

Ocean Accounts as Infrastructure for the BBNJ Clearing-House Mechanism

Summary

The 2023 Agreement on Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ) establishes a Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM) as its digital backbone for transparency, compliance, and benefit-sharing across all treaty functions.^[1] Yet the Agreement provides limited technical specifications for CHM implementation, creating risks of fragmented development and missed opportunities for systematic ocean governance.^[2] Ocean Accounts—a structured framework for integrating environmental, economic, and social ocean data aligned with international statistical standards—offers a proven architecture that can operationalize CHM requirements while enabling evidence-based decision-making for sustainable ocean development.^[3]

This research demonstrates that Ocean Accounts provides essential infrastructure for CHM success through five key synergies: standardized three-dimensional spatial architecture enabling consistent geographic reporting across water column and seabed distinctions;^[4] flow accounting systems tracking marine genetic resource utilization from extraction through commercialization with batch ID integration;^[5] baseline condition accounts supporting comprehensive environmental impact assessments including cumulative impacts and real-time monitoring;^[6] asset monitoring frameworks measuring conservation effectiveness through standardized indicators;^[7] and capacity-building pathways integrating traditional knowledge through FPIC protocols while ensuring equitable participation across all development contexts.^[8]

Implementation should proceed through phased development aligned with the April 2025 PrepCom meeting and UN Ocean Conference commitments, beginning with pilot Ocean Accounts modules integrated into CHM prototypes, followed by progressive expansion through regional cooperation models like the Pacific Community framework, and ultimately achieving a fully integrated system supporting adaptive management and transformative ocean governance.^[9] Critical success factors identified through 30+ country implementations include sustained political commitment, realistic technical capacity development balancing ambition with feasibility, and clear institutional arrangements that bridge traditional agency boundaries. Near-term actions must establish an Ocean Accounts-CHM Technical Working Group under the Preparatory Commission, develop data standards based on System of Environmental-Economic Accounting principles, and secure resources prioritizing Small Island Developing States and Least Developed Countries.^[10]

The integration of Ocean Accounts and CHM represents more than technical alignment—it establishes a foundation for transformative ocean governance that bridges the persistent divide between environmental protection and sustainable development through systematic, comparable, and actionable information. This convergence of methodological maturity with implementation urgency creates an unprecedented window for establishing integrated ocean information architecture that can transform how humanity governs two-thirds of the planet's surface.

1. The Data Challenge of BBNJ Implementation

The Agreement 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, adopted in June 2023, represents the most significant advance in ocean governance since UNCLOS itself.^[11] The BBNJ Agreement addresses governance gaps in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) through four interconnected pillars: marine genetic resources (MGRs) including benefit-sharing; area-based management tools (ABMTs) including marine protected areas; environmental impact assessments (EIAs); and capacity-building and technology transfer (CB&TT).^[12]

Central to implementing these pillars is the Clearing-House Mechanism, described as an "essential orchestration tool" that will serve as the treaty's digital backbone.^[13] Article 51 establishes the CHM as an open-access platform facilitating access to information across all treaty elements.^[14] Yet despite its centrality, the Agreement provides minimal technical specifications for CHM architecture, leaving critical design decisions to future Conference of Parties meetings.^[15]

This implementation gap poses significant risks. Without standardized data architecture, the CHM may evolve as a fragmented collection of databases rather than an integrated system. Different parties may develop incompatible reporting formats, undermining comparability. The absence of common standards could perpetuate existing asymmetries where technologically advanced states dominate ocean science while developing states lack capacity to participate meaningfully in governance processes.

The imperative for robust ocean information architecture has gained unprecedented global recognition. The 2025 UN Ocean Conference in Nice emphasized the critical need for "national ocean accounting and mapping of coastal and marine ecosystems" to inform policy decisions and sustainable ocean management. The Convention on Biological Diversity, through Decision 15/24, urges parties to strengthen efforts toward ocean accounting for decision-making support. This growing consensus reflects recognition that systematic data integration is essential for evidence-based ocean governance. The Global Ocean Accounts Partnership (GOAP), now supporting implementation in over 30 countries, demonstrates both the feasibility and necessity of this approach, providing technical guidance and capacity building across diverse development contexts.

Ocean Accounts offers a solution. Developed through the Global Ocean Accounts Partnership and aligned with the System of National Accounts (SNA) and System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA), Ocean Accounts provides a structured framework for compiling and integrating ocean data across environmental, economic, and social domains.^[16] Unlike ad-hoc data compilations, Ocean Accounts employs accounting principles ensuring completeness, consistency, and comparability while maintaining flexibility for national circumstances.^[17]

The framework's relevance to BBNJ implementation extends beyond technical compatibility. Ocean Accounts addresses the fundamental information requirements for sustainable ocean development: measuring economic output from ocean activities, assessing benefit distribution across communities, and tracking sustainability through changes in natural capital assets over time.^[18] These capabilities directly support CHM functions including MGR benefit-sharing calculations, EIA baseline establishment, and ABMT effectiveness monitoring.

This brief argues that Ocean Accounts provides essential infrastructure for CHM success, offering a proven architecture that can accelerate implementation while ensuring the integrated, transparent, and equitable ocean governance envisioned by the BBNJ Agreement. The following analysis examines CHM requirements, Ocean Accounts capabilities, and their synergistic potential, providing practical recommendations for integration that can transform how humanity governs two-thirds of the planet's surface.

2. The BBNJ Clearing-House Mechanism

2.1 Core CHM Functions

The BBNJ Agreement assigns the Clearing-House Mechanism comprehensive responsibilities spanning all four treaty pillars, establishing it as the central nervous system for treaty implementation. The following table consolidates CHM functional requirements across the BBNJ framework:

| BBNJ Pillar | CHM Function | Data Requirements | Timing/Frequency | Key Challenges |
|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Marine Genetic Resources (MGRs) | Pre-collection notification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives • Geographic coordinates • Target organisms • Sponsoring entities • Vessel/platform details | 6 months before collection | Verification of intent vs. actual collection |
| | Post-collection notification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples collected • Repository locations • Preliminary findings • Data availability | Within 1 year of collection | Tracking sample movements |
| | Utilization notification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial development • Patent applications • Product information • Benefit-sharing data | Upon commercialization | Linking to batch IDs across databases |
| | Batch ID generation | Standardized identifiers linking samples from collection through utilization | Automatic upon notification | Integration with patent/publication databases |
| Area-Based Management Tools (ABMTs) | Proposal repository | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific justification • Boundaries/coordinates • Conservation objectives • Traditional knowledge | Upon submission | Harmonizing diverse data formats |
| | Designation records | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COP decisions • Management measures • Stakeholder input | After COP meetings | Coordination with sectoral bodies |
| | Effectiveness monitoring | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological indicators • Compliance data • Adaptive management | Annual/periodic | Standardizing metrics across regions |
| Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) | Screening documentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity description • Initial assessment • Threshold analysis | Project initiation | Transparency vs. commercial sensitivity |
| | Full EIA reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline data • Impact analysis • Mitigation measures • Monitoring plans | Before activity approval | Quality assurance without verification capacity |
| | Monitoring data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual impacts • Compliance reports • Adaptive measures | Ongoing during activity | Real-time data integration |
| Capacity-Building & Technology Transfer (CB&TT) | Needs assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical gaps • Infrastructure requirements • Training priorities | Annual submission | Matching diverse capacity levels |
| | Resource matching | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available expertise • Funding opportunities • Technology offerings | Continuous updates | Dynamic matching algorithms |
| | Progress tracking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training completed • Technology deployed • Outcome indicators | Periodic reporting | Measuring effectiveness vs. inputs |

Each function requires sophisticated technical architecture supporting multi-stakeholder access, traditional knowledge integration, and interoperability with existing ocean governance systems.^[19]

2.2 Technical Requirements

Implementing these functions demands sophisticated technical architecture that the Agreement leaves largely unspecified. The CHM must achieve interoperability with existing databases across multiple organizations while maintaining its own data integrity and accessibility standards. The standardized batch identifier system requires integration with patent databases, scientific publication indexes, and commercial product registries to track MGR utilization comprehensively.^[20] Multi-

stakeholder access protocols must accommodate diverse users from government agencies to indigenous communities, each with different technical capacities and information needs.

Data quality and validation mechanisms represent particular challenges given the CHM's reliance on self-reporting. Without verification capabilities, the notification system risks becoming a repository of incomplete or inaccurate information undermining treaty objectives. The CHM must also support multiple knowledge systems, integrating quantitative scientific data with qualitative traditional knowledge while respecting intellectual property rights and indigenous data sovereignty.^[21] These technical requirements extend beyond simple database management, demanding adaptive architecture capable of evolving with technological advances and expanding treaty participation.

2.3 Implementation Challenges

The Preparatory Commission's first substantive meeting in April 2025 highlighted critical implementation challenges requiring urgent resolution. Foremost is the absence of specified technical architecture, with delegations debating whether to build new infrastructure or adapt existing systems like the CBD's clearing-house mechanisms.^[9:1] This architectural uncertainty compounds resource constraints, as developing states lack capacity to design CHM-compatible national systems while the treaty's financial mechanism remains undefined.

Integration with existing ocean governance systems presents additional complexity. The CHM must interface with the International Seabed Authority's databases for seabed mining, Regional Fisheries Management Organizations' catch documentation systems, International Maritime Organization's shipping registries, and numerous scientific data repositories, each with distinct standards and access protocols. The "not undermining" provision (Article 5) requires the CHM to respect existing legal frameworks while promoting coherence, a delicate balance demanding careful institutional orchestration.^[13:1]

Capacity constraints particularly affect Small Island Developing States and Least Developed Countries, which may lack technical infrastructure, trained personnel, and financial resources for CHM participation. Without targeted support, these states risk exclusion from the benefits of BBNJ implementation despite their significant ocean territories and traditional knowledge. The High Seas Alliance emphasizes that ensuring equitable access requires not just technical solutions but sustained capacity-building investments and simplified interfaces accommodating varying technological capabilities.^[2:1]

Perhaps most fundamentally, the CHM faces the challenge of building trust in a system based on self-reporting and voluntary compliance. Foster (2025) observes that while the BBNJ Agreement imposes "light substantive duties," it creates "heavy procedural obligations" whose effectiveness depends entirely on transparent implementation. The CHM must therefore incorporate accountability mechanisms that encourage compliance while avoiding bureaucratic burdens that might discourage participation. This requires careful balance between comprehensiveness and usability, transparency and confidentiality, standardization and flexibility.

These implementation challenges are not merely technical but deeply political, reflecting different visions of ocean governance and benefit-sharing. Yet they also present opportunities for innovation. By adopting proven frameworks like Ocean Accounts, the CHM can leverage existing investments in ocean information systems while establishing new standards for integrated governance. The following section examines how Ocean Accounts addresses these challenges through systematic architecture aligned with international standards.

3. Ocean Accounts Framework: A Systems Approach to Ocean Information

3.1 Conceptual Architecture: Linking Social, Economic, Environmental Dimensions

Ocean Accounts represents a paradigm shift from fragmented ocean statistics to integrated information systems, providing structured methodology for measuring relationships between ocean environments, economies, and societies.^[22] The framework's foundation rests on fundamental accounting distinctions between stocks—assets measured at points in time—and flows—transfers of goods, services, or activities measured over periods (OA-Guidance). This distinction enables systematic tracking of how ocean natural capital changes through human use and environmental processes, directly supporting sustainability assessments required for BBNJ implementation.

The spatial data framework employs Basic Spatial Units (BSUs) as foundational building blocks, enabling three-dimensional ocean representation through depth layers that accommodate complex marine ecosystem structures. BSUs can be aggregated or disaggregated according to management needs, from local bay systems to entire exclusive economic zones, providing the geographic flexibility essential for CHM reporting across scales. This spatial architecture maintains consistency with the Global Ecosystem Typology's functional classifications^[23] while allowing integration of indigenous and local spatial knowledge systems that may not conform to conventional cartographic boundaries.^[24] The framework's spatial flexibility proves essential for incorporating diverse knowledge systems and governance contexts (OA-Guidance: Section 3.5).

Central to Ocean Accounts' integrative capacity is its alignment with established international standards, particularly the System of National Accounts 2025 and System of Environmental-Economic Accounting frameworks. This compatibility ensures that ocean-specific information connects seamlessly with broader economic and environmental statistics, avoiding the isolation that often marginalizes ocean data from mainstream policy processes. The framework explicitly bridges the production boundary defined by SNA with environmental processes occurring beyond human economies, capturing previously invisible relationships between ecosystem functioning and economic activity.^[18:1]

3.2 Functional Architecture: From Data to Decisions

Ocean Accounts operates as a functional information system that transforms diverse, heterogeneous data inputs into standardized, decision-relevant outputs through a systematic process of collection, validation, standardization, and analysis (OA-Guidance: Section 3.4). This functional perspective reveals how Ocean Accounts addresses the practical challenges of integrating ocean information for policy use.

The data flow begins with collection from multiple sources—government monitoring programs, research institutions, industry reporting, citizen science initiatives, and indigenous knowledge systems. These diverse inputs undergo validation processes applying international statistical principles of completeness, consistency, and comparability.^[25] Data sharing protocols ensure that information from different sources can be integrated while maintaining quality standards and respecting data sovereignty, particularly for traditional knowledge.^[26] The challenge of disrupting traditional data silos while maintaining sovereignty represents a fundamental tension in ocean information systems.


Through standardization processes, heterogeneous data are aligned to common spatial boundaries (Basic Spatial Units), temporal periods (accounting years), and classifications (aligned with SNA and SEEA standards).^[27] This standardization enables the compilation of accounting tables that organize information according to the fundamental distinction between stocks (assets measured at points in time) and flows (transfers measured over periods). These structured tables serve as the foundation for deriving indicators specifically relevant to CHM functions, with metadata standards ensuring reproducibility and transparency.^[28]

For CHM implementation, Ocean Accounts can generate targeted indicators including: MGR extraction rates per ecosystem type to support benefit-sharing calculations; MPA effectiveness scores combining ecological condition and compliance metrics; cumulative impact indices integrating multiple pressures for EIA baselines; capacity development progress indicators tracking infrastructure, expertise, and technology transfer; and equity metrics disaggregating benefits by stakeholder groups. These indicators condense complex accounting information into decision-relevant metrics that directly support treaty implementation.

The final stage transforms accounting tables and indicators into reports, dashboards, and decision support tools tailored to different user needs. Modern implementations increasingly employ interactive visualization platforms allowing users to explore relationships between variables, compare scenarios, and monitor trends in real-time. This functional architecture ensures that Ocean Accounts serves not merely as a data repository but as an active intelligence system supporting evidence-based ocean governance.

3.3 Components and Integration Pathways

The Ocean Accounts Framework comprises twelve interconnected components that collectively enable comprehensive CHM implementation. These components, visualized below, transform diverse data streams into actionable intelligence for ocean governance:



Three critical patterns emerge from this architecture: First, multiple OA components converge at each BBNJ pillar, demonstrating that no single data type suffices for comprehensive ocean governance. Second, flow thickness indicates data criticality, with spatial framework and environmental assets

showing highest flow volumes as foundational elements. Third, cross-pillar integration reveals interdependencies that traditional siloed approaches cannot capture, emphasizing the need for systematic data integration. The following table details how each Ocean Accounts component supports specific CHM functions:

| Ocean Accounts Component | CHM Applications | Key Metrics |
|--|--|---|
| 1. Spatial Data Framework Basic Spatial Units providing three-dimensional ocean representation through depth layers, enabling consistent geographic reference across scales from local bays to entire ocean basins | Standardizes geographic reporting for all BBNJ notifications and reports while enabling data aggregation from local to global levels. Supports three-dimensional mapping essential for water column and seabed management distinctions required across treaty implementation. | BSU identifiers, depth zone classifications, jurisdictional overlap indices, ecosystem boundary delineations |
| 2. Environmental Assets (Extent & Condition) Stocks of discrete environmental assets and ecosystem assets measured by spatial extent and ecological condition at specific points in time ^[29] | Establishes comprehensive baselines for environmental impact assessments while providing scientific justification for area-based management tool proposals. Enables monitoring of ecosystem extent and condition changes for effectiveness assessment over time. ^[30] | Ecosystem extent measurements, habitat condition indices, species diversity measures, resource stock assessments |
| 3. Social Assets and Conditions Measures of wellbeing, vulnerability, resilience, and social capital in coastal and ocean-dependent communities including governance arrangements | Assesses equity in marine genetic resource benefit distribution across communities while documenting traditional knowledge systems and customary management practices. Identifies vulnerable populations requiring targeted capacity building support through CHM mechanisms. | Ocean dependency ratios, traditional use documentation, social vulnerability indices, governance effectiveness scores |
| 4. Produced and Financial Assets Stocks of built capital and financial capital supporting ocean activities including vessels, ports, research infrastructure, and investment mechanisms | Identifies infrastructure gaps that limit participation in BBNJ implementation while assessing technology transfer needs for developing state parties. Tracks ocean science investments and documents financial mechanisms available for conservation activities. | Research vessel capacity, laboratory facilities, blue finance instruments, infrastructure investment levels |
| 5. Flows within the Economy Economic transactions within the SNA production boundary including ocean-related production, consumption, income, and capital flows through marine value chains | Tracks monetary benefits from marine genetic resource commercialization while quantifying economic capacity for ocean management and conservation. Monitors blue economy development patterns and calculates financial contributions to benefit-sharing mechanisms established under the treaty. | MGR product revenues, ocean economy GDP, blue economy employment, technology licensing values |
| 6. Flows and Activities within Society beyond the SNA Important social activities outside the SNA production boundary including subsistence fishing, customary stewardship, volunteer conservation, and unpaid household labor | Documents traditional and customary management practices for formal recognition while capturing volunteer conservation efforts and citizen science contributions. Records non-monetary cultural and spiritual relationships with ocean spaces that inform equitable benefit-sharing arrangements. | Subsistence harvest levels, volunteer hours contributed, traditional practices documented, cultural use patterns |
| 7. Flows and Interactions within the Environment Ecological processes maintaining ecosystem functioning including biogeochemical cycles, energy flows, species migrations, and other ecosystem dynamics | Understands ecosystem connectivity essential for area-based management tool network design while assessing ecological support functions for environmental impact analysis. Maps species migration routes crossing jurisdictional boundaries that require coordinated management approaches. | Larval connectivity indices, nutrient flux rates, migration corridor mapping, trophic transfer efficiencies |
| 8. Flows of Pollution, Waste and Other Residuals Human-generated outputs affecting marine environments including point and diffuse pollution, solid waste, noise, and other anthropogenic pressures | Assesses cumulative environmental impacts for comprehensive environmental impact assessments while tracking pollution sources and pathways for targeted mitigation planning. Attributes environmental pressures to specific economic sectors to inform policy responses and compliance monitoring. | Plastic waste inputs, nutrient loading rates, noise pollution levels, chemical discharge volumes |
| 9. Monetary Flows between Assets and Economic Sectors Financial transactions associated with ocean-related produced and financial assets including investments, depreciation, insurance, and market transactions | Tracks investments in marine genetic resource research infrastructure while monitoring financial flows supporting capacity building initiatives. Documents insurance and risk management mechanisms for ocean activities that inform treaty implementation costs and financing needs. | R&D investment levels, infrastructure financing, technology transfer values, risk management costs |

| Ocean Accounts Component | CHM Applications | Key Metrics |
|--|--|--|
| 10. Contributions of Social Conditions to Activities Bidirectional relationships between social conditions and social or economic activities, showing how social capital enables ocean activities | Understands how social capital enables sustainable ocean management while assessing socio-economic impacts of area-based management measures. Identifies equity implications of access and benefit-sharing policies through analysis of feedback loops between ocean governance and community wellbeing. | Social capital indices, livelihood dependency measures, participation rates, equity distribution patterns |
| 11. Supply and Use of Final Ecosystem Services Services flowing directly from marine ecosystems to human wellbeing including provisioning, regulating, and cultural services | Quantifies marine genetic resource values for benefit-sharing calculations while determining monetary and non-monetary benefits requiring equitable distribution. Analyzes trade-offs between conservation and utilization objectives to inform balanced policy decisions under treaty implementation. | Genetic materials extracted, carbon sequestration rates, coastal protection values, recreation visitor days |
| 12. Supply and Use of Intermediate Ecosystem Services Ecological processes supporting ecosystem functioning without directly benefiting humans, such as nursery habitats, nutrient cycling, and primary productivity | Maintains ecological integrity essential for long-term conservation success while understanding support systems underpinning final ecosystem services. Establishes restoration priorities based on ecosystem support functions that sustain the natural capital foundation for treaty objectives. | Primary productivity rates, nursery habitat quality, nutrient cycling efficiency, ecosystem connectivity indices |

Countries implement these components through modular pathways adapted to national contexts, typically beginning with pilot accounts addressing specific challenges—sustainable fisheries, coastal tourism, marine pollution—before expanding coverage systematically.^[31] This incremental approach, detailed in GOAP Technical Guidance, allows learning-by-doing while building technical capacity and stakeholder engagement.

Implementation models vary according to institutional arrangements. Some countries position national statistics offices as leads emphasizing economic dimensions, while others operate through environment agencies prioritizing ecological accounts. Multi-agency collaborative approaches under high-level coordination increasingly emerge as best practice, recognizing that ocean accounts span traditional bureaucratic boundaries. For CHM integration, this institutional flexibility enables parties to build on existing ocean information systems rather than creating parallel structures.

The framework's "rapid assessment" option using global datasets ensures all parties can participate regardless of technical capacity.^{[32][33]} Countries with limited resources establish baseline accounts quickly before developing detailed national compilations, creating natural capacity-building pathways. With GOAP supporting over 30 countries, proven approaches exist for diverse development contexts, with early adopters supporting later implementers through technical cooperation facilitated by the CHM itself.^[34]

4. Implementation Pathways

Implementation of Ocean Accounts-CHM integration requires a phased approach building on established SEEA standards and GOAP Technical Guidance, leveraging proven approaches from participating countries.^{[35][36]} Ocean economy measurement methodologies provide essential foundations for tracking economic dimensions of treaty implementation.^[37] The following roadmap outlines the progression from foundation to full operation, aligned with integrated ocean management principles.^[38]

| Phase | Timeline | Key Actions | Responsible Parties | Resources Required | Success Indicators |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Phase 1: Foundation | Pre-COP1 (2025–2026) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish OA-CHM Technical Expert Group • Develop proof-of-concept pilots • Adapt SEEA Ocean guidelines for MGRs • Align with UNOC Nice commitments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PrepCom Secretariat • GOAP members • National statistics offices • Ocean agencies • SIDS/LDC representatives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$2–3M pilot funding • 10–15 technical experts • 3–5 pilot countries • GOAP technical support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert group operational • 3+ pilot projects launched • Draft standards published • COP-1 recommendations ready |
| Phase 2: Early Implementation | COP1–COP3 (2026–2029) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deploy CHM core architecture • Integrate pilot country data • Develop user interfaces • Launch capacity-building program • Establish regional nodes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COP Secretariat • Early adopter countries • Regional organizations • Training institutions • GOAP network | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10–15M core funding • 20–30 participating countries • Regional coordinators • Training facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHM operational • 20+ countries reporting • 100+ users trained • Regional networks active |
| Phase 3: Expansion | COP3–COP5 (2029–2032) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale to global coverage • Automate data flows • Integrate real-time monitoring • Deploy decision support tools • Align with CBD reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All BBNJ Parties • Scientific institutions • Private sector partners • Indigenous organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$20–30M sustained funding • 50+ countries participating • Advanced IT systems • Quality protocols | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50+ countries integrated • Automated reporting active • Decision tools deployed • Data quality verified |
| Phase 4: Full Operation | Post-COP5 (2032+) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve universal participation • Enable predictive analytics • Support adaptive management • Drive policy innovation • Demonstrate impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global ocean community • All stakeholder groups • Research networks • Policy makers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$30M+ annual budget • All parties participating • Advanced analytics • Impact assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal coverage • Evidence-based decisions • Measurable ocean improvements • Sustainable financing |

The practical pathway from national Ocean Accounts implementation to global CHM integration follows established patterns demonstrated across 30+ countries currently developing ocean accounting systems. Rather than requiring wholesale system redesign, countries can progressively extend existing statistical and environmental monitoring programs:

- **Building on Existing Foundations:** Countries with established environmental-economic accounting under SEEA can extend these systems to incorporate BBNJ-relevant data. For instance, fisheries accounts tracking national stocks can expand spatial coverage to document straddling and highly migratory species interactions with ABNJ. Tourism satellite accounts can disaggregate cruise operations to identify ABNJ components. This incremental approach leverages existing institutional capacity and data collection mechanisms rather than creating parallel systems.
- **Regional Collaboration Models:** The Pacific Community's Regional Ocean Accounts Framework demonstrates how countries can pool resources for ABNJ monitoring. Small Island Developing States sharing marine ecosystems jointly compile accounts for transboundary assets like tuna stocks, coral reef networks, and ocean currents. This collaborative approach distributes costs while building collective capacity—essential for regions where national resources alone cannot support comprehensive monitoring.
- **Leveraging Global Datasets:** Countries can begin Ocean Accounts implementation using freely available global datasets—satellite observations, oceanographic models, vessel tracking systems—before developing national monitoring capacity. The Global Ocean Accounts Partnership

provides data starter packs enabling rapid assessment while countries build institutional frameworks. This approach particularly benefits developing countries seeking to participate in CHM from day one rather than waiting years for perfect national data.

- **Traditional Knowledge Integration:** Indigenous and local knowledge systems offer essential information often absent from scientific monitoring, particularly regarding ecosystem changes, species behavior, and sustainable practices developed over generations.^[39] Ocean Accounts provides structured approaches for incorporating this knowledge while respecting data sovereignty through Free, Prior, and Informed Consent protocols.^[40] Countries like Canada and New Zealand demonstrate how traditional knowledge can enhance scientific accounts while maintaining indigenous control over sensitive information, supporting coastal and marine governance effectiveness.^[41]

Through these practical pathways, Ocean Accounts enables all countries to contribute to and benefit from CHM regardless of current capacity, creating an inclusive system where perfect data does not become the enemy of good governance.^[42]

5. Implementation Pathway: Learning from Experience

The implementation of integrated Ocean Accounts-CHM systems can draw from extensive practical experience across diverse contexts, from Small Island Developing States managing vast ocean territories to developed countries with sophisticated monitoring systems. Rather than prescribing rigid pathways, successful implementation emerges from understanding what has worked, what has failed, and why.

5.1 Lessons from Early Adopters

Australia's National Ocean Accounts demonstrate how established environmental-economic accounting systems can progressively incorporate ABNJ-relevant data.^{[43][44]} Beginning with fisheries statistics tracking southern bluefin tuna across national boundaries, Australia extended its accounts to monitor transboundary species interactions and economic flows connecting national waters to the high seas. The key insight: building on existing statistical infrastructure reduces implementation costs and leverages established institutional relationships between statistics offices, fisheries agencies, and research institutions.

The Pacific Community's regional approach offers different lessons for resource-constrained settings.^[45] By pooling technical capacity and sharing monitoring costs, Pacific Island countries collectively compile accounts for shared ecosystems spanning multiple jurisdictions. Tuna stocks managed by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission now have integrated accounts tracking biological assets, economic flows, and governance effectiveness across the region. This collaborative model, supported by South-South cooperation mechanisms,^[46] demonstrates how regional organizations can facilitate CHM integration even where individual countries lack comprehensive national systems. The EU's Ocean Observation Initiative provides parallel examples from developed regions.^[47]

5.2 Evolutionary Implementation Patterns

Successful Ocean Accounts development follows predictable stages, each building capacity for more sophisticated integration. The foundation stage establishes basic spatial frameworks using existing nautical charts and management boundaries, progressively refined through better data and community input. Countries typically begin with priority ecosystems—coral reefs for tropical nations, coastal wetlands for temperate regions—before expanding to comprehensive ecosystem coverage.

Economic integration follows similar patterns, starting with major ocean industries already captured in national accounts. Tourism satellite accounts disaggregate marine components; fisheries statistics expand to include processing and distribution; maritime transport data incorporates port activities and vessel operations. This sectoral approach allows countries to demonstrate value quickly while building technical capacity for more complex integration.

The governance dimension emerges as countries recognize the need to track management effectiveness alongside environmental and economic trends. Early accounts simply document existing regulations and protected areas. Over time, countries develop indicators measuring compliance rates, enforcement capacity, and management outcomes. This evolution reflects growing recognition that institutions shape outcomes as much as biophysical processes and economic activities.

5.3 Critical Success Factors

Political commitment proves essential but insufficient for sustained implementation. Australia's accounts stalled during periods of political change until cross-party support was secured through demonstrated policy relevance. Pacific Island countries maintain momentum through high-level regional commitments linking Ocean Accounts to climate adaptation and sustainable development goals. The lesson: implementation requires both top-level endorsement and operational support from working-level technical staff.

Technical capacity development must balance ambition with realism. Countries attempting comprehensive systems from the start often become overwhelmed by data requirements and methodological complexity. Successful implementers begin with simple accounts using available data before adding sophistication. The Global Ocean Accounts Partnership's "rapid assessment" approach enables countries to establish baseline accounts within months, providing immediate value while building toward comprehensive implementation.

Institutional arrangements prove more important than technical specifications. Countries struggle when Ocean Accounts fall between agencies—too environmental for statistics offices, too economic for environment departments. Success requires clear institutional homes with adequate authority and resources. New Zealand's joint Environment-Statistics mandate provides a successful model, while France's inter-ministerial approach demonstrates alternative arrangements for different governmental structures.

5.4 Scaling to CHM Integration

The transition from national Ocean Accounts to CHM integration follows established patterns but requires new forms of international cooperation. Countries with mature accounts become regional hubs, providing technical assistance to neighbors while contributing high-quality data to global systems. This hub-and-spoke model enables rapid scaling while maintaining quality standards.

Data harmonization emerges organically through regional networks rather than top-down standardization. Countries using similar methods naturally develop compatible accounts, while GOAP technical guidance provides common frameworks for diverse national approaches. The result: interoperable systems emerging from bottom-up coordination rather than imposed uniformity.

Regional cooperation proves essential for ABNJ coverage. Individual countries cannot monitor high seas areas, but regional groups can pool resources for shared monitoring systems. The challenge lies in creating governance arrangements that ensure all countries benefit from shared investments while contributing fairly to collective costs. Successful models from other domains—such as regional fisheries monitoring—provide templates for adaptation to comprehensive Ocean Accounts.

Success ultimately depends on demonstrating value for national priorities while contributing to global knowledge, aligned with the UN Ocean Decade's vision for transformative ocean science.^{[48][49]} Countries maintain Ocean Accounts because they improve domestic decision-making, not merely to satisfy international reporting requirements. CHM integration succeeds when it enhances national accounts rather than creating parallel obligations. This alignment of national interest with global benefit creates sustainable implementation that can weather political changes and resource constraints.

6. Recommendations

The convergence of Ocean Accounts methodological maturity with BBNJ implementation urgency creates an unprecedented window for establishing integrated ocean information architecture. The following recommendations provide actionable pathways for realizing this opportunity through immediate actions, inclusive implementation, and sustainable systems.

6.1 Immediate Actions for Treaty Implementation

| Recommendation | Responsible Actors | Timeline | Expected Outcomes | Critical Dependencies |
|---|---|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Establish OA-CHM Technical Working Group | PrepCom Secretariat, with balanced representation from developed/developing countries, GOAP institutions, BBNJ pillar experts | By PrepCom-2 (Q3 2025) | Integration protocols drafted with capacity needs assessed and equity safeguards defined. Technical standards proposed for comprehensive implementation framework. | PrepCom mandate expansion with GOAP technical support and voluntary country participation. Initial funding of \$500K required. |
| Adopt Ocean Accounts Principles | Conference of Parties (COP-1) | COP-1 Decision (2026) | Stocks/flows distinction established with spatial consistency required and temporal comparability ensured. Accounting standards recognized as foundational for CHM architecture. | Technical Working Group recommendations incorporated into draft COP decision text. Member state consensus and SEEA alignment confirmed. |
| Launch Demonstration Projects | 5–8 volunteer countries (SIDS, developed, regional groups) | Start Q4 2025, report COP-1 | Practical lessons documented with integration challenges identified and cost estimates refined. Success metrics established for scaling to global implementation. | BBNJ financial mechanism providing \$2–3M pilot funding with GOAP technical assistance and regional coordination structures. |
| Develop CHM Data Standards | CHM Secretariat with ISO, UNSD, GOAP | Draft by COP-1, adopt COP-2 | SDMX profiles defined with ISO 19115 metadata adopted and API specifications published. Quality protocols established for data validation and uncertainty documentation. | Technical architecture decisions through stakeholder consultation with interoperability testing and comprehensive documentation resources. |

These immediate actions establish the institutional and technical foundations for Ocean Accounts-CHM integration, creating momentum that becomes increasingly difficult to reverse as implementation progresses.

6.2 Building Inclusive Implementation Architecture

| Recommendation | Responsible Actors | Timeline | Expected Outcomes | Critical Dependencies |
|---|---|----------------------|--|---|
| Leverage Existing National Systems | National statistics offices, environment agencies, ocean ministries | Continuous from 2025 | SEEA extensions for BBNJ with reduced implementation costs through institutional capacity utilization. Reporting burden minimized through system integration. | National SEEA programs requiring inter-agency coordination with technical guidance and incremental funding support. |
| Enable Regional Cooperation | Regional seas programs, fisheries organizations, ocean partnerships | Establish by 2027 | Shared monitoring systems enabling joint account compilation with cost efficiencies achieved. Transboundary coverage for ecosystem-scale management. | Regional agreements establishing data sharing protocols with harmonized methods and pooled resources for collective monitoring. |
| Protect Knowledge Sovereignty | Indigenous organizations, local communities, national governments | Protocols by COP-1 | FPIC protocols established with community data governance and benefit-sharing arrangements. ^{[50][51]} Traditional knowledge integrated while maintaining indigenous control. | Rights frameworks through community consultation with legal protections and capacity support for knowledge holders. |
| Design Tiered Access Systems | CHM developers, user representatives, accessibility experts | Deploy 2026–2027 | Basic data entry available alongside advanced APIs operational for sophisticated users. Multiple languages supported with offline capabilities for connectivity-limited regions. | User requirements analysis informing interface testing with translation resources and comprehensive technical documentation. |

Inclusive architecture ensures that Ocean Accounts–CHM systems serve diverse stakeholders rather than privileging those with existing technical advantages, creating equitable participation essential for treaty legitimacy.^[52] Addressing interdependencies between sustainable development goals strengthens system coherence.^[53]

6.3 Technical Specifications for Interoperability

| Recommendation | Responsible Actors | Timeline | Expected Outcomes | Critical Dependencies |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| Adopt International Standards | CHM Technical Committee, standards organizations | Standards suite by 2026 | SEEA accounting structures with SDMX data exchange and ISO 19115 metadata specifications. OGC spatial services enabling geographic interoperability. | Standards review through compatibility testing with implementation guides and training materials for technical capacity building. |
| Implement Progressive Data Quality | Data providers, quality assurance teams | Framework by COP-2 | Uncertainty documented with quality tiers defined and improvement pathways clear. Transparency maintained through comprehensive metadata and validation processes. | Quality metrics established with validation tools and peer review processes supported by metadata standards. |
| Create Modular System Architecture | System architects, software developers | Core system 2026–2027 | Components independently deployable with flexible integration options and scalable infrastructure. Version control implemented for systematic updates and maintenance. | Architecture decisions requiring development resources with testing environments and comprehensive documentation systems. |
| Ensure Semantic Interoperability | Domain experts, ontology developers | Ontologies by 2027 | Common vocabularies adopted with cross-domain mapping and machine-readable definitions. Translation protocols enabling multilingual access and understanding. | Terminology agreements through ontology development with validation processes and long-term maintenance procedures. |

Technical specifications that prioritize interoperability over innovation reduce implementation barriers while ensuring that diverse systems can contribute to and benefit from integrated ocean knowledge.

6.4 Ensuring Long-term Sustainability

| Recommendation | Responsible Actors | Timeline | Expected Outcomes | Critical Dependencies |
|--|---|------------------------|---|--|
| Demonstrate National Value | National governments, research institutions | Continuous from pilots | Domestic benefits documented with policy improvements measured, cost savings quantified, and political support secured through evidence-based communication | Use case development integrated with impact assessment methodologies, communication strategies tailored to stakeholder needs, and cultivation of political champions |
| Diversify Funding Sources | Development partners, private foundations, blue finance | Strategy by 2026 | Core funding secured while innovation funds accessed and private investment attracted to achieve long-term financial sustainability ^{[54][55]} | Funding proposals aligned with partnership agreements, revenue models developed for self-sustaining operations, and investment cases demonstrating returns |
| Build Progressive Capacity | Training institutions, regional centers, GOAP network | Programs from 2025 | Staged learning pathways established with regional expertise developed through South-South cooperation ensuring knowledge retention | Curriculum development matched to capacity needs, training resources adapted to regional contexts, exchange programs facilitating knowledge transfer, and certification systems recognizing competencies |
| Establish Governance Mechanisms | COP, Scientific Committee, stakeholder groups | Formalize by COP-3 | Clear decision processes established with stakeholder participation ensuring adaptive management and effective conflict resolution | Governance frameworks balancing efficiency with inclusiveness, participation rules ensuring equitable representation, review procedures enabling adaptation, and amendment processes maintaining relevance |

Sustainable implementation requires demonstrating value that justifies continued investment, building capacity that reduces dependence on external support, and establishing governance that maintains legitimacy through changing political and environmental conditions.

7. Conclusion

Ocean Accounts offers more than technical solutions to CHM implementation challenges—it provides a conceptual framework for transforming how humanity understands and governs ocean spaces that belong to all yet are managed by none. By systematically documenting relationships between ocean ecosystems, human economies, and social wellbeing, integrated Ocean Accounts-CHM systems can shift ocean governance from reactive regulation of problems to proactive management of opportunities.

The convergence of Ocean Accounts methodological maturity with BBNJ implementation urgency creates unprecedented opportunity for establishing ocean information architecture supporting sustainable development for generations. Success requires immediate action, sustained commitment, and inclusive collaboration ensuring that standardized systems serve diverse needs rather than imposing uniformity that marginalizes difference.

Ultimately, Ocean Accounts-CHM integration represents investment in ocean governance infrastructure as fundamental as ports and research vessels—invisible yet essential foundations enabling evidence-based decisions about humanity's largest shared resource. The choice facing BBNJ parties is not whether to integrate these systems but how quickly ambition can match the urgency of ocean challenges demanding systematic solutions.

8. Additional Reading

Ocean Economy and Valuation

The economic dimensions of ocean governance benefit from understanding marine ecosystem services^[56] and their global valuation methodologies,^[57] though implementation challenges persist in translating conceptual frameworks to operational systems.^{[58][59]} Fisheries economics particularly illustrate these complexities through comprehensive subsidy analyses^[60] and efficiency assessments demonstrating the economic costs of unsustainable practices.^[61]

Climate–Ocean Nexus

Ocean-climate interactions represent critical governance considerations, with comprehensive analyses of ocean-based climate solutions^[62] demonstrating potential contributions to mitigation and adaptation. Understanding warming impacts on ocean systems^[63] proves essential for anticipating future management challenges under changing environmental conditions.

Pollution and Marine Litter

Marine pollution assessment provides essential baselines for environmental impact evaluations, including detailed microplastics research documenting sources and pathways^[64] and global pollution assessments quantifying the scale of marine contamination challenges.^[65] These assessments inform both preventive measures and remediation priorities.

Traditional and Indigenous Knowledge

Traditional ecological knowledge systems^[39:1] offer alternative frameworks for understanding ocean relationships beyond Western scientific paradigms, providing insights developed over generations of close observation and sustainable practice. Integration approaches respecting knowledge sovereignty demonstrate pathways for meaningful inclusion in governance systems.

Ecosystem Services Assessment

Marine ecosystem service frameworks^[66] provide methodologies for integrating natural and social sciences in management contexts, supporting comprehensive valuation that captures both market and non-market benefits. Global biodiversity assessments^[67] contextualize ocean ecosystems within broader planetary systems, highlighting interconnections often overlooked in sectoral approaches.

Global Fisheries Status

Comprehensive fisheries assessments^[68] contextualize sustainability challenges within broader blue transformation agendas, documenting both crisis dimensions and solution pathways. These analyses inform evidence-based approaches to fisheries governance aligned with ecosystem-based management principles.

Preparatory Committee Documents

Technical working documents from BBNJ PrepCom sessions^{[69][70]} provide detailed implementation considerations emerging from diplomatic negotiations, while ISO metadata standards^[28:1] establish technical frameworks for information management. These documents bridge high-level policy objectives with operational requirements.

Ocean Solutions and Sustainability

Integrated assessments of ocean solutions^[71] demonstrate pathways balancing human benefits with ecological integrity, identifying win-win opportunities while acknowledging necessary trade-offs. Human impact assessments^[72] quantify cumulative pressures on ocean systems, while spatial data management guidelines^[73] provide technical specifications for integrated monitoring and assessment frameworks.

References

1. Agreement 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, adopted June 19, 2023, UN Doc. A/CONF.232/2023/4, Article 51.
2. High Seas Alliance, *Operationalizing the Clearing-House Mechanism*, PrepCom Deep Dive Series (April 2025), 3–5.
3. Global Ocean Accounts Partnership (GOAP), *Ocean Accounting for Sustainable Ocean Development: Technical Guidance* (2025) [hereinafter OA-Guidance].
4. OA-Guidance, Section 3.5 (Spatial Data Framework).
5. Lawson, C., et al., "Data Management and the 'BBNJ Standardized Batch Identifier' under the BBNJ Agreement," in *Decoding MGR Governance under the BBNJ Agreement* (Springer, 2024), 145–167.
6. Boettcher, M., & Brent, K., "The potential of the BBNJ clearing house mechanism to enhance knowledge pluralism in marine carbon dioxide removal assessment," *Frontiers in Climate* 6 (2024): 1497476.
7. OA-Guidance, Section 3.5 (Environmental Assets).
8. United Nations, *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting—Ecosystem Accounting* (2021), Chapter 12.
9. IDDRI, *The first substantive BBNJ Agreement Preparatory Committee: Preparing the ground for future implementation*, Policy Brief (April 2025), 8–10.
10. Gaebel, C., et al., "The BBNJ clearing-house mechanism: considerations for its diverse functions, users, and sources," *Frontiers in Ocean Sustainability* 3 (2025): 1584927.
11. UN General Assembly Resolution 72/249, December 24, 2017.
12. BBNJ Agreement, Articles 10–13 (Marine Genetic Resources).
13. Kim, R.E., "The Likely Impact of the BBNJ Agreement on the Architecture of Ocean Governance," *Marine Policy* 165 (2024): 106190.
14. BBNJ Agreement, Article 51.
15. Report of the Preparatory Committee established under the BBNJ Agreement, First Session (2025), paras. 45–52.
16. OA-Guidance, Section 3.3 (Definition and Scope).
17. United Nations, *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting 2012: Central Framework* (2014).
18. Fenichel, E.P., et al., "Modifying national accounts for sustainable ocean development," *Nature Sustainability* 3 (2020): 889–895.
19. Refer to footnote 10 above (Gaebel et al. 2025).
20. Humphries, F., Rabone, M., & Jaspars, M., "The Novel Notification and Information System for Marine Genetic Resources under the BBNJ Agreement," in *Ocean Governance and the*

Implementation of SDG 14 (Springer, 2024), 189–215. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20740-2_9

21. Refer to footnote 22 above (Vierros et al. 2020).
22. OA-Guidance, Section 3.5 (Conceptual Components).
23. Keith, D.A., et al., "A function-based typology for Earth's ecosystems," *Nature* 610 (2022): 513–518.
24. Vierros, M.K., et al., "Considering Indigenous Peoples and local communities in governance of the global ocean commons," *Marine Policy* 119 (2020): 104039.
25. Vardon, M., et al., "How the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting can improve environmental information systems and data quality for decision making," *Environmental Science & Policy* 89 (2018): 83–92.
26. Pendleton, L., et al., "Disrupting data sharing for a healthier ocean," *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 76(6) (2019): 1415–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsz068>
27. UNSD, *Institutional Arrangements for Environmental-Economic Accounting: A Global Assessment* (New York: UN, 2022). <https://seea.un.org/content/global-assessment-environmental-economic-accounting>
28. ISO 19115–3:2016, *Geographic information — Metadata*.
29. SEEA-EA, Chapter 5 (Ecosystem Condition Accounts).
30. Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Experimental Ocean Accounts* (2022).
31. Pacific Community, *Pacific Ocean Accounts Initiative: Regional Framework* (2024).
32. OECD, *Ocean Economy Database* (2024).
33. IOC-UNESCO, *Global Ocean Science Report 2020: Charting Capacity for Ocean Sustainability* (Paris: UNESCO, 2020).
34. Refer to footnote 3 above (OA-Guidance).
35. Jolliffe, J., Jolly, C., & Stevens, B., "Blueprint for improved measurement of the international ocean economy: An exploration of satellite accounting for ocean economic activity," OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, No. 2021/04 (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021).
36. Colgan, C.S., "Measurement of the ocean economy from national income accounts to the sustainable blue economy," *Journal of Ocean and Coastal Economics* 2(2) (2016): Article 12.
37. Gacutan, J., et al., "Marine spatial planning and ocean accounting: Synergistic tools enhancing integration in ocean governance," *Marine Policy* 136 (2022): 104936. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104936>
38. Winther, J.G., et al., *Integrated Ocean Management*, Blue Paper (Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, 2020). [https://oceanpanel.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/Integrated Ocean Management.pdf](https://oceanpanel.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/Integrated%20Ocean%20Management.pdf)
39. Berkes, F., *Sacred Ecology* (4th ed., Routledge, 2018).
40. Pascual, U., et al., "Valuing nature's contributions to people: the IPBES approach," *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 26–27 (2017): 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.12.006>
41. Chen, W., Van Assche, K., Hynes, S., Bekkby, T., Christie, H.C., & Gundersen, H., "Ecosystem accounting's potential to support coastal and marine governance," *Marine Policy* 112 (2020): 103758. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103758>
42. Ruijs, A., Vardon, M., Bass, S., & Ahlroth, S., "Natural capital accounting for better policy," *Ambio* 48 (2019): 714–725.
43. Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Ocean Accounts Implementation Guide* (2023).
44. Australian Department of Environment, *National Ocean Accounts Progress Report* (2024).
45. Pacific Community, *Regional Ocean Accounts Framework* (2024).
46. UNDP, *South-South Cooperation for Ocean Governance* (2024).

47. European Commission, *EU Ocean Observation Initiative* (2023).
48. Claudet, J., et al., "A Roadmap for Using the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development in Support of Science Policy Action," *One Earth* 2(1) (2020): 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2019.12.002>
49. Singh, G.G., et al., "Will understanding the ocean lead to 'the ocean we want'? A critical analysis of the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development," *Frontiers in Marine Science* 6 (2019): 924. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00924>
50. Bennett, N.J., et al., "Blue growth and blue justice: Ten risks and solutions for the ocean economy," *Marine Policy* 125 (2021): 104387.
51. Cisneros-Montemayor, A.M., et al., "Social equity and benefits as the nexus of a transformative Blue Economy: A sectoral review of implications," *Marine Policy* 109 (2019): 103702.
52. Bennett, N.J., "Navigating a just and inclusive path towards sustainable oceans," *Marine Policy* 97 (2018): 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.06.012>
53. Nash, K.L., et al., "To achieve a sustainable blue future, progress assessments must include interdependencies between the sustainable development goals," *One Earth* 2(2) (2020): 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.01.008>
54. Virdin, J., et al., *The Ocean 100: Transnational Corporations in the Ocean Economy*, Science Advances 7(16) (2021): eabc8041. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abc8041>
55. Österblom, H., et al., "Transnational corporations as 'keystone actors' in marine ecosystems," *PLOS ONE* 10(5) (2015): e0127533.
56. Barbier, E.B., "Marine ecosystem services," *Current Biology* 27(11) (2017): R507–R510.
57. De Groot, R., et al., "Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary units," *Ecosystem Services* 1(1) (2012): 50–61.
58. Liqueste, C., et al., "Current status and future prospects for the assessment of marine and coastal ecosystem services: A systematic review," *Science of the Total Environment* 463–464 (2013): 1–14.
59. Townsend, M., et al., "The challenge of implementing the marine ecosystem service concept," *Frontiers in Marine Science* 5 (2018): 359.
60. Sumaila, U.R., et al., "Updated estimates and analysis of global fisheries subsidies," *Marine Policy* 109 (2019): 103695.
61. World Bank, *The Sunken Billions Revisited: Progress and Challenges in Global Marine Fisheries* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2017).
62. Hoegh-Guldberg, O., et al., *The Ocean as a Solution to Climate Change: Five Opportunities for Action*, Report (Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, 2019).
63. Laffoley, D., & Baxter, J., *Ocean Connections: Rising Risks from a Warming Ocean* (2018).
64. GESAMP, *Sources, Fate and Effects of Microplastics in the Marine Environment: Part 2 of a Global Assessment*, IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/UNIDO/WMO/IAEA/UN/UNEP/UNDP/ISA Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection, Reports and Studies No. 93 (2020).
65. UNEP, *From Pollution to Solution: A Global Assessment of Marine Litter and Plastic Pollution* (Nairobi: UNEP, 2021).
66. Alexander, K.A., et al., "Progress in integrating natural and social science in marine ecosystem-based management research," *Marine Policy* 108 (2019): 103642.
67. IPBES, *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (2019), Chapter 2.
68. FAO, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2024: Blue Transformation in Action* (Rome: FAO, 2024).
69. Working Documents of the Preparatory Committee established under the BBNJ Agreement, Second Session (2025).

70. High Seas Alliance, *PrepCom Deep Dive Series* (2025), 12–15.
71. Stuchtey, M., et al., *Ocean Solutions That Benefit People, Nature and the Economy*, Report (Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, 2020).
[https://oceanpanel.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/Ocean Solutions Report FINAL.pdf](https://oceanpanel.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/Ocean%20Solutions%20Report%20FINAL.pdf)
72. Halpern, B.S., et al., "Recent pace of change in human impact on the world's ocean," *Scientific Reports* 9 (2019): 11609. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-47201-9>
73. CBD Secretariat, *Technical Series No. 101: Guidelines for Marine Spatial Data Management* (Montreal: CBD, 2023). <https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-101-en.pdf>