	Contribution to the SDG	Textual description of the potential contribution of the ABMTs group to the SDG studied.	
What is the level of confidence on which the assessment is based?	Q5.5	Confidence	Qualitative scoring indicating the confidence level of the experts in assessing the potential contribution of ABMTs towards the SDG (summary terms: ‘low,’ ‘medium,’ ‘high’).	(Mastrandrea et al., 2011; McCollum et al., 2018)

Are there any enabling factors or barriers that can enhance or inhibit the contribution of ABMTs towards the assessed SDG?	Q5.6	Enabling factors and/or barriers	Text describing factors and barriers that can enable or inhibit the contribution of ABMTs towards the achievement of the SDG from literature and cases; enabling factors and barriers are drawn from expert knowledge, literature, and implemented ABMTs.	(United Nations, 2015) (Nilsson et al., 2017, 2016; Singh et al., 2018)
Are there any examples of ABMT implementation and related contribution towards the assessed SDG?	Q5.7	Examples	Text describing cases reported as examples of ABMTs implementation that did or did not contribute towards the achievement of the SDG.	
What is the level of evidence on enabling factors and barriers from the various sources on ABMTs applications?	Q5.8	Evidence	Qualitative scoring to indicate the type, amount, quality, and consistency of evidence on which enabling factors and barriers were elaborated (summary terms: 'low,' 'medium,' or 'high').	(Mastrandrea et al., 2011; McCollum et al., 2018)

201

202 **Table 2:** Qualitative scoring system to assess the contribution of the ABMT to the achievement of the SDGs, elaborated from Nilsson et al. (2017, 2016) and Singh et al. (2018).

203

Score	Name of the criterion	Explanation expanded from Nilsson et al (2016) for the purpose of this study	Example of assessed relationships between ABMTs and SDG goals for illustration (this study)
<i>Benefits (potential positive contribution of the ABMT to the achievement of the target or goal)</i>			
+3	Indivisible	Goal achievement is inextricably linked with the designation and implementation of the ABMT.	The achievement of SDG target 14.5 which aims to conserve at least 10% of coastal and marine areas is inextricably linked to the implementation of MPAs.
+2	Reinforcing	Goal achievement is reinforced by the designation and implementation of the ABMT (direct support).	MSP is a reinforcing condition to SDG target 14.2, i.e. the sustainable management and protection of marine and coastal ecosystems.
+1	Enabling	The designation and implementation of the ABMT creates conditions that further the goal (indirect support).	The designation and implementation of shipping-related ABMTs can reduce potential harm from international shipping to marine and coastal ecosystems providing multiple benefits and natural resources (ie ecosystem services) to coastal communities, indeed enabling SDG 1 <i>No poverty</i> achievement.
<i>Neutral contribution of the ABMT to the target or goal</i>			
0	Neutral	No significant positive or negative interactions towards goal achievement.	The designation of an APEI by the International Seabed Authority or the development of environmental management plans for defined areas such as the Clarion Clipperton Zone have no apparent positive or negative interaction with SDG target 14.6 which is related to the prohibition of certain fisheries subsidies.
<i>Trade-offs (potential negative contribution of the ABMT to the achievement of the target or goal)</i>			
-1	Constraining	The designation and implementation of the ABMT limits options on the goal.	(No potential contributions of ABMTs going in this direction were found in this study)

-2	Counteracting	The designation and implementation of the ABMT clashes with the goal.	(No potential contributions of ABMTs going in this direction were found in this study)
-3	Cancelling	The designation and implementation of the ABMT makes it impossible to reach the goal.	(No potential contributions of ABMTs going in this direction were found in this study)

204

205 The assessment of the potential contribution of ABMTs to SDGs was based on internal expert elicitation, in
206 line with the method applied by McCollum et al. (2018). Experts involved were part of the Working Group
207 on “Area Based Management” of the European COST Action CA 15217 OceanGov “Ocean Governance for
208 Sustainability: Challenges, Options and the Role of Science”. We leveraged the diverse and in-depth
209 knowledge of the experts – as the authors of this study – on the different ABMT groups (conservation,
210 shipping, fisheries, deep seabed mining, UCNH, MSP) to conduct and produce the assessment. Sub-teams
211 were formed during the first expert workshop (Ghent, 20-21 February 2019), where they were trained on the
212 assessment method. The sub-teams were composed of at least three researchers coordinated by the lead
213 author. They worked through small-group discussions to reach agreement on each score, first in person
214 during the workshop, and remotely afterwards. The sub-teams were also asked to assess the confidence
215 (Table 1) with which they collectively judged the different potential contributions of ABMTs towards the
216 achievement of SDGs. Confidence scores were assigned considering the level of expert knowledge on the
217 different ABMTs.

218 Once the scoring was defined, the sub-teams also analyzed the actual implementation of ABMTs, reporting
219 evidence on potential enabling factors and barriers that enhance or inhibit ABMTs contribution towards
220 specific SDGs. The sub-teams leveraged evidence from their own knowledge, as well as scientific and grey
221 literature on the implementation of ABMTs. They compiled empirical examples and cases of ABMT
222 implementation that have contributed towards (or hindered) the achievement of the targeted SDG. Finally,
223 the sub-teams assessed the level of evidence of implemented cases, and related enabling or constraining
224 factors, in order to identify potential knowledge gaps in our assessment.

225 When preliminary versions of the assessment for all ABMTs were finalized, they were circulated among the
226 entire group of authors with two goals: i) provide elements of agreement or disagreement with the initial
227 assessment; ii) comment and add potentially relevant knowledge and cases on the implementation of

228 ABMTs. The sub-teams were then asked to collect feedback and to elaborate on potential points of
229 disagreement in the assessments.

230 Finally, revised versions of the assessment were circulated among the entire expert group again, and further
231 discussed in a second expert workshop (Potsdam, 10-11 December 2019). Here, there was a special focus on
232 points of disagreement regarding the scoring through verbal discussions in parallel and plenary sessions. The
233 final version of the assessment was jointly consolidated into 20 SDG-ABMT tables (see Tables B.1-20).

234


235 **3. Results**

236 **3.1. ABMTs contributions to ocean sustainability goals**

237 ABMTs have the potential to generate multiple benefits necessary for achieving SDG 14 and other ocean-
238 related SDGs (Figs. 2 and 3; for a detailed description see Tables B.1-20). For SDG 14, Figure 2 indicates
239 that fisheries- and conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP have the greatest potential contributions overall.
240 Also, looking at the columns, there is high complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most
241 targets, with the exception of SDG 14.6 *Prohibit fisheries subsidies*. These patterns are also evident in Figure
242 3 for the other SDGs, for which fishery- and conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP have the greatest
243 potential contributions overall, with high complementarity for most goals, and the lowest in SDG 7
244 *Affordable and clean energy*.

245 While some of these contributions are straightforward, others are nuanced or unexpected. Indeed, some
246 ABMTs are inextricably linked to the achievement of specific SDG 14 targets, being “indivisible” from them
247 (Fig. 2 and 3). For instance, SDG target 14.5 relates to the conservation of at least 10% of coastal and marine
248 areas and is thus inextricably linked to the current global coverage of MPAs (United Nations, 2015).
249 Similarly, fishery-related ABMTs aim to regulate harvesting to avoid overfishing, eliminate illegal
250 unregulated and unreported fishing, and conserve living marine resources (Haas et al., 2021), thus
251 contributing substantially to the achievement of SDG target 14.4 (Fig. 2).

252



253

254 **Figure 2: Potential contribution of existing Area Based Management Tools (ABMTs) stipulated in**
 255 **international and regional agreements towards the achievement of the seven SDG 14 targets. UCNH =**
 256 **Underwater Cultural and Natural Heritage. For details see Tables B.1-20.**



Legend

- +3 Indivisible - Inextricably linked to the achievement of the goal
- +2 Reinforcing - Aid the achievement of the goal
- +1 Enabling - Create conditions that further the goal
- 0 Neutral - The contribution to the goal is unknown / There is no apparent contribution

257

258 **Figure 3: Potential contribution of existing Area Based Management Tools (ABMTs) stipulated in**
 259 **international and regional agreements towards the achievement of selected ocean-related SDGs at goal**
 260 **level.** UCNH = Underwater Natural and Cultural Heritage. For details see Tables B.1-20.

261

262 At the same time, there are cases where ABMTs can still create the conditions to further such goals, i.e.
 263 “enabling” or even aiding (“reinforcing”) in their achievement, although they are not inextricably linked to
 264 the respective SDGs (Figs. 2 and 3). For example, integrating women’s needs and actions in the
 265 establishment of fishery-related ABMTs can increase women empowerment and provide social and
 266 economic benefits to their families and the broader community (Di Ciommo and Schiavetti, 2012; Rohe et
 267 al., 2018), simultaneously supporting SDG 14.4 *Regulating harvesting*, SDG 5 *Gender equality* and SDG 1
 268 *Reduce poverty*. Another example can be found with respect to SDG 9 *Build resilient infrastructure, promote*
 269 *inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation*, where the adoption of MARPOL Special
 270 Areas (Annexes I, II, IV, V) in the Baltic Sea has led to the creation of reception facilities in Baltic ports
 271 (Klopott, 2018), followed by other EU ports in a Special Area. To meet the new environmental regulations

272 targets, shipping industry and port facilities responded through fleet renewals and retrofitting (Klopott,
273 2018). Also, the designation of shipping- related ABMTs (e.g., Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas - PSSAs,
274 special areas, or routing measures) contributes to sustainable tourism (SDG 8 *Decent work and economic*
275 *growth*) by reducing safety risks and significant negative impacts of shipping, as in the Malaysia PSSA case
276 (Marine Environment Protection Committee, 2017). Finally, transboundary protected areas, some
277 particularly connotated peace parks, have been designated to simultaneously protect and maintain biological
278 diversity and natural and cultural resources, and to promote peace and cooperation between countries, as in
279 the case of the Red Sea Marine Peace Park (Portman and Teff-Seker, 2016); these clearly contribute to SDG
280 14 and SDG 16 *Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development*.

281 In general, ABMTs have the overarching potential to contribute to SDG 17 *Strengthen the means of*
282 *implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development*, as their designation and
283 implementation is usually the outcome of negotiations and coordination between multiple stakeholders
284 including private actors, non-governmental organizations and States.

285 Importantly, several ABMTs can significantly contribute towards SDG 13 *Taking urgent action to combat*
286 *climate change and its impacts*, and to minimize and address the impacts of ocean acidification (SDG target
287 14.3). For instance, the adaptive management of fishery closures and spatially-based rights towards climate-
288 induced shifts of fish stocks can promote long-term resource stewardship (Ojea et al., 2017; Pinsky and
289 Byler, 2015). Targeting climate refugia to identify new MPAs is also a promising action to improve
290 ecosystem resilience and to adapt to the effects of climate change (Rilov et al., 2020b). Another example is
291 the proposed 10% speed reduction across the global shipping fleet to be implemented throughout shipping-
292 related ABMTs by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), which is estimated to reduce overall
293 greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) by around 13% (Faber et al., 2017; Psaraftis, 2019), and therefore
294 improves the probability of meeting GHG reduction targets by 23% (Comer et al., 2018). The OSPAR
295 Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic Ocean and the
296 Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) emphasize the
297 importance of marine research on ocean acidification to ensure effective management of their MPA networks

298 (Johnson et al., 2018), in line with the indications of SDG target 14.3 on minimizing and address the impacts
299 of ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels.

300 For several SDGs, limited evidence was found on the potential contributions of ABMTs towards their
301 achievement. This is the case, for example, of SDG 14.6 *Prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which*
302 *contribute to overcapacity and overfishing*, where no clear contribution was detected for any ABMTs, except
303 for fishery-related ones. This is most likely due to the limited spatial nature of the target for which the other
304 ABMTs are not suitable instruments. Negative influences of ABMTs on SDG 14 targets and other goals
305 were not identified.

306

307 **3.2 Enabling factors and impediments to progress towards SDGs**

308 Although it is clear that ABMTs have the potential to contribute substantially to the achievement of SDGs,
309 there are important factors that could reduce or potentially even hinder the realization of such contributions.
310 To unlock the full potential of ABMTs for SDG achievement, it is therefore crucial to consider a range of
311 context-specific, positive and negative factors (see examples in Table 3, and full description in Tables B.1-
312 20). Though the evidence is still limited for several ABMTs (Figs. 4 and 5), overall enabling factors and
313 impediments were found to be largely related to questions of governance (e.g., in conservation-oriented
314 ABMTs (Ban et al., 2017; Sciberras et al., 2015)), institutional capacity in ABMTs enforcement (e.g., in
315 fishery-related ABMTs in ABNJ (Haas et al., 2020)), societal challenges (e.g. raising awareness amongst
316 multiple actor groups, such as on cultural and natural heritage along with UCNH sites implementation
317 (Calado et al., 2019)), or environmental factors (e.g. with regard to the effectiveness of fishery closures both
318 in areas under national jurisdiction (Beare et al., 2013) and ABNJ (Davies et al., 2017)).

319 For instance, a complex picture emerged on whether or not MPA designation and implementation increases
320 people's overall food security (SDG 2), as the enabling factors for implementing MPAs towards food
321 security are unclear (Charles et al., 2016; Kumar, 2014). Moreover, the impact of MPAs on food security and
322 health of local populations is complicated by a range of mediating, historical, political, socioeconomic,
323 ecological, seasonal, cultural, and contextual factors (Kamat and Woo Kinshella, 2018). Similarly, the

324 likelihood of reducing impacts from deep sea trawling on seabed habitats and biota by fisheries spatial
 325 measures is influenced by several factors. These range from legal barriers, to the characteristics of the fishery
 326 and the ecosystem, to local, regional or national priorities and resources (McConnaughey et al., 2019), thus
 327 affecting the contribution of fishery-related ABMTs towards SDG targets 14.2, 14.4, and 14.5. Enforcement
 328 capacity of ABMTs also determines the contribution towards SDGs. Adequate human and financial
 329 resources to implement ABMTs have proven critical for MPAs within national jurisdiction and in ABNJ
 330 (Gill et al., 2017), as well as for fishery closures (Haas et al., 2020) and UCNH zones (Calado et al., 2019).
 331 For example, mobilizing private investments by setting up innovative financing mechanisms is critical in
 332 supporting enforcement capacity (Thiele and Gerber, 2017).

333

334 **Table 3:** Examples of enabling and constraining factors of the contribution of ABMTs to attaining SDGs.

335 For details see Tables B.1-20.

Categories of enabling and constraining factors	Examples
Political factors/political will	<u>Fishery-related ABMTs and SDG 2:</u> Suarez de Vivero et al. (Suárez-de Vivero et al., 2019) found that, with the exception of the African Union and its 2050 Africa's Integrated Maritime Strategy, the notion of food security can be said to lack relevance and visibility in newest visions of marine strategy. This will influence the way the concept is formally reflected in technical and political documents (Suárez-de Vivero et al., 2019) and related ABMTs.
Legal factors	<u>MSP and SDG 7:</u> By supporting the allocation of space to renewable energy developments, MSP can substantially increase the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix by 2030 (European Commission, 2019). The overall legal framework for wind energy projects in ABNJ can however pose challenges. Flag states will play a central regulatory role for high seas wind energy developments. However, there is the risk that flags of convenience might unduly undercut environmental and safety standards (in place for projects at territorial sea and EEZs). Such abuse of high seas freedom could compromise the UNCLOS principle of 'due regard'. MSP approaches and the establishment of cooperative mechanisms, led by the IMO, could safeguard against such potential misappropriation (Elsner and Suarez, 2019).
Enforceability	<u>UCNH ABMTs and SDG 9:</u> The 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage is slowly but peremptorily becoming a standard reference tool for underwater archaeology and underwater cultural heritage management. The many provisions included within the Convention touch on many aspects that are key to an effective protection and promotion of the underwater cultural heritage. Within the web of these provisions many aspects are gaining consideration and driving research in underwater archaeology worldwide. These provisions, when seen within a wider frame of social, economic and technological dynamics, pinpoint many aspects requiring further scrutiny from the disciplinary circle (Secci, 2017). <u>Shipping-related ABMTs and SDG 11:</u> The designation of PSSA and the adoption of routing measures (ATBA and TSS) in relevant areas for cultural and natural heritage contribute to their safeguard (Target 11.4) by reducing significant negative impacts of shipping. However, TSS speed reduction is not mandatory (Faber et al., 2017), hampering the contribution of PSSA towards safeguarding UCNH. <u>Fishery-related ABMTs and SDG 12:</u> With respect to sustainable consumption, already in 2007, Jacquet and Pauly (2007) documented several limitations in the relationships between seafood awareness campaigns and sustainable consumption, due, for instance, to the lack of traceability of the products, and, consequently, the capacity to relate to fishery-related ABMT. Still, the proliferation of eco-labelling

practices makes the assessment and evaluation of their effectiveness complex (Alfnes et al., 2018).


Transparency Conservation-related ABMTs and SDG 2: In five MPAs of South Africa, the loss of tenure rights and access to resources amongst already marginalized communities contributed to food insecurity, less exchange of food and less household income (Sowman and Sunde, 2018). Nevertheless, MPAs may represent a viable strategy for enhancing food security, but current MPA practices in many places can negatively affect some fishers (Mascia et al., 2010). If food security of local communities is envisaged as one of the objectives to design an MPA, this has to be clearly addressed in the MPA management and governance (Kamat and Woo Kinshella, 2018).

Governance structure Conservation-related ABMTs and SDG 10: When setting a MPA, the conservation targets, the established objectives, and the type of governance structures in place will partly determine the benefits for coastal communities and their equal distribution across social groups, actors, and communities (Bennett et al., 2020).

Inclusivity MSP and SDG 2: In Canada, MSP supports priority use of marine resources for First Nations traditional use (subject to conservation needs), including food, social and ceremonial requirements. It also supports maintenance of natural resource systems that deliver marine goods and services at multiple scales (Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) Initiative, 2017)


Fishery-related ABMTs and SDG 8: Fishery-related ABMTs such as fishery closures have the capacity to provide both economic benefits (e.g., revenues, incomes) and conservation benefits. These benefits, however, depend on several factors (Goetze et al., 2018) such as the duration of the closing period; the extension of the closing area (the larger the better), compliance to the closure, which should be encouraged via community engagement and enforcement; and strict deadlines/goals for harvesting to prevent overfishing.

336



337

338 **Figure 4: Evidence from experts' knowledge, scientific and grey literature on enabling factors and**
 339 **barriers for ABMTs to contribute to the seven SDG 14 targets.** Evidence is leveraged from ABMTs cases
 340 implemented in areas under national jurisdiction and in ABNJ; boxes provide a summary estimate of
 341 evidence for both enabling factors and barriers. UCNH = Underwater Cultural and Natural Heritage. For
 342 details see Tables B.1-20.



343

344 **Figure 5: Evidence from experts' knowledge, scientific and grey literature on enabling factors and**
 345 **barriers for ABMTs to contribute to the selected ocean-related SDGs at goal level.** Evidence is
 346 leveraged from ABMTs cases implemented in areas under national jurisdiction and in ABNJ; boxes provide
 347 a summary estimate of evidence for both enabling factors and barriers. UCNH = Underwater Cultural and
 348 Natural Heritage. For details see Tables B.1-20.

349

350 A general hindering factor pertains to power relationships and equity in ABMTs designation and
 351 implementation, both within and between countries, with respect to the use of marine resources (SDG targets
 352 14.2, 14.5, and 14.7). This is of special concern to Small Island Developing States and Least Developed
 353 Countries, many of which can be affected by activities occurring beyond their national boundaries (Popova

354 et al., 2019). Concerns for equity in designating ABMTs are particularly relevant in marine areas under
355 national jurisdiction, for instance with respect to equal access to natural resources for multiple economic
356 actors and local communities (Stead, 2018). Concerns on equity and power relationships have also been
357 raised on ABNJ for deep seabed mining, e.g., with regard to Areas of Particular Environmental Interest
358 (APEIs), and on fishery closures. For these areas, transparency and inclusiveness are at stake for decision-
359 making mechanisms of the International Seabed Authority (Ardron et al., 2018) and some of the Regional
360 Fishery Management Organizations (RFMOs) (Haas et al., 2020).

361

362 **4. Discussion**

363 This study showed that ABMTs can significantly contribute to SDGs attainment, with fisheries- and
364 conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP having the greatest potential contributions overall. We also depicted
365 various ways in which ABMTs can complement the attainment of various SDGs in parallel, showing high
366 complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most SDGs.

367 Importantly, we did not find trade-offs between ABMTs and SDGs. This might be partially attributed to the
368 methodological approach taken in this research, which focused on potential contributions of ABMTs for
369 achieving SDGs under ideal circumstances. Further in-depth analysis of existing cases that accounts for
370 different context-related factors would be valuable to show how the contribution of ABMTs to achieving
371 SDGs is dependent on case-based implementation. This is also valid for the ABMTs for which we did not
372 find any apparent contribution towards some SDGs, such as for shipping-related ABMTs towards SDG 5 on
373 *Gender equity*. In these cases, the authors were not aware of any case of ABMT implemented for the purpose
374 of achieving other SDGs in addition to their primary purpose. This consideration opens for a vast field of
375 investigation. For instance, intersectional research could provide valuable insights on the contributions of
376 ABMTs towards the achievement of SDGs 3 *Good health and well-being*, 5 *Gender equity*, 10 *Reduce*
377 *inequalities*, and on the role of multiple interacting factors shaping marine and coastal social-ecological
378 systems, such as socio-economics, gendered division of labour, ethnicity, education level. This would help to
379 unveil the potential contribution of ABMTs to the achievement of all the SDGs, including for those that
380 appear not strictly related to ABMTs designation and implementation.

381 Another point to be raised pertains to the questions how the contributions of ABMTs towards the SDGs
382 could be determined and monitored for best possible outcomes. The current SDG framework addresses
383 ABMTs and their potential to achieve the SDGs in a generic way, with only two targets directly referencing
384 ABMTs: SDG targets 14.2 and 14.5 refer respectively to “sustainably manage[ing] and protect[ing] marine
385 and coastal ecosystems (...)”, and “conserve[ing] at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas (...)”
386 (United Nations, 2015); the latter target will likely be overpassed by the CBD’s new post-2020 global
387 biodiversity target which is set at the 30% (UNEP, 2020). The indicators defined by the Inter-agency and
388 Expert Group of the UN Statistical Commission to monitor these SDG 14 targets only count for the area
389 coverage of ABMTs, with indicator 14.2.1 referring to the “Proportion of national exclusive economic zones
390 managed using ecosystem-based approaches”, and indicator 14.5.1 to the “Coverage of protected areas in
391 relation to marine areas”. However, counting the area managed with ABMTs does not allow for a sound
392 reporting about the actual effectiveness of implementing ABMTs towards any SDG attainment.

393 Thus, a next step should be to define quantitative and qualitative indicators to monitor the contribution of
394 ABMT implementation to achieving the SDGs. These indicators need to be relevant and straightforward (Cai
395 et al., 2021; Hák et al., 2016) in reflecting on the management quality towards SDG attainment, and go
396 beyond monitoring managed areas by quantity or area coverage (De Santo, 2013; Grorud-Colvert et al.,
397 2021). The vast experience and knowledge on assessing MPA effectiveness towards environmental, social,
398 and economic outcomes (e.g., Grorud-Colvert et al., 2021; Meehan et al., 2020; Picone et al., 2020) could be
399 utilized to develop such indicators for assessing the contribution and effectiveness of ABMTs towards SDG
400 achievements. A meaningful assessment framework that brings together these indicators could help to align
401 policies and ABMT initiatives, monitor goal attainment and identify gaps, and so help making progress
402 towards the 2030 Agenda while ensuring durable and equitable outcomes from ABMT implementation.

403 To make progress towards multiple SDGs at once, it is crucial to ensure coordination between initiatives
404 established by different organisations and responsible authorities. At present, different ABMT initiatives can
405 potentially be developed in parallel and independently from one another in the same geographical area by the
406 respective responsible authorities, and without any coordination between the competent management bodies.
407 The lack of coordination between ABMTs can potentially undermine the achievement of their objectives,

408 because of potentially conflicting visions and agendas between institutions (Singh et al., 2018). Without
409 coordination, the co-occurrence of multiple interests and responsible authorities over the same areas can
410 significantly hinder a holistic approach to ecosystem-based decision-making and transformation towards
411 sustainability (Gjerde and Wright, 2019; Saunders et al., 2019; Vince and Day, 2020) – and hence, towards
412 SDGs achievement. Eventually, the implementation of ABMTs can provide nuanced contributions to SDGs
413 while responding directly to the specifics of problems they were set up to address, e.g., related to a single
414 sector, a single area, or a single management problem.

415 Whereas sectoral ABMTs have the potential to directly support the implementation of specific SDG 14
416 targets, the analysis has shown that ABMTs taking a cross- or multi-sectoral approach tend to simultaneously
417 enable a broader range of benefits for different SDG 14 targets, as well as for other SDGs (Fig. 1, 2). Cross-
418 sectoral ABMTs, such as MSP, are those managed to coordinate multiple uses at sea towards the common
419 overarching objective of sustainable development (Ehler and Douvère, 2009; IOC-UNESCO and DG
420 MARE, 2017). They usually work by harmonizing sectoral management and related ABMTs through the
421 cooperation of respective responsible authorities (e.g., fisheries agencies and conservation agencies).
422 Especially in Africa, initiatives to foster a blue economy are seen as a way to alleviate poverty (SDG 1) and
423 to support sustainable economic development (SDG 8, e.g., World Bank and UNDESA, 2017). In addition to
424 MSP, other ABMTs can adopt cross-sectoral management approaches, as it is the case of MPAs (Muraki
425 Gottlieb et al., 2018). However, MSP can provide several benefits for both conservation and the sustainable
426 use of marine resources (Agardy et al., 2011; Frascchetti et al., 2018; Rilov et al., 2020b). MSP is usually
427 applied to large areas under the responsibility of coastal States, i.e. territorial seas and EEZs, and so MSP can
428 support the achievement of multiple SDGs on large areas. In some cases, national MSP initiatives fully or
429 partially coincide with the management of large MPAs, such as in Palau with the Palau National Marine
430 Sanctuary (PICRC and COS, 2019), and in the 30 year-long MSP process of managing the long-term
431 protection and ecologically sustainable use of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (Day et al., 2019).

432 The need for coordination of multiple ABMT initiatives for the purpose of achieving multiple SDGs is
433 especially urgent in ABNJ, where ABMTs are generally far less developed compared to those in national
434 waters that are subject to the rights and obligations of single coastal States, and where the coexistence of

435 many different sectorial organizations can undermine each other. The need for MSP in international waters
436 has long been advocated (Ardron et al., 2008; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the
437 Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel and —GEF, 2012; The Aspen Institute, 2011), and is increasingly
438 argued for as part of a more comprehensive approach to ocean sustainability (Ehler, 2020; Wright et al.,
439 2019). However, there are no formal MSP initiatives in ABNJ, nor is there a specific policy context for it.
440 The ongoing negotiation of a legally-binding instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of marine
441 biological diversity beyond national jurisdiction provides the opportunity to address the shortcomings of
442 predominantly sectoral approaches for ABMT in ABNJ and facilitate the development of cross-sectoral
443 approaches with a greater potential to deliver the overall 2030 Agenda. As UN Resolution 69/292 (UN,
444 2015) on the development of such a new legal instrument included a provision that it should “not undermine”
445 relevant existing legal instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional, and sectoral bodies in
446 ABNJ, it will be important that a “narrow” interpretation of this provision will be avoided in the negotiation
447 process (Clark, 2020; Scanlon, 2018). Instead, sectoral organisations with mandates in ABNJ, such as the
448 ISA or RFMOs, need to adopt coordinated and collaborative approaches that contribute towards the overall
449 objective of the new legal instrument. In ABNJ, there are pioneering cases of ABMT applications that have
450 successfully provided multiple benefits towards the achievement of SDGs. An example of cross-sectoral
451 cooperation is the development of a regional network of MPAs in ABNJ in the North-East Atlantic. This
452 world’s first MPA network in ABNJ was established by the OSPAR Commission and largely corresponds to
453 fisheries closure in the same area established by the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (Smith and
454 Jabour, 2018). A collective arrangement between both organisation helps further cooperation across
455 institutional and sectoral barriers and addresses some of the weaknesses of the fragmented governance
456 approach (Kvalvik, 2012; NEAFC and OSPAR, 2015).

457

458 **4. Conclusions**

459 This study demonstrates the benefits of ABMTs for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and achieving
460 SDG 14 and other related SDGs. However, without much needed transformations in the governance of
461 ABMTs, the largely fragmented governance of ABMTs might hamper the implementation of the holistic

462 2030 Agenda with its indivisible set of SDGs. Here, the 2030 Agenda might not only serve as goal-based
463 governance framework within which ABMTs are implemented, it could also drive change that serves the
464 development of novel holistic ocean governance approaches needed, e.g., in the context of the proposed post-
465 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework putting forward new global targets to ensure all sea areas are under
466 integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and at least 30 per cent globally of all sea areas are
467 conserved through protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (CBD, 2021).

468 To increase the opportunities to achieve the 2030 Agenda and associated SDGs, coastal states should address
469 relevant contextual factors and strengthen the coordinated, equitable and inclusive applications of ABMTs.
470 There is an urgent need to move beyond the current sectoral approach in ABMTs, and to advance strategies
471 and governance arrangements for coordinated actions between multiple types of ABMTs. In contrast to a
472 sectoral ABMT approach, the adoption of a holistic perspective that promotes the coordinated and coherent
473 implementation of ABMTs will amplify associated co-benefits for multiple SDGs, both within and beyond
474 national jurisdiction.

475 Overcoming potential conflicts and competing interests that hinder the achievement of the SDGs requires not
476 only consistent coordination and cooperation between ABMT initiatives, but also the identification of
477 overarching goals to be achieved and towards which the different ABMT initiatives can converge through
478 multilevel governance agreements over multi-administrative boundaries and responsibilities. SDGs in itself
479 are an attempt to provide such overarching goals to reduce potential conflicts between multiple policy
480 objectives. Integrated ABMTs can become a key tool to operationalize and implement SDGs in the ocean.
481 Future research needs to establish an indicator framework for assessing and monitoring implementation and
482 effectiveness of ABMTs and their support of SDG attainment.

483

484 **Acknowledgments**

485 This research was conducted in the framework of COST action on “Ocean Governance for Sustainability -
486 challenges, options and the role of science”, CA15217, within the Working Group 2 “Area Based
487 Management” activities. We would like to thank COST for the funding that made the cooperation amongst
488 the authors, and thus this article, possible. EG partially acknowledges also funding from PORTODIMARE

489 “geoPORTal of TOols & Data for sustaInable Management of coAstal and maRine Environment” (2018-
490 2020), Adriatic-Ionian Programme INTERREG V-B Transnational 2014-2020, grant no. 205, and from the
491 European Commission, MSCA MEDIX (grant no. 893614-4); AQ partially acknowledges the Project
492 SIMAtlantic (grant no. EASME/EMFF/2018/1.2.1.5); MLF partially acknowledges the Portuguese
493 Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT), with a Do*Mar programme PhD grant
494 (PD/BD/113485/2015); MM partially acknowledges FCT, with a PhD grant (SFRH/BD/138422/2018). AQ,
495 FA, MLF, LS, MM, CP partially acknowledge the financial support to FCT/MCTES for the financial support
496 to CESAM (UIDP/50017/2020+UIDB/50017/2020), through national funds. CFS partially acknowledges
497 funding from FCT research contract 2020.03704.CEECIND, research grant PTDC/CTA-AMB/30226/2017,
498 and MARE strategic project UID/MAR/04292/2019. NV partially acknowledges also funding from the
499 Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, grants no. CNCS-UEFISCDI PN-III-
500 P1-1.1-TE-2016-2491, PN-III-P1-1.1-TE-2019-1444, and the project T4BS (grant no.
501 EASME/EMFF/2019/863621). The work of CP was supported by FCT research contract
502 2020.02510.CEECIND. The work of BN and SU was supported by the German Federal Ministry of
503 Education and Research (BMBF) through its Research for Sustainable Development program (FONA), and
504 the Federal State of Brandenburg.

505

506 **References**

- 507 Agardy, T., di Sciara, G.N., Christie, P., 2011. Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine
508 protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning. *Mar. Policy* 35, 226–232.
509 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.10.006>
- 510 Alfnes, F., Chen, X., Rickertsen, K., 2018. Labeling farmed seafood: A review. *Aquac. Econ. Manag.*
511 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13657305.2017.1356398>
- 512 Ardron, J., Gjerde, K., Pullen, S., Tilot, V., 2008. Marine spatial planning in the high seas. *Mar. Policy* 32,
513 832–839. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2008.03.018>
- 514 Ardron, J.A., Ruhl, H.A., Jones, D.O.B., 2018. Incorporating transparency into the governance of deep-
515 seabed mining in the Area beyond national jurisdiction. *Mar. Policy*.
516 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.11.021>
- 517 Ban, N.C., Davies, T.E., Aguilera, S.E., Brooks, C., Cox, M., Epstein, G., Evans, L.S., Maxwell, S.M.,
518 Nenadovic, M., 2017. Social and ecological effectiveness of large marine protected areas. *Glob.*
519 *Environ. Chang.* 43, 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.01.003>
- 520 Bartram, J., Brocklehurst, C., Bradley, D., Muller, M., Evans, B., 2018. Policy review of the means of
521 implementation targets and indicators for the sustainable development goal for water and sanitation. *npj*
522 *Clean Water* 1, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41545-018-0003-0>
- 523 Beare, D., Rijnsdorp, A.D., Blaesberg, M., Damm, U., Egekvist, J., Fock, H., Kloppmann, M., Röckmann,
524 C., Schroeder, A., Schulze, T., Tulp, I., Ulrich, C., Van Hal, R., Van Kooten, T., Verweij, M., 2013.
525 Evaluating the effect of fishery closures: Lessons learnt from the Plaice Box. *J. Sea Res.*
526 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2013.04.002>
- 527 Bennett, N.J., Calò, A., Di Franco, A., Niccolini, F., Marzo, D., Domina, I., Dimitriadis, C., Sobrado, F.,
528 Santoni, M.C., Charbonnel, E., Trujillo, M., Garcia-Charton, J., Seddiki, L., Cappanera, V., Grbin, J.,
529 Kastelic, L., Milazzo, M., Guidetti, P., 2020. Social equity and marine protected areas: Perceptions of
530 small-scale fishermen in the Mediterranean Sea. *Biol. Conserv.* 244, 108531.

531 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2020.108531>

532 Cai, J., Zhao, D., Varis, O., 2021. Match words with deeds: Curbing water risk with the Sustainable
533 Development Goal 6 index. *J. Clean. Prod.* 318, 128509.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2021.128509>

535 Calado, H., Papaioannou, E.A., Caña-Varona, M., Onyango, V., Zaucha, J., Przedzimirska, J., Roberts, T.,
536 Sangiuliano, S.J., Vergilio, M., 2019. Multi-uses in the Eastern Atlantic: Building bridges in maritime
537 space. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.03.004>

538 CBD, 2021. First draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Convention on Biological
539 Diversity, UN Environment Programme. New York.

540 Charles, A., Westlund, L., Bartley, D.M., Fletcher, W.J., Garcia, S., Govan, H., Sanders, J., 2016. Fishing
541 livelihoods as key to marine protected areas: insights from the World Parks Congress. *Aquat. Conserv.*
542 *Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 26, 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2648>

543 Clark, N.A., 2020. Institutional arrangements for the new BBNJ agreement: Moving beyond global, regional,
544 and hybrid. *Mar. Policy.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104143>

545 Comer, A.B., Ph, D., Chen, C., Rutherford, D., Ph, D., 2018. Relating short-term measures to IMO 's
546 minimum 2050 emissions reduction target. International Council on Clean Transportation. Working
547 paper 2018-13 (No. 13).

548 Convention on Biological Diversity, 2010. Conference of the Parties Decision X/2: Strategic plan for
549 biodiversity 2011–2020, Document UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/X/2. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12383>

550 Davies, T.K., Mees, C.C., Milner-Gulland, E.J., 2017. Use of a counterfactual approach to evaluate the effect
551 of area closures on fishing location in a tropical tuna fishery. *PLoS One.*
552 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174758>

553 Day, J.C., Kenchington, R.A., Tanzer, J.M., Cameron, D.S., 2019. Marine zoning revisited: How decades of
554 zoning the Great Barrier Reef has evolved as an effective spatial planning approach for marine
555 ecosystem- based management. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 29, 9–32.

556 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3115>

557 De Santo, E.M., 2013. Missing marine protected area (MPA) targets: How the push for quantity over quality
558 undermines sustainability and social justice. *J. Environ. Manage.*
559 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.01.033>

560 Di Ciommo, R.C., Schiavetti, A., 2012. Women participation in the management of a Marine Protected Area
561 in Brazil. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 62, 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2012.02.010>

562 Ehler, C.N., 2020. Two decades of progress in Marine Spatial Planning. *Mar. Policy* 104134.
563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104134>

564 Ehler, C.N., Douvère, F., 2009. Marine Spatial Planning: A Step-by-step Approach toward Ecosystem-based
565 Management, IOC Manuals and Guides. <https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2010.100>

566 Elsner, P., Suarez, S., 2019. Renewable energy from the high seas: Geo-spatial modelling of resource
567 potential and legal implications for developing offshore wind projects beyond the national jurisdiction
568 of coastal States. *Energy Policy* 128, 919–929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.01.064>

569 European Commission, 2019. EU policies and actions related to Sustainable Development Goals and targets,
570 Goal 7 Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all [WWW Document].
571 URL https://ec.europa.eu/sustainable-development/goal7_en#target-7-a (accessed 4.7.20).

572 Faber, J., Huigen, T., Dagmar, N., 2017. Regulating speed: a short-term measure to reduce maritime GHG
573 emissions. Delft, NL.

574 Frascchetti, S., Pipitone, C., Mazaris, A.D., Rilov, G., Badalamenti, F., Bevilacqua, S., Claudet, J., Caric, H.,
575 Dahl, K., D’Anna, G., Daunys, D., Frost, M., Gissi, E., Göke, C., Goriup, P., Guarnieri, G., Holcer, D.,
576 Lazar, B., Mackelworth, P., Manzo, S., Martin, G., Palialexis, A., Panayotova, M., Petza, D., Rumes,
577 B., Todorova, V., Katsanevakis, S., 2018. Light and shade in marine conservation across European and
578 contiguous seas. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 5, 420. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00420>

579 Gill, D.A., Mascia, M.B., Ahmadi, G.N., Glew, L., Lester, S.E., Barnes, M., Craigie, I., Darling, E.S., Free,
580 C.M., Geldmann, J., Holst, S., Jensen, O.P., White, A.T., Basurto, X., Coad, L., Gates, R.D., Guannel,

581 G., Mumby, P.J., Thomas, H., Whitmee, S., Woodley, S., Fox, H.E., 2017. Capacity shortfalls hinder
582 the performance of marine protected areas globally. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21708>

583 Gjerde, K., Wright, G., 2019. Towards Ecosystem-based Management of the Global Ocean: Strengthening
584 Regional Cooperation through a New Agreement for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine
585 Biodiversity in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction. STRONG High Seas Project. Institute for
586 Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS). <https://doi.org/10.2312/iass.2019.055>

587 Goetze, J.S., Claudet, J., Januchowski-Hartley, F., Langlois, T.J., Wilson, S.K., White, C., Weeks, R.,
588 Jupiter, S.D., 2018. Demonstrating multiple benefits from periodically harvested fisheries closures. *J.*
589 *Appl. Ecol.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13047>

590 Grorud-Colvert, K., Sullivan-Stack, J., Roberts, C., Constant, V., Costa, B.H. e, Pike, E.P., Kingston, N.,
591 Laffoley, D., Sala, E., Claudet, J., Friedlander, A.M., Gill, D.A., Lester, S.E., Day, J.C., Gonçalves,
592 E.J., Ahmadi, G.N., Rand, M., Villagomez, A., Ban, N.C., Gurney, G.G., Spalding, A.K., Bennett,
593 N.J., Briggs, J., Morgan, L.E., Moffitt, R., Deguignet, M., Pikitch, E.K., Darling, E.S., Jessen, S.,
594 Hameed, S.O., Carlo, G. Di, Guidetti, P., Harris, J.M., Torre, J., Kizilkaya, Z., Agardy, T., Cury, P.,
595 Shah, N.J., Sack, K., Cao, L., Fernandez, M., Lubchenco, J., 2021. The MPA Guide: A framework to
596 achieve global goals for the ocean. *Science* (80-.). 373. <https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ABF0861>

597 Haas, B., Haward, M., McGee, J., Fleming, A., 2021. Explicit targets and cooperation: regional fisheries
598 management organizations and the sustainable development goals. *Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law*
599 *Econ.* 21, 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-020-09491-7>

600 Haas, B., McGee, J., Fleming, A., Haward, M., 2020. Factors influencing the performance of regional
601 fisheries management organizations. *Mar. Policy* 103787.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103787>

603 Hák, T., Janoušková, S., Moldan, B., 2016. Sustainable Development Goals: A need for relevant indicators.
604 *Ecol. Indic.* 60, 565–573. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2015.08.003>

605 IOC-UNESCO, DG MARE, 2017. Joint roadmap to accelerate maritime/marine spatial planning processes
606 worldwide (MSP). In 2nd International Conference on Marine/Maritime Spatial Planning, Paris,

607 France. . Paris.

608 Jacquet, J., Pauly, D., 2007. Funding Priorities: Big Barriers to Small-Scale Fisheries.
609 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00978.x>

610 Johnson, D., Adelaide Ferreira, M., Kenchington, E., 2018. Climate change is likely to severely limit the
611 effectiveness of deep-sea ABMTs in the North Atlantic. *Mar. Policy* 87, 111–122.
612 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.09.034>

613 Jouffray, J.-B., Blasiak, R., Norström, A. V., Österblom, H., Nyström, M., 2020. The Blue Acceleration: The
614 Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean. *One Earth* 2, 43–54.
615 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2019.12.016>

616 Kamat, V.R., Woo Kinshella, M.L., 2018. Food insecurity and coping strategies in a marine protected area in
617 southeastern Tanzania. *Ecol. Food Nutr.* 57, 187–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03670244.2018.1455672>

618 Klopott, M., 2018. The Baltic Sea as a model region for green ports and maritime transport. Tallin, EE.

619 Kumar, M.S., 2014. Sustainable Management of Fisheries and Aquaculture for Food Security and Nutrition:
620 Policies Requirements and Actions. *Agric. Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40003-014-0111-0>

621 Kvalvik, I., 2012. Managing institutional overlap in the protection of marine ecosystems on the high seas.
622 The case of the North East Atlantic. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*
623 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2011.09.009>

624 Laffoley, D., Baxter, J.M., Amon, D.J., Claudet, J., Hall-Spencer, J.M., Grorud-Colvert, K., Levin, L.A.,
625 Reid, P.C., Rogers, A.D., Taylor, M.L., Woodall, L.C., Andersen, N.F., 2020. Evolving the narrative
626 for protecting a rapidly changing ocean, post-COVID-19. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*
627 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3512>

628 Marine Environment Protection Committee, 2017. Identification and protection of special areas and
629 particularly sensitivity sea areas, Protection of Pulau Kukup (Kukup Island) and Tanjung Piai (Cape
630 Piai).

631 Mascia, M.B., Claus, C.A., Naidoo, R., 2010. Impacts of marine protected areas on fishing communities.

632 Conserv. Biol. 24, 1424–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01523.x>

633 Mastrandrea, M.D., Mach, K.J., Plattner, G.K., Edenhofer, O., Stocker, T.F., Field, C.B., Ebi, K.L.,
634 Matschoss, P.R., 2011. The IPCC AR5 guidance note on consistent treatment of uncertainties: A
635 common approach across the working groups. *Clim. Change*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0178-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0178-6)
636 6

637 McCollum, D.L., Echeverri, L.G., Busch, S., Pachauri, S., Parkinson, S., Rogelj, J., Krey, V., Minx, J.C.,
638 Nilsson, M., Stevance, A.S., Riahi, K., 2018. Connecting the sustainable development goals by their
639 energy inter-linkages. *Environ. Res. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaafe3>

640 McConnaughey, R.A., Hiddink, J.G., Jennings, S., Pitcher, C.R., Kaiser, M.J., Suuronen, P., Sciberras, M.,
641 Rijnsdorp, A.D., Collie, J.S., Mazon, T., Amoroso, R.O., Parma, A.M., Hilborn, R., 2019. Choosing
642 best practices for managing impacts of trawl fishing on seabed habitats and biota. *Fish Fish.*
643 <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12431>

644 Meehan, M.C., Ban, N.C., Devillers, R., Singh, G.G., Claudet, J., 2020. How far have we come? A review of
645 MPA network performance indicators in reaching qualitative elements of Aichi Target 11. *Conserv.*
646 *Lett.* 13, e12746. <https://doi.org/10.1111/CONL.12746>

647 Menegon, S., Depellegrin, D., Farella, G., Gissi, E., Ghezzi, M., Sarretta, A., Venier, C., Barbanti, A., 2018.
648 A modelling framework for MSP-oriented cumulative effects assessment. *Ecol. Indic.*
649 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.03.060>

650 Muraki Gottlieb, H., Laffoley, D., Gjerde, K., Spadone, A., 2018. Area Based Management Tools, Including
651 Marine Protected Areas in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction: A Report of the workshop on Area
652 Based Management Tools, including Marine Protected Areas in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction, 9
653 – 11 October 2018 at IU. Gland.

654 Nash, K.L., Blythe, Jessica L., Cvitanovic, C., Fulton, E.A., Halpern, B.S., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Addison,
655 P.F.E., Pecl, G.T., Watson, R.A., Blanchard, J.L., 2020. To Achieve a Sustainable Blue Future,
656 Progress Assessments Must Include Interdependencies between the Sustainable Development Goals.
657 *One Earth* 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.01.008>

658 NEAFC, OSPAR, 2015. The Process of Forming a Cooperative Mechanism Between NEAFC and OSPAR,
659 UNEP.

660 Nilsson, M., Griggs, D., Visbeck, M., 2016. Policy: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development
661 Goals. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/534320a>

662 Nilsson, M., McCollum, D., Echeverri, L.G., Riahi, K., Parkinson, S., International Council for Science
663 (ICSU), 2017. A Guide to SDG Interactions: from Science to Implementation, A Guide To SDG
664 Interactions : From Science To Implementation. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.24948/2017.01>

665 Obura, D.O., 2020. Getting to 2030 - Scaling effort to ambition through a narrative model of the SDGs. *Mar.*
666 *Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103973>

667 Ojea, E., Pearlman, I., Gaines, S.D., Lester, S.E., 2017. Fisheries regulatory regimes and resilience to climate
668 change. *Ambio*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0850-1>

669 Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) Initiative, 2017. Pacific North Coast Integrated
670 Management Area Plan: vii + 78 pp.

671 Picone, F., Buonocore, E., Claudet, J., Chemello, R., Russo, G.F., Franzese, P.P., 2020. Marine protected
672 areas overall success evaluation (MOSE): A novel integrated framework for assessing management
673 performance and social-ecological benefits of MPAs. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 198, 105370.
674 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2020.105370>

675 PICRC, COS, 2019. Palau's National Marine Sanctuary: Managing Ocean Change and Supporting Food
676 Security.

677 Pinsky, M.L., Byler, D., 2015. Fishing, fast growth and climate variability increase the risk of collapse. *Proc.*
678 *R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 282. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1053>

679 Popova, E., Vousden, D., Sauer, W.H.H., Mohammed, E.Y., Allain, V., Downey-Breedt, N., Fletcher, R.,
680 Gjerde, K.M., Halpin, P.N., Kelly, S., Obura, D., Pecl, G., Roberts, M., Raitos, D.E., Rogers, A.,
681 Samoilys, M., Sumaila, U.R., Tracey, S., Yool, A., 2019. Ecological connectivity between the areas
682 beyond national jurisdiction and coastal waters: Safeguarding interests of coastal communities in

683 developing countries. *Mar. Policy* 104, 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.02.050>

684 Portman, M., Teff-Seker, Y., 2016. Remembering the Red Sea Marine Peace Park, in: Mackelworth, P. (Ed.),
685 Marine Transboundary Conservation and Protected Areas. Routledge, London, pp. 89–110.
686 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315724270-14>

687 Psaraftis, H.N., 2019. Speed optimization vs speed reduction: The choice between speed limits and a Bunker
688 Levy. *Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082249>

689 Reimer, J.M., Devilliers, R., Claudet, J., 2021. Benefits and gaps in area-based management tools for the
690 ocean Sustainable Development Goal. *Nat. Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00659-2>

691 Reusch, T.B.H., Dierking, J., Andersson, H.C., Bonsdorff, E., Carstensen, J., Casini, M., Czajkowski, M.,
692 Hasler, B., Hinsby, K., Hyytiäinen, K., Johannesson, K., Jomaa, S., Jormalainen, V., Kuosa, H.,
693 Kurland, S., Laikre, L., MacKenzie, B.R., Margonski, P., Melzner, F., Oesterwind, D., Ojaveer, H.,
694 Refsgaard, J.C., Sandström, A., Schwarz, G., Tonderski, K., Winder, M., Zandersen, M., 2018. The
695 Baltic Sea as a time machine for the future coastal ocean. *Sci. Adv.*
696 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aar8195>

697 Rilov, G., Fraschetti, S., Gissi, E., Pipitone, C., Badalamenti, F., Tamburello, L., Menini, E., Goriup, P.,
698 Mazaris, A.D., Garrabou, J., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J.,
699 Katsanevakis, S., 2020a. A fast-moving target: achieving marine conservation goals under shifting
700 climate and policies. *Ecol. Appl.* 30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2009>

701 Rilov, G., Fraschetti, S., Gissi, E., Pipitone, C., Badalamenti, F., Tamburello, L., Menini, E., Goriup, P.,
702 Mazaris, A.D., Garrabou, J., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J.,
703 Katsanevakis, S., Benedetti- Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J., Katsanevakis, S.,
704 Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J., Katsanevakis, S., 2020b. A fast-moving
705 target: achieving marine conservation goals under shifting climate and policies. *Ecol. Appl.* 30, 1–14.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2009>

707 Roberts, J., Chircop, A., Prior, S., 2010. Area-based management on the high seas: Possible application of
708 the IMO’s particularly sensitive sea area concept. *Int. J. Mar. Coast. Law* 25, 483–522.

709 <https://doi.org/10.1163/157180810X525403>

710 Rohe, J., Schlüter, A., Ferse, S.C.A., 2018. A gender lens on women’s harvesting activities and interactions
711 with local marine governance in a South Pacific fishing community. *Marit. Stud.* 2018 172 17, 155–
712 162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40152-018-0106-8>

713 Saunders, F., Gilek, M., Day, J., Hassler, B., Mccann, J., Smythe, T., 2019. Examining the role of integration
714 in marine spatial planning: Towards an analytical framework to understand challenges in diverse
715 settings. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 169, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.11.011>

716 Scanlon, Z., 2018. The art of “not undermining”: Possibilities within existing architecture to improve
717 environmental protections in areas beyond national jurisdiction. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*
718 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsx209>

719 Schmidt, S., Neumann, B., Waweru, Y., Durussel, C., Unger, S., Visbeck, M., 2017. SDG 14 Conserve and
720 sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development, in: Nilsson, M.,
721 Griggs, D., Visbeck, M., Ringler, C., McCollum, D. (Eds.), *A Guide to SDG Interactions: From*
722 *Science to Implementation* . International Council for Science, Paris, pp. 174–214.

723 Schmidt, Stefanie, Neumann, B., Waweru, Y., Durussel, C., Unger, S., Visbeck, M., 2017. SDG14 Conserve
724 and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development, in: Griggs, D.J.,
725 Nilsson, M., Stevance, A.-S., McCollum, D. (Eds.), *A Guide to SDG Interactions: From Science to*
726 *Implementation*. International Council for Science, Paris, pp. 174–218.

727 Sciberras, M., Jenkins, S.R., Mant, R., Kaiser, M.J., Hawkins, S.J., Pullin, A.S., 2015. Evaluating the relative
728 conservation value of fully and partially protected marine areas. *Fish Fish.* 16, 58–77.
729 <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12044>

730 Secci, M., 2017. Survey and Recording Technologies in Italian Underwater Cultural Heritage: Research and
731 Public Access Within the Framework of the 2001 UNESCO Convention. *J. Marit. Archaeol.*
732 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11457-017-9174-y>

733 Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, —

734 GEF, 2012. Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study
735 carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29. Montreal.

736 Singh, G.G., Cisneros-Montemayor, A.M., Swartz, W., Cheung, W., Guy, J.A., Kenny, T.A., McOwen, C.J.,
737 Asch, R., Geffert, J.L., Wabnitz, C.C.C., Sumaila, R., Hanich, Q., Ota, Y., 2018. A rapid assessment of
738 co-benefits and trade-offs among Sustainable Development Goals. *Mar. Policy*.
739 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.030>

740 Smith, D., Jabour, J., 2018. MPAs in ABNJ: lessons from two high seas regimes. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 75, 417–
741 425. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsx189>

742 Sowman, M., Sunde, J., 2018. Social impacts of marine protected areas in South Africa on coastal fishing
743 communities. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 157, 168–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.02.013>

744 Stead, S.M., 2018. Rethinking marine resource governance for the United Nations Sustainable Development
745 Goals. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2018.12.001>

746 Suárez-de Vivero, J.L., Rodríguez Mateos, J.C., Florido del Corral, D., Barragán, M.J., Calado, H.,
747 Kjellevold, M., Miasik, E.J., 2019. Food security and maritime security: A new challenge for the
748 European Union’s ocean policy. *Mar. Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103640>

749 The Aspen Institute, 2011. *The Shared Future: a report of the Aspen Institute Commission on Arctic Climate
750 Change* . Washington, DC.

751 Thiele, T., Gerber, L.R., 2017. Innovative financing for the High Seas. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw.*
752 *Ecosyst.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2794>

753 UN, 2015. Development of an international legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on the conservation
754 and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. A/RES/69/292.
755 Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 19 June 2015.

756 UNEP, 2020. Zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, Convention of Biological Diversity,
757 CBD/WG2020/2/3. Kunming, China.

758 UNGA, 2007. Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations General Assembly on Oceans and the

759 Law of the Sea (10 September 2007), UN Doc. A/62/66/Add.2, paras. 122–161.

760 United Nations, 2020. Sustainable Development Goals [WWW Document]. Sustain. Dev. Goals Knowl.
761 Platf.

762 United Nations, 2018. International legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the
763 Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond
764 national jurisdiction, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 24 December 2017,
765 A/RES/72/249 [WWW Document]. URL <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/72/249> (accessed 12.10.20).

766 United Nations, 2015. A/RES/70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
767 Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Preamble. United Nations
768 Gen. Assem. Resolut.

769 Vince, J., Day, J.C., 2020. Effective integration and integrative capacity in marine spatial planning. *Marit.*
770 *Stud.* 19, 317–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40152-020-00167-1>

771 Winther, J.G., Dai, M., Rist, T., Hoel, A.H., Li, Y., Trice, A., Morrissey, K., Juinio-Meñez, M.A., Fernandes,
772 L., Unger, S., Scarano, F.R., Halpin, P., Whitehouse, S., 2020. Integrated ocean management for a
773 sustainable ocean economy. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1259-6>

774 World Bank, UNDESA, 2017. The Potential of the Blue Economy: Increasing Long-term Benefits of the
775 Sustainable Use of Marine Resources for Small Island Developing States and Coastal Least Developed
776 Countries, WorldBank.

777 Wright, G., Gjerde, K.M., Johnson, D.E., Finkelstein, A., Ferreira, M.A., Dunn, D.C., Chaves, M.R., Grehan,
778 A., 2019. Marine spatial planning in areas beyond national jurisdiction. *Mar. Policy.*
779 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.12.003>

780