

Accepted Manuscript

This is an Accepted Manuscript of the following article:

Elena Gissi, Frank Maes, Zacharoula Kyriazi, Ana Ruiz-Frau, Catarina Frazão Santos, Barbara Neumann, Adriano Quintela, Fátima Alves, Simone Borg, Wenting Chen, Maria da Luz Fernandes, Maria Hadjimichael, Elisabetta Manea, Márcia Marques, Froukje Maria Platjouw, Michelle E. Portman, Lisa P. Sousa, Luca Bolognini, Wesley Flannery, Fabio Grati, Cristina Pita, Nataa Văidianu, Robert Stojanov, Jan van Tatenhove, Fiorenza Micheli, Anna-Katharina Hornidge, Sebastian Unger. Contributions of marine area-based management tools to the UN sustainable development goals. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. Volume 330, 2022, 129910. 0959-6526.

The article has been published in final form by Elsevier at
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129910>

© 2021. This manuscript version is made available under the

CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

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

11 Department of Environmental and Resources Law, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta

12 Norwegian Institute for Water Research, Gaustadalléen 21, NO-0349 Oslo, Norway

13 Independent Researcher, Nicosia, Cyprus

28 14 Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Kiryat HaTechnion, Haifa 32000 Israel
29 15 National Research Council (CNR), Institute of Marine Biological Resources and Biotechnologies (IRBIM),
30 Largo Fiera della Pesca 1, 60125 Ancona, Italy
31 16 School of Natural and Built Environment, David Keir Building, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, BT9 5AG,
32 United Kingdom
33 17 International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), 235 High Holborn, Holborn, London WC1V
34 7DN, U.K.
35 18 Faculty of Natural Sciences and Agricultural Sciences, Ovidius University of Constanța, Aleea Universității 1,
36 900470, Constanța, Romania
37 19 Interdisciplinary Center for Advanced Research on Territorial Dynamics, University of Bucharest, Regina
38 Elisabeta 4-12, 030018, Bucharest, Romania
39 20 Faculty of Business and Economics, Mendel University in Brno, Zemědělská 1, 61300 Brno, Czech Republic
40 21 Centre for Blue Governance, Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14, 9000 Aalborg,
41 Denmark
42 22 Stanford Center for Ocean Solutions, 120 Ocean View Blvd, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA
43 23 German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Tulpenfeld 6, D - 53113 Bonn,
44 Germany
45
46 * Corresponding author: Elena Gissi, Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA,
47 tel: +1 831 655 6200; e-mail address: elena.gissi@ismar.cnr.it

48

49

50 **Abstract**

51 Area-Based Management Tools (ABMTs) are spatial instruments for conservation and managing different
52 forms of ocean use. A multitude of ABMTs exists in marine areas within and beyond national jurisdiction,
53 ranging from tools for the regulation of specific human activities (e.g. fisheries, shipping, or mining) to cross-
54 sectoral tools (e.g. such as marine protected areas, MPAs, and marine spatial planning, MSP). By applying
55 expert elicitation and reviewing scientific and grey literature we evaluate the contribution of ABMTs to

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

70

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

73

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

11 Department of Environmental and Resources Law, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta

12 Norwegian Institute for Water Research, Gaustadalléen 21, NO-0349 Oslo, Norway

13 Independent Researcher, Nicosia, Cyprus

- 28 14 Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Kiryat HaTechnion, Haifa 32000 Israel
1
2 29 15 National Research Council (CNR), Institute of Marine Biological Resources and Biotechnologies (IRBIM),
3
4 30 Largo Fiera della Pesca 1, 60125 Ancona, Italy
5
6 31 16 School of Natural and Built Environment, David Keir Building, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, BT9 5AG,
7
8 32 United Kingdom
9
10 33 17 International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), 235 High Holborn, Holborn, London WC1V
11
12 34 7DN, U.K.
13
14 35 18 Faculty of Natural Sciences and Agricultural Sciences, Ovidius University of Constanța, Aleea Universității 1,
15 36 900470, Constanța, Romania
16
17 37 19 Interdisciplinary Center for Advanced Research on Territorial Dynamics, University of Bucharest, Regina
20
21 38 Elisabeta 4-12, 030018, Bucharest, Romania
22
23 39 20 Faculty of Business and Economics, Mendel University in Brno, Zemědělská 1, 61300 Brno, Czech Republic
24
25 40 21 Centre for Blue Governance, Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14, 9000 Aalborg,
26
27 41 Denmark
28
29 42 22 Stanford Center for Ocean Solutions, 120 Ocean View Blvd, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA
30
31 43 23 German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Tulpenfeld 6, D - 53113 Bonn,
32
33
34 44 Germany
35
36 45
37
38 46 * Corresponding author: Elena Gissi, Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA,
39
40 47 tel: +1 831 655 6200; e-mail address: elena.gissi@ismar.cnr.it
41
42 48
43
44 49
45
46

47 50 **Abstract**
48
49

50 51 Area-Based Management Tools (ABMTs) are spatial instruments for conservation and managing different
52
53 52 forms of ocean use. A multitude of ABMTs exists in marine areas within and beyond national jurisdiction,
54
55 53 ranging from tools for the regulation of specific human activities (e.g. fisheries, shipping, or mining) to cross-
56
57 54 sectoral tools (e.g. such as marine protected areas, MPAs, and marine spatial planning, MSP). By applying
58
59 55 expert elicitation and reviewing scientific and grey literature we evaluate the contribution of ABMTs to
60
61
62
63
64
65

56 sustainable development goals (SDGs) as set out under the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable
1
2 57 Development, including for SDG 14 that directly addresses the conservation and sustainable use of oceans,
3
4 58 seas, and marine resources. We find that fisheries-related and conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP offer
5
6 59 the greatest potential contributions to SDG 14 and to SDGs in general. Moreover, there is high
7
8 60 complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most SDG 14 targets and other SDGs, with the
9
10
11 61 exception of SDG target 14.6 *Prohibit fisheries subsidies* and SDG 7 *Affordable and clean energy*. We find
12
13 62 that some ABMTs contribute directly to goal attainment, while others contribute in more nuanced or even
14
15 63 unexpected ways. Furthermore, context-specific factors that relate to political and legal factors, enforceability,
16
17 64 transparency, governance, and inclusivity are crucial for unlocking the full potential of ABMTs of attaining
18
19
20 65 multiple SDGs, as shown through examples. The major challenge to face in the next decade is ensuring durable
21
22 66 and equitable outcomes from ABMT implementation by coordinating ABMT initiatives established by
23
24 67 different organisations and responsible authorities. It is also critical that outcomes are monitored and evaluated
25
26 68 across environmental, social, economic, governance, and health dimensions, with indicators addressing
27
28
29 69 management effectiveness and not only ABMT area coverage.
30

31
32 70
33
34
35 71 **Keywords:** area-based management, marine/maritime spatial planning, ocean governance, cooperation
36
37 72 mechanisms, areas beyond national jurisdiction, biodiversity, conservation, sustainable development.
38
39

40 73 41 42 43 74 **1. Introduction**

44
45
46 75 The United Nations (UN) 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015), henceforth the
47
48 76 2030 Agenda, is a holistic, inclusive and coherent strategy encompassing a set of 17 “integrated and
49
50 77 indivisible” Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One of these goals, SDG 14 *Life below water*, focuses
51
52 78 specifically on the conservation and sustainable use of the ocean and its resources. It builds on commitments
53
54
55 79 and requirements as set out in different, yet related legal instruments or international declarations. For example,
56
57 80 the target to conserve at least 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020 (SDG 14.5) was based on the UN
58
59 81 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Target 11 (Convention on Biological Diversity, 2010). The
60

82 ‘zero draft’ proposal for the CBD post-2020 global biodiversity framework now recommends the protection
1
2 83 of at least 30% of the ocean by 2030 (UNEP, 2020). Achieving conservation outcomes in the ocean while
3
4 84 supporting other SDGs is critical, especially in light of the recent and rapid “blue” acceleration in marine
5
6 85 resource exploitation (Jouffray et al., 2020), and major challenges in achieving sustainable blue growth
7
8 86 (Laffoley et al., 2020; Rilov et al., 2020a; Winther et al., 2020). Furthermore, the ocean is a continuum, with
9
10
11 87 currents and species moving across multiple zones (Popova et al., 2019) and ecosystems being affected by
12
13 88 transboundary anthropogenic pressures that cannot be controlled through protected zones alone (Menegon et
14
15 89 al., 2018; Reusch et al., 2018). Whilst there is a growing body of literature on the nature of interlinkages
16
17 90 between sustainability goals and targets in the ocean (Nash et al., 2020; Nilsson et al., 2016; Obura, 2020; S.
18
19 Schmidt et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2018), there is limited comprehensive evaluation of the contribution of
20 91
21
22 92 specific management tools to attaining SDGs.

23
24
25 93 Area-based management tools (ABMTs) are globally applied, purpose-orientated instruments used in the
26
27 94 planning and management of marine and coastal areas. By definition, ABMTs entail the implementation of a
28
29 95 system of rights and duties in a particular management area, under the responsibility of a designated authority,
30
31
32 96 and tend to afford high levels of protection (Roberts et al., 2010; UNGA, 2007). Taking into account the legal
33
34 97 status of the different maritime zones under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), ABMTs
35
36 98 range from sectoral spatial instruments designed to manage a particular human activity (e.g., fisheries,
37
38 99 shipping, or mining) to cross-sectoral tools for managing multiple uses, such as marine protected areas
39
40
41 100 (MPAs), and marine/maritime spatial planning (MSP) (Muraki Gottlieb et al., 2018).

42
43
44 101 These tools reached particular global resonance in recent years, as part of biodiversity conservation targets and
45
46 102 the negotiation of an international legally binding instrument (under UNCLOS) for the conservation and
47
48 103 sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) (General Assembly
49
50 104 resolution 72/249, United Nations, 2018). In addition to being discussed as a potential measure to achieve
51
52 105 BBNJ-related objectives, ABMTs have been identified as a key mechanism for delivering global biodiversity
53
54 106 goals and SDG 14 (Reimer et al., 2021). However, due to the great variety of ABMTs, there is a need for a
55
56
57 107 clear understanding of how these tools can contribute – separately and/or combined – to the implementation
58
59 108 of the 2030 Agenda as a whole. Given the indivisible and interlinked nature of SDGs delivering on a broad
60
61
62
63
64
65

109 range of objectives, it is vital that implementation considers synergies and trade-offs between different SDGs.
1
110 Understanding the broad and interconnected nature of SDGs is key to supporting decision-makers, managers
3
111 and communities in applying ABMTs to maximize policy effectiveness for environmental and societal
5
112 benefits, as well as addressing challenges and potential trade-offs among goals.
7
8
113 Here, we review existing types of ABMTs as stipulated by different international and regional agreements
10
114 (Fig. 1) and their contribution to achieving SDG 14 and other SDGs. Drawing on expert opinion, we first
12
115 assessed the potential range of ABMTs' contributions to achieving the different targets of SDG 14, together
15
116 with several other interlinked SDGs with strong implications for ocean-related transformations towards
17
117 sustainability, i.e., SDGs 1, 2, 5, 7-13, 16, and 17 (see section 2.2 below). We then explored constraining and
19
118 enabling factors of ABMTs implementation through existing cases and evidence from literature. Finally, we
21
119 discussed the potential multiple contributions of ABMTs to sustainable development in both areas beyond
24
120 national jurisdiction (ABNJ) and areas under national jurisdiction, and we outlined pathways towards more
26
121 effective SDGs achievement – acknowledging the multiplicity of social, environmental, economic, political,
28
122 and institutional challenges, as well as opportunities that come with ABMTs implementation.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Legend




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

129 jurisdiction (ABNJ), indicating in which maritime zone the ABMTs classified by the colored rectangles can
1
130 or could apply. “High Seas” is just the water column in ABNJ. The sea floor is the “Area” (International
3
131 Seabed Authority ABMTs apply there). Both can be taken together as ABNJ. The colors of the rectangles
5
132 represent the sector or cross-sectorial group to which the ABMTs belong. The vertical marine domain
7
133 subdivisions indicate the scope of the ABMTs, such as air, water, seabed, and are shown by different icons.
8
134 For detailed descriptions of each ABMT see Table A.3; APEI=Areas of Particular Environmental Interest,
12
135 ASMA=Antarctic Specially Managed Area, ASPA=Antarctic Specially Protected Area, BBNJ=Biodiversity
14
136 Beyond National Jurisdictions, EBSA=Ecologically and Biologically Significant Area, ECA=Emissions
16
137 Control Areas, FRA=Fisheries Restricted Areas, GES=Good Environmental Status, MPA=Marine Protected
18
138 Area, MSP=Marine/Maritime Spatial Planning, OECM=Other Effective area-based Conservation Measure,
21
139 PA=Protected Areas, PSSA=Particular Sensitive Sea Areas, SAC=Special Areas of Conservation, SCI=Site
23
140 of Community Importance, SECA=Sulphur Emissions Control Areas, SPA=Specially Protected Areas,
25
141 TURF=Territorial Use Rights in Fisheries, VME=Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems; for the acronyms of the
27
142 International and Regional Agreements see Table C.1.
30

31
32

34 144 **2. Material and methods**

37
38 145 The assessment conducted in this study is structured around two main steps: i) the descriptive analysis of a
39
40 146 vast set of ABMTs with respect to their scope, mandate, responsibilities, spatial extent, and single/multiple
41
42 147 sector-based objectives; and ii) the qualitative assessment of the potential contribution of selected ABMTs to
43
44 148 ocean-related SDGs of the 2030 Agenda.
45
46

47
48

50 150 **2.1. Descriptive analysis of ABMTs (Step 1)**

51
52
53 151 An initial list of 47 ocean-related international agreements (at global and regional levels) was compiled, with
54
55 152 respect to shipping, fisheries management, deep seabed mining in the Area, underwater natural and cultural
56
57 153 heritage, environmental conservation, and marine spatial planning (Step 1). We screened them and compiled
58
59
60 154 a list of ABMTs mentioned by the respective legal sources and related tools. ABMTs were selected along two
61
62
63
64
65

155 criteria: i) implementation in practice; and ii) existing specific, identifiable geographical scope for zoning. We
1 recorded how legal sources at the international level have shaped ABMTs with regard to spatial scope, mandate
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

168 **2.2 Contribution of ABMTs towards SDGs (Step 2)**

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

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

181 2020), which we aim to expand here. With respect to SDG 14, we focused the analysis on the seven outcome-
 182 oriented targets (targets 1-7). We did not address the three targets (targets a-c) that represent “means of
 183 implementation” (namely, science and technology, knowledge-sharing and capacity building, and
 184 implementation of international law) as the latter were recognized to be inconsistently formulated and mainly
 185 qualitative (Bartram et al., 2018).

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

196 **Table 1: Research questions and criteria for the assessment of the contribution of ABMTs towards the**
 197 **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)

1 2 3 4 5 6	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)
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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.	
14 15 16 17 18 19	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)

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).

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)

1	-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)
2	-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)

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 201
 7
 202
 9
 1003
 11
 1204
 13
 14
 1505
 16
 1706
 18
 1907
 20
 2108
 22
 2309
 24
 25
 2610
 27
 2811
 29
 3012
 31
 32
 3313
 34
 35
 3614
 37
 3815
 39
 4016
 41
 4217
 43
 4418
 45
 46
 4719
 48
 4920
 50
 51
 5221
 53
 5422
 55
 5623
 57
 58
 5924
 60
 6125
 62
 63
 64
 65

The assessment of the potential contribution of ABMTs to SDGs was based on internal expert elicitation, in line with the method applied by McCollum et al. (2018). Experts involved were part of the Working Group on “Area Based Management” of the European COST Action CA 15217 OceanGov “Ocean Governance for Sustainability: Challenges, Options and the Role of Science”. We leveraged the diverse and in-depth knowledge of the experts – as the authors of this study – on the different ABMT groups (conservation, shipping, fisheries, deep seabed mining, UCNH, MSP) to conduct and produce the assessment. Sub-teams were formed during the first expert workshop (Ghent, 20-21 February 2019), where they were trained on the assessment method. The sub-teams were composed of at least three researchers coordinated by the lead author. They worked through small-group discussions to reach agreement on each score, first in person during the workshop, and remotely afterwards. The sub-teams were also asked to assess the confidence (Table 1) with which they collectively judged the different potential contributions of ABMTs towards the achievement of SDGs. Confidence scores were assigned considering the level of expert knowledge on the different ABMTs. Once the scoring was defined, the sub-teams also analyzed the actual implementation of ABMTs, reporting evidence on potential enabling factors and barriers that enhance or inhibit ABMTs contribution towards specific SDGs. The sub-teams leveraged evidence from their own knowledge, as well as scientific and grey literature on the implementation of ABMTs. They compiled empirical examples and cases of ABMT implementation that have contributed towards (or hindered) the achievement of the targeted SDG. Finally, the sub-teams assessed the level of evidence of implemented cases, and related enabling or constraining factors, in order to identify potential knowledge gaps in our assessment. When preliminary versions of the assessment for all ABMTs were finalized, they were circulated among the entire group of authors with two goals: i) provide elements of agreement or disagreement with the initial assessment; ii) comment and add potentially relevant knowledge and cases on the implementation of ABMTs. The sub-teams were then asked to collect feedback and to elaborate on potential points of disagreement in the assessments.

226 Finally, revised versions of the assessment were circulated among the entire expert group again, and further
1
227 discussed in a second expert workshop (Potsdam, 10-11 December 2019). Here, there was a special focus on
3
228 points of disagreement regarding the scoring through verbal discussions in parallel and plenary sessions. The
5
229 final version of the assessment was jointly consolidated into 20 SDG-ABMT tables (see Tables B.1-20).
7
8

9
230
10

231 3. Results

232 3.1. ABMTs contributions to ocean sustainability goals

233 ABMTs have the potential to generate multiple benefits necessary for achieving SDG 14 and other ocean-
19
234 related SDGs (Figs. 2 and 3; for a detailed description see Tables B.1-20). For SDG 14, Figure 2 indicates that
21
235 fisheries- and conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP have the greatest potential contributions overall. Also,
22
236 looking at the columns, there is high complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most targets,
26
237 with the exception of SDG 14.6 *Prohibit fisheries subsidies*. These patterns are also evident in Figure 3 for the
28
238 other SDGs, for which fishery- and conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP have the greatest potential
30
239 contributions overall, with high complementarity for most goals, and the lowest in SDG 7 *Affordable and clean*
31
240 *energy*.
33
34

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




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




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

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

268 facilities responded through fleet renewals and retrofitting (Klopott, 2018). Also, the designation of shipping-
1
269 related ABMTs (e.g., Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas - PSSAs, special areas, or routing measures) contributes
3
270 to sustainable tourism (SDG 8 *Decent work and economic growth*) by reducing safety risks and significant
5
271 negative impacts of shipping, as in the Malaysia PSSA case (Marine Environment Protection Committee,
7
272 2017). Finally, transboundary protected areas, some particularly connotated peace parks, have been designated
8
10
1273 to simultaneously protect and maintain biological diversity and natural and cultural resources, and to promote
12
1374 peace and cooperation between countries, as in the case of the Red Sea Marine Peace Park (Portman and Teff-
14
1575 Seker, 2016); these clearly contribute to SDG 14 and SDG 16 *Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for*
16
17276 *sustainable development*.
18
19

20
21277 In general, ABMTs have the overarching potential to contribute to SDG 17 *Strengthen the means of*
22
23278 *implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development*, as their designation and
24
2579 implementation is usually the outcome of negotiations and coordination between multiple stakeholders
26
27280 including private actors, non-governmental organizations and States.
28
29

30281 Importantly, several ABMTs can significantly contribute towards SDG 13 *Taking urgent action to combat*
31
32282 *climate change and its impacts*, and to minimize and address the impacts of ocean acidification (SDG target
33
34283 14.3). For instance, the adaptive management of fishery closures and spatially-based rights towards climate-
36
37284 induced shifts of fish stocks can promote long-term resource stewardship (Ojea et al., 2017; Pinsky and Byler,
38
39285 2015). Targeting climate refugia to identify new MPAs is also a promising action to improve ecosystem
40
41286 resilience and to adapt to the effects of climate change (Rilov et al., 2020b). Another example is the proposed
42
43287 10% speed reduction across the global shipping fleet to be implemented throughout shipping-related ABMTs
44
45288 by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), which is estimated to reduce overall greenhouse gas
47
48289 emissions (GHG) by around 13% (Faber et al., 2017; Psaraftis, 2019), and therefore improves the probability
49
50290 of meeting GHG reduction targets by 23% (Comer et al., 2018). The OSPAR Commission for the Protection
51
52291 of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic Ocean and the Commission for the Conservation of
53
54292 Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) emphasize the importance of marine research on ocean
56
57293 acidification to ensure effective management of their MPA networks (Johnson et al., 2018), in line with the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

294 indications of SDG target 14.3 on minimizing and address the impacts of ocean acidification, including through
1
295 enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels.
3

4
296 For several SDGs, limited evidence was found on the potential contributions of ABMTs towards their
6
297 achievement. This is the case, for example, of SDG 14.6 *Prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which*
8
298 *contribute to overcapacity and overfishing*, where no clear contribution was detected for any ABMTs, except
10
299 for fishery-related ones. This is most likely due to the limited spatial nature of the target for which the other
12
300 ABMTs are not suitable instruments. Negative influences of ABMTs on SDG 14 targets and other goals were
15
301 not identified.
17
18

19
20
21
22
23
24

2303 **3.2 Enabling factors and impediments to progress towards SDGs**

25
26
2704 Although it is clear that ABMTs have the potential to contribute substantially to the achievement of SDGs,
28
2705 there are important factors that could reduce or potentially even hinder the realization of such contributions.
29
306 To unlock the full potential of ABMTs for SDG achievement, it is therefore crucial to consider a range of
31
307 context-specific, positive and negative factors (see examples in Table 3, and full description in Tables B.1-
32
308 20). Though the evidence is still limited for several ABMTs (Figs. 4 and 5), overall enabling factors and
35
309 impediments were found to be largely related to questions of governance (e.g., in conservation-oriented
37
310 ABMTs (Ban et al., 2017; Sciberras et al., 2015)), institutional capacity in ABMTs enforcement (e.g., in
39
311 fishery-related ABMTs in ABNJ (Haas et al., 2020)), societal challenges (e.g. raising awareness amongst
41
312 multiple actor groups, such as on cultural and natural heritage along with UCNH sites implementation (Calado
44
313 et al., 2019)), or environmental factors (e.g. with regard to the effectiveness of fishery closures both in areas
46
314 under national jurisdiction (Beare et al., 2013) and ABNJ (Davies et al., 2017)).
48
49

50
315 For instance, a complex picture emerged on whether or not MPA designation and implementation increases
51
316 people's overall food security (SDG 2), as the enabling factors for implementing MPAs towards food security
53
317 are unclear (Charles et al., 2016; Kumar, 2014). Moreover, the impact of MPAs on food security and health of
55
318 local populations is complicated by a range of mediating, historical, political, socioeconomic, ecological,
58
319 seasonal, cultural, and contextual factors (Kamat and Woo Kinshella, 2018). Similarly, the likelihood of
60
61
62
63
64
65

320 reducing impacts from deep sea trawling on seabed habitats and biota by fisheries spatial measures is
 1
 321 influenced by several factors. These range from legal barriers, to the characteristics of the fishery and the
 3
 322 ecosystem, to local, regional or national priorities and resources (McConnaughey et al., 2019), thus affecting
 5
 323 the contribution of fishery-related ABMTs towards SDG targets 14.2, 14.4, and 14.5. Enforcement capacity of
 7
 324 ABMTs also determines the contribution towards SDGs. Adequate human and financial resources to
 8
 10
 1325 implement ABMTs have proven critical for MPAs within national jurisdiction and in ABNJ (Gill et al., 2017),
 12
 1326 as well as for fishery closures (Haas et al., 2020) and UCNH zones (Calado et al., 2019). For example,
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

330 **Table 3:** Examples of enabling and constraining factors of the contribution of ABMTs to attaining SDGs. For
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

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 routeing 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.





Figure 4: Evidence from experts' knowledge, scientific and grey literature on enabling factors and barriers for ABMTs to contribute to the seven SDG 14 targets. Evidence is leveraged from ABMTs cases

336 implemented in areas under national jurisdiction and in ABNJ; boxes provide a summary estimate of
 337 evidence for both enabling factors and barriers. UCNH = Underwater Cultural and Natural Heritage. For
 338 details see Tables B.1-20.



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

346 A general hindering factor pertains to power relationships and equity in ABMTs designation and
 347 implementation, both within and between countries, with respect to the use of marine resources (SDG targets
 348 14.2, 14.5, and 14.7). This is of special concern to Small Island Developing States and Least Developed
 349 Countries, many of which can be affected by activities occurring beyond their national boundaries (Popova et
 350 al., 2019). Concerns for equity in designating ABMTs are particularly relevant in marine areas under national
 351 jurisdiction, for instance with respect to equal access to natural resources for multiple economic actors and

352 local communities (Stead, 2018). Concerns on equity and power relationships have also been raised on ABNJ
1
353 for deep seabed mining, e.g., with regard to Areas of Particular Environmental Interest (APEIs), and on fishery
3
354 closures. For these areas, transparency and inclusiveness are at stake for decision-making mechanisms of the
5
355 International Seabed Authority (Ardron et al., 2018) and some of the Regional Fishery Management
7
356 Organizations (RFMOs) (Haas et al., 2020).
8

10

11

12 357

13

14

15 358 **4. Discussion**

16

17

18 359 This study showed that ABMTs can significantly contribute to SDGs attainment, with fisheries- and
19
20 360 conservation-related ABMTs, and MSP having the greatest potential contributions overall. We also depicted
21
22 361 various ways in which ABMTs can complement the attainment of various SDGs in parallel, showing high
23
24 362 complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most SDGs.
25

26

27

28 363 Importantly, we did not find trade-offs between ABMTs and SDGs. This might be partially attributed to the
29
30 364 methodological approach taken in this research, which focused on potential contributions of ABMTs for
31
32 365 achieving SDGs under ideal circumstances. Further in-depth analysis of existing cases that accounts for
33
34 366 different context-related factors would be valuable to show how the contribution of ABMTs to achieving SDGs
35
36 367 is dependent on case-based implementation. This is also valid for the ABMTs for which we did not find any
37
38 368 apparent contribution towards some SDGs, such as for shipping-related ABMTs towards SDG 5 on *Gender*
39
40 369 *equity*. In these cases, the authors were not aware of any case of ABMT implemented for the purpose of
41
42 370 achieving other SDGs in addition to their primary purpose. This consideration opens for a vast field of
43
44 371 investigation. For instance, intersectional research could provide valuable insights on the contributions of
45
46 372 ABMTs towards the achievement of SDGs 3 *Good health and well-being*, 5 *Gender equity*, 10 *Reduce*
47
48 373 *inequalities*, and on the role of multiple interacting factors shaping marine and coastal social-ecological
49
50 374 systems, such as socio-economics, gendered division of labour, ethnicity, education level. This would help to
51
52 375 unveil the potential contribution of ABMTs to the achievement of all the SDGs, including for those that appear
53
54 376 not strictly related to ABMTs designation and implementation.
55
56
57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

377 Another point to be raised pertains to the questions how the contributions of ABMTs towards the SDGs could
1
378 be determined and monitored for best possible outcomes. The current SDG framework addresses ABMTs and
3
379 their potential to achieve the SDGs in a generic way, with only two targets directly referencing ABMTs: SDG
5
380 targets 14.2 and 14.5 refer respectively to “sustainably manage[ing] and protect[ing] marine and coastal
6
381 ecosystems (...)”, and “conserve[ing] at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas (...)” (United Nations,
8
382 2015); the latter target will likely be overpassed by the CBD’s new post-2020 global biodiversity target which
10
383 is set at the 30% (UNEP, 2020). The indicators defined by the Inter-agency and Expert Group of the UN
12
384 Statistical Commission to monitor these SDG 14 targets only count for the area coverage of ABMTs, with
15
385 indicator 14.2.1 referring to the “Proportion of national exclusive economic zones managed using ecosystem-
17
386 based approaches”, and indicator 14.5.1 to the “Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas”.
18
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

404 because of potentially conflicting visions and agendas between institutions (Singh et al., 2018). Without
1
405 coordination, the co-occurrence of multiple interests and responsible authorities over the same areas can
3
406 significantly hinder a holistic approach to ecosystem-based decision-making and transformation towards
5
407 sustainability (Gjerde and Wright, 2019; Saunders et al., 2019; Vince and Day, 2020) – and hence, towards
7
408 SDGs achievement. Eventually, the implementation of ABMTs can provide nuanced contributions to SDGs
8
10
1109 while responding directly to the specifics of problems they were set up to address, e.g., related to a single
12
13
1410 sector, a single area, or a single management problem.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

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

431 different sectorial organizations can undermine each other. The need for MSP in international waters has long
1
432 been advocated (Ardron et al., 2008; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific
3
433 and Technical Advisory Panel and —GEF, 2012; The Aspen Institute, 2011), and is increasingly argued for as
5
434 part of a more comprehensive approach to ocean sustainability (Ehler, 2020; Wright et al., 2019). However,
7
435 there are no formal MSP initiatives in ABNJ, nor is there a specific policy context for it. The ongoing
8
10 negotiation of a legally-binding instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological
11
12 diversity beyond national jurisdiction provides the opportunity to address the shortcomings of predominantly
13
14 sectoral approaches for ABMT in ABNJ and facilitate the development of cross-sectoral approaches with a
15
16 greater potential to deliver the overall 2030 Agenda. As UN Resolution 69/292 (UN, 2015) on the development
17
18 of such a new legal instrument included a provision that it should “not undermine” relevant existing legal
19
20 instruments and frameworks and relevant global, regional, and sectoral bodies in ABNJ, it will be important
21
22 that a “narrow” interpretation of this provision will be avoided in the negotiation process (Clark, 2020;
23
24 Scanlon, 2018). Instead, sectoral organisations with mandates in ABNJ, such as the ISA or RFMOs, need to
25
26 adopt coordinated and collaborative approaches that contribute towards the overall objective of the new legal
27
28 instrument. In ABNJ, there are pioneering cases of ABMT applications that have successfully provided
29
30 multiple benefits towards the achievement of SDGs. An example of cross-sectoral cooperation is the
31
32 development of a regional network of MPAs in ABNJ in the North-East Atlantic. This world’s first MPA
33
34 network in ABNJ was established by the OSPAR Commission and largely corresponds to fisheries closure in
35
36 the same area established by the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (Smith and Jabour, 2018). A
37
38 collective arrangement between both organisation helps further cooperation across institutional and sectoral
39
40 barriers and addresses some of the weaknesses of the fragmented governance approach (Kvalvik, 2012;
41
42 NEAFC and OSPAR, 2015).

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 **4. Conclusions** 53

54
55 This study demonstrates the benefits of ABMTs for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and achieving
56
57 SDG 14 and other related SDGs. However, without much needed transformations in the governance of
58
59 ABMTs, the largely fragmented governance of ABMTs might hamper the implementation of the holistic 2030
60
61

458 Agenda with its indivisible set of SDGs. Here, the 2030 Agenda might not only serve as goal-based governance
1
459 framework within which ABMTs are implemented, it could also drive change that serves the development of
3
460 novel holistic ocean governance approaches needed, e.g., in the context of the proposed post-2020 Global
5
461 Biodiversity Framework putting forward new global targets to ensure all sea areas are under integrated
7
462 biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and at least 30 per cent globally of all sea areas are conserved through
8
10 protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (CBD, 2021).

12
13
1464 To increase the opportunities to achieve the 2030 Agenda and associated SDGs, coastal states should address
15
1465 relevant contextual factors and strengthen the coordinated, equitable and inclusive applications of ABMTs.

17
18466 There is an urgent need to move beyond the current sectoral approach in ABMTs, and to advance strategies
19
20467 and governance arrangements for coordinated actions between multiple types of ABMTs. In contrast to a
21
22468 sectoral ABMT approach, the adoption of a holistic perspective that promotes the coordinated and coherent
23
24469 implementation of ABMTs will amplify associated co-benefits for multiple SDGs, both within and beyond
26
27470 national jurisdiction.

28
29
30471 Overcoming potential conflicts and competing interests that hinder the achievement of the SDGs requires not
31
32472 only consistent coordination and cooperation between ABMT initiatives, but also the identification of
33
34473 overarching goals to be achieved and towards which the different ABMT initiatives can converge through
35
36474 multilevel governance agreements over multi-administrative boundaries and responsibilities. SDGs in itself
38
39475 are an attempt to provide such overarching goals to reduce potential conflicts between multiple policy
40
41476 objectives. Integrated ABMTs can become a key tool to operationalize and implement SDGs in the ocean.

42
43477 Future research needs to establish an indicator framework for assessing and monitoring implementation and
44
45478 effectiveness of ABMTs and their support of SDG attainment.

47
48
49479
50
51
52480 **Acknowledgments**

53
5481 This research was conducted in the framework of COST action on “Ocean Governance for Sustainability -
55
56482 challenges, options and the role of science”, CA15217, within the Working Group 2 “Area Based
57
58483 Management” activities. We would like to thank COST for the funding that made the cooperation amongst the
59
60484 authors, and thus this article, possible. EG partially acknowledges also funding from PORTODIMARE

485 “geoPORtal of TOols & Data for sustaInable Management of coAstal and maRine Environment” (2018-2020),
1
286 Adriatic-Ionian Programme INTERREG V-B Transnational 2014-2020, grant no. 205, and from the European
3
487 Commission, MSCA MEDIX (grant no. 893614-4); AQ partially acknowledges the Project SIMAtlantic (grant
5
688 no. EASME/EMFF/2018/1.2.1.5); MLF partially acknowledges the Portuguese Foundation for Science and
7
889 Technology (FCT), with a Do*Mar programme PhD grant (PD/BD/113485/2015); MM partially
9
10 acknowledges FCT, with a PhD grant (SFRH/BD/138422/2018). AQ, FA, MLF, LS, MM, CP partially
11
1290 acknowledge the financial support to FCT/MCTES for the financial support to CESAM
13
1491 (UIDP/50017/2020+UIDB/50017/2020), through national funds. CFS partially acknowledges funding from
15
1692 FCT research contract 2020.03704.CEECIND, research grant PTDC/CTA-AMB/30226/2017, and MARE
17
1893 strategic project UID/MAR/04292/2019. NV partially acknowledges also funding from the Romanian National
19
2094 Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, grants no. CNCS-UEFISCDI PN-III-P1-1.1-TE-2016-2491,
21
2295 PN-III-P1-1.1-TE-2019-1444, and the project T4BS (grant no. EASME/EMFF/2019/863621). The work of CP
23
2496 was supported by FCT research contract 2020.02510.CEECIND. The work of BN and SU was supported by
25
2697 the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) through its Research for Sustainable
27
2898 Development program (FONA), and the Federal State of Brandenburg.
29
3099

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

501 **References**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14

15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32
33
34

35
36
37
38
39

40
41
42
43
44

45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57
58
59

60
61
62
63
64
65

Agardy, T., di Sciara, G.N., Christie, P., 2011. Mind the gap: Addressing the shortcomings of marine protected areas through large scale marine spatial planning. *Mar. Policy* 35, 226–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.10.006>

Alfnes, F., Chen, X., Rickertsen, K., 2018. Labeling farmed seafood: A review. *Aquac. Econ. Manag.*
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13657305.2017.1356398>

Ardron, J., Gjerde, K., Pullen, S., Tilot, V., 2008. Marine spatial planning in the high seas. *Mar. Policy* 32, 832–839. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2008.03.018>

Ardron, J.A., Ruhl, H.A., Jones, D.O.B., 2018. Incorporating transparency into the governance of deep-seabed mining in the Area beyond national jurisdiction. *Mar. Policy*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.11.021>

Ban, N.C., Davies, T.E., Aguilera, S.E., Brooks, C., Cox, M., Epstein, G., Evans, L.S., Maxwell, S.M., Nenadovic, M., 2017. Social and ecological effectiveness of large marine protected areas. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* 43, 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.01.003>

Bartram, J., Brocklehurst, C., Bradley, D., Muller, M., Evans, B., 2018. Policy review of the means of implementation targets and indicators for the sustainable development goal for water and sanitation. *npj Clean Water* 1, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41545-018-0003-0>

Beare, D., Rijnsdorp, A.D., Blaesberg, M., Damm, U., Egekvist, J., Fock, H., Kloppmann, M., Röckmann, C., Schroeder, A., Schulze, T., Tulp, I., Ulrich, C., Van Hal, R., Van Kooten, T., Verweij, M., 2013. Evaluating the effect of fishery closures: Lessons learnt from the Plaice Box. *J. Sea Res.*
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2013.04.002>

Bennett, N.J., Calò, A., Di Franco, A., Niccolini, F., Marzo, D., Domina, I., Dimitriadis, C., Sobrado, F., Santoni, M.C., Charbonnel, E., Trujillo, M., Garcia-Charton, J., Seddiki, L., Cappanera, V., Grbin, J., Kastelic, L., Milazzo, M., Guidetti, P., 2020. Social equity and marine protected areas: Perceptions of small-scale fishermen in the Mediterranean Sea. *Biol. Conserv.* 244, 108531.

526 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2020.108531>
1
2
3 527 Cai, J., Zhao, D., Varis, O., 2021. Match words with deeds: Curbing water risk with the Sustainable
4
5 528 Development Goal 6 index. *J. Clean. Prod.* 318, 128509.
6
7 529 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2021.128509>
8
9
10 530 Calado, H., Papaioannou, E.A., Caña-Varona, M., Onyango, V., Zaucha, J., Przedzimirska, J., Roberts, T.,
11
12 531 Sangiuliano, S.J., Vergilio, M., 2019. Multi-uses in the Eastern Atlantic: Building bridges in maritime
13
14 532 space. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.03.004>
15
16
17 533 CBD, 2021. First draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Convention on Biological
18
19 534 Diversity, UN Environment Programme. New York.
20
21
22 535 Charles, A., Westlund, L., Bartley, D.M., Fletcher, W.J., Garcia, S., Govan, H., Sanders, J., 2016. Fishing
23
24 536 livelihoods as key to marine protected areas: insights from the World Parks Congress. *Aquat. Conserv.*
25
26 537 *Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 26, 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2648>
27
28
29
30 538 Clark, N.A., 2020. Institutional arrangements for the new BBNJ agreement: Moving beyond global, regional,
31
32 539 and hybrid. *Mar. Policy.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104143>
33
34
35 540 Comer, A.B., Ph, D., Chen, C., Rutherford, D., Ph, D., 2018. Relating short-term measures to IMO 's
36
37 541 minimum 2050 emissions reduction target. International Council on Clean Transportation. Working
38
39 542 paper 2018-13 (No. 13).
40
41
42
43 543 Convention on Biological Diversity, 2010. Conference of the Parties Decision X/2: Strategic plan for
44
45 544 biodiversity 2011–2020, Document UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/X/2. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12383>
46
47
48 545 Davies, T.K., Mees, C.C., Milner-Gulland, E.J., 2017. Use of a counterfactual approach to evaluate the effect
49
50 546 of area closures on fishing location in a tropical tuna fishery. *PLoS One.*
51
52 547 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174758>
53
54
55 548 Day, J.C., Kenchington, R.A., Tanzer, J.M., Cameron, D.S., 2019. Marine zoning revisited: How decades of
56
57 549 zoning the Great Barrier Reef has evolved as an effective spatial planning approach for marine
58
59 550 ecosystem- based management. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 29, 9–32.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 551 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3115>
1
2
- 552 De Santo, E.M., 2013. Missing marine protected area (MPA) targets: How the push for quantity over quality
4
553 undermines sustainability and social justice. *J. Environ. Manage.*
6
554 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.01.033>
8
9
- 555 Di Ciommo, R.C., Schiavetti, A., 2012. Women participation in the management of a Marine Protected Area
11
556 in Brazil. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 62, 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2012.02.010>
12
13
14
- 557 Ehler, C.N., 2020. Two decades of progress in Marine Spatial Planning. *Mar. Policy* 104134.
16
558 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104134>
17
18
19
- 559 Ehler, C.N., Douvère, F., 2009. Marine Spatial Planning: A Step-by-step Approach toward Ecosystem-based
21
560 Management, IOC Manuals and Guides. <https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2010.100>
22
23
24
- 561 Elsner, P., Suarez, S., 2019. Renewable energy from the high seas: Geo-spatial modelling of resource
27
562 potential and legal implications for developing offshore wind projects beyond the national jurisdiction
29
563 of coastal States. *Energy Policy* 128, 919–929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.01.064>
31
32
- 564 European Commission, 2019. EU policies and actions related to Sustainable Development Goals and targets,
34
565 Goal 7 Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all [WWW Document].
36
566 URL https://ec.europa.eu/sustainable-development/goal7_en#target-7-a (accessed 4.7.20).
37
38
39
- 567 Faber, J., Huigen, T., Dagmar, N., 2017. Regulating speed: a short-term measure to reduce maritime GHG
41
568 emissions. Delft, NL.
42
43
44
- 569 Frascchetti, S., Pipitone, C., Mazaris, A.D., Rilov, G., Badalamenti, F., Bevilacqua, S., Claudet, J., Caric, H.,
46
570 Dahl, K., D’Anna, G., Daunys, D., Frost, M., Gissi, E., Göke, C., Goriup, P., Guarnieri, G., Holcer, D.,
47
49
571 Lazar, B., Mackelworth, P., Manzo, S., Martin, G., Palialexis, A., Panayotova, M., Petza, D., Rumes,
51
572 B., Todorova, V., Katsanevakis, S., 2018. Light and shade in marine conservation across European and
53
573 contiguous seas. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 5, 420. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00420>
54
55
56
- 574 Gill, D.A., Mascia, M.B., Ahmadi, G.N., Glew, L., Lester, S.E., Barnes, M., Craigie, I., Darling, E.S., Free,
58
59
575 C.M., Geldmann, J., Holst, S., Jensen, O.P., White, A.T., Basurto, X., Coad, L., Gates, R.D., Guannel,
61
62
63
64
65

- 576 G., Mumby, P.J., Thomas, H., Whitmee, S., Woodley, S., Fox, H.E., 2017. Capacity shortfalls hinder
1 the performance of marine protected areas globally. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21708>
2
3
4
578 Gjerde, K., Wright, G., 2019. Towards Ecosystem-based Management of the Global Ocean: Strengthening
6
779 Regional Cooperation through a New Agreement for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine
8
980 Biodiversity in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction. STRONG High Seas Project. Institute for
10
11581 Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS). <https://doi.org/10.2312/iass.2019.055>
12
13
14582 Goetze, J.S., Claudet, J., Januchowski-Hartley, F., Langlois, T.J., Wilson, S.K., White, C., Weeks, R.,
15
1683 Jupiter, S.D., 2018. Demonstrating multiple benefits from periodically harvested fisheries closures. *J.*
17
1884 *Appl. Ecol.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13047>
19
20
21
2285 Grorud-Colvert, K., Sullivan-Stack, J., Roberts, C., Constant, V., Costa, B.H. e, Pike, E.P., Kingston, N.,
23
2486 Laffoley, D., Sala, E., Claudet, J., Friedlander, A.M., Gill, D.A., Lester, S.E., Day, J.C., Gonçalves,
25
2687 E.J., Ahmadi, G.N., Rand, M., Villagomez, A., Ban, N.C., Gurney, G.G., Spalding, A.K., Bennett,
27
2888 N.J., Briggs, J., Morgan, L.E., Moffitt, R., Deguignet, M., Pikitch, E.K., Darling, E.S., Jessen, S.,
29
3089 Hameed, S.O., Carlo, G. Di, Guidetti, P., Harris, J.M., Torre, J., Kizilkaya, Z., Agardy, T., Cury, P.,
31
3290 Shah, N.J., Sack, K., Cao, L., Fernandez, M., Lubchenco, J., 2021. The MPA Guide: A framework to
33
3491 achieve global goals for the ocean. *Science* (80-.). 373. <https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ABF0861>
35
36
37
3892 Haas, B., Haward, M., McGee, J., Fleming, A., 2021. Explicit targets and cooperation: regional fisheries
39
4093 management organizations and the sustainable development goals. *Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law*
41
4294 *Econ.* 21, 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-020-09491-7>
43
44
45
4695 Haas, B., McGee, J., Fleming, A., Haward, M., 2020. Factors influencing the performance of regional
47
4896 fisheries management organizations. *Mar. Policy* 103787.
49
5097 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103787>
51
52
5398 Hák, T., Janoušková, S., Moldan, B., 2016. Sustainable Development Goals: A need for relevant indicators.
54
5599 *Ecol. Indic.* 60, 565–573. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2015.08.003>
56
57
58600 IOC-UNESCO, DG MARE, 2017. Joint roadmap to accelerate maritime/marine spatial planning processes
59
60601 worldwide (MSP). In 2nd International Conference on Marine/Maritime Spatial Planning, Paris,
61
62
63
64
65

- 602 France. . Paris.
1
2
- 603 Jacquet, J., Pauly, D., 2007. Funding Priorities: Big Barriers to Small-Scale Fisheries.
4
604 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00978.x>
6
7
- 605 Johnson, D., Adelaide Ferreira, M., Kenchington, E., 2018. Climate change is likely to severely limit the
9
606 effectiveness of deep-sea ABMTs in the North Atlantic. *Mar. Policy* 87, 111–122.
11
607 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.09.034>
12
13
14
- 608 Jouffray, J.-B., Blasiak, R., Norström, A. V., Österblom, H., Nyström, M., 2020. The Blue Acceleration: The
16
609 Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean. *One Earth* 2, 43–54.
17
18
610 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2019.12.016>
19
20
21
- 611 Kamat, V.R., Woo Kinshella, M.L., 2018. Food insecurity and coping strategies in a marine protected area in
22
612 southeastern Tanzania. *Ecol. Food Nutr.* 57, 187–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03670244.2018.1455672>
23
24
25
26
27
- 613 Klopott, M., 2018. The Baltic Sea as a model region for green ports and maritime transport. Tallin, EE.
28
29
30
- 614 Kumar, M.S., 2014. Sustainable Management of Fisheries and Aquaculture for Food Security and Nutrition:
31
615 Policies Requirements and Actions. *Agric. Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40003-014-0111-0>
32
33
34
35
- 616 Kvalvik, I., 2012. Managing institutional overlap in the protection of marine ecosystems on the high seas.
36
617 The case of the North East Atlantic. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*
37
38
618 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2011.09.009>
39
40
41
42
- 619 Laffoley, D., Baxter, J.M., Amon, D.J., Claudet, J., Hall-Spencer, J.M., Grorud-Colvert, K., Levin, L.A.,
43
44
620 Reid, P.C., Rogers, A.D., Taylor, M.L., Woodall, L.C., Andersen, N.F., 2020. Evolving the narrative
45
46
621 for protecting a rapidly changing ocean, post-COVID-19. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.*
47
48
622 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3512>
49
50
51
52
- 623 Marine Environment Protection Committee, 2017. Identification and protection of special areas and
53
54
624 particularly sensitivity sea areas, Protection of Pulau Kukup (Kukup Island) and Tanjung Piai (Cape
55
56
625 Piai).
57
58
59
- 626 Mascia, M.B., Claus, C.A., Naidoo, R., 2010. Impacts of marine protected areas on fishing communities.
60
61
62
63
64
65

627 Conserv. Biol. 24, 1424–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01523.x>
1
2
3 628 Mastrandrea, M.D., Mach, K.J., Plattner, G.K., Edenhofer, O., Stocker, T.F., Field, C.B., Ebi, K.L.,
4
5 629 Matschoss, P.R., 2011. The IPCC AR5 guidance note on consistent treatment of uncertainties: A
6
7 630 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)
8
9 631 6
10
11
12 632 McCollum, D.L., Echeverri, L.G., Busch, S., Pachauri, S., Parkinson, S., Rogelj, J., Krey, V., Minx, J.C.,
13
14 633 Nilsson, M., Stevance, A.S., Riahi, K., 2018. Connecting the sustainable development goals by their
15
16 634 energy inter-linkages. *Environ. Res. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaafe3>
17
18
19 635 McConnaughey, R.A., Hiddink, J.G., Jennings, S., Pitcher, C.R., Kaiser, M.J., Suuronen, P., Sciberras, M.,
20
21 636 Rijnsdorp, A.D., Collie, J.S., Mazor, T., Amoroso, R.O., Parma, A.M., Hilborn, R., 2019. Choosing
22
23 637 best practices for managing impacts of trawl fishing on seabed habitats and biota. *Fish Fish.*
24
25 638 <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12431>
26
27
28
29 639 Meehan, M.C., Ban, N.C., Devillers, R., Singh, G.G., Claudet, J., 2020. How far have we come? A review of
30
31 640 MPA network performance indicators in reaching qualitative elements of Aichi Target 11. *Conserv.*
32
33 641 *Lett.* 13, e12746. <https://doi.org/10.1111/CONL.12746>
34
35
36 642 Menegon, S., Depellegrin, D., Farella, G., Gissi, E., Ghezzi, M., Sarretta, A., Venier, C., Barbanti, A., 2018.
37
38 643 A modelling framework for MSP-oriented cumulative effects assessment. *Ecol. Indic.*
39
40 644 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.03.060>
41
42
43
44 645 Muraki Gottlieb, H., Laffoley, D., Gjerde, K., Spadone, A., 2018. Area Based Management Tools, Including
45
46 646 Marine Protected Areas in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction: A Report of the workshop on Area
47
48 647 Based Management Tools, including Marine Protected Areas in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction, 9
49
50
51 648 – 11 October 2018 at IU. Gland.
52
53
54 649 Nash, K.L., Blythe, Jessica L. Cvitanovic, C., Fulton, E.A., Halpern, B.S., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Addison,
55
56 650 P.F.E., Pecl, G.T., Watson, R.A., Blanchard, J.L., 2020. To Achieve a Sustainable Blue Future,
57
58 651 Progress Assessments Must Include Interdependencies between the Sustainable Development Goals.
59
60 652 *One Earth* 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.01.008>
61
62
63
64
65


- 653 NEAFC, OSPAR, 2015. The Process of Forming a Cooperative Mechanism Between NEAFC and OSPAR,
1
654 UNEP.
3
4
- 655 Nilsson, M., Griggs, D., Visbeck, M., 2016. Policy: Map the interactions between Sustainable Development
6
656 Goals. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/534320a>
8
9
- 10657 Nilsson, M., McCollum, D., Echeverri, L.G., Riahi, K., Parkinson, S., International Council for Science
11
12658 (ICSU), 2017. A Guide to SDG Interactions: from Science to Implementation, A Guide To SDG
13
14659 Interactions : From Science To Implementation. Paris. <https://doi.org/10.24948/2017.01>
15
16
- 17660 Obura, D.O., 2020. Getting to 2030 - Scaling effort to ambition through a narrative model of the SDGs. *Mar.*
18
19
20661 *Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103973>
21
22
- 23662 Ojea, E., Pearlman, I., Gaines, S.D., Lester, S.E., 2017. Fisheries regulatory regimes and resilience to climate
24
25663 change. *Ambio*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0850-1>
26
27
- 28664 Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) Initiative, 2017. Pacific North Coast Integrated
29
30665 Management Area Plan: vii + 78 pp.
31
32
- 33666 Picone, F., Buonocore, E., Claudet, J., Chemello, R., Russo, G.F., Franzese, P.P., 2020. Marine protected
34
35667 areas overall success evaluation (MOSE): A novel integrated framework for assessing management
36
37668 performance and social-ecological benefits of MPAs. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 198, 105370.
38
39
40669 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OCECOAMAN.2020.105370>
41
42
- 43670 PICRC, COS, 2019. Palau's National Marine Sanctuary: Managing Ocean Change and Supporting Food
44
45671 Security.
46
47
- 48672 Pinsky, M.L., Byler, D., 2015. Fishing, fast growth and climate variability increase the risk of collapse. *Proc.*
49
50673 *R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 282. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1053>
51
52
- 53674 Popova, E., Vousden, D., Sauer, W.H.H., Mohammed, E.Y., Allain, V., Downey-Breedt, N., Fletcher, R.,
54
55675 Gjerde, K.M., Halpin, P.N., Kelly, S., Obura, D., Pecl, G., Roberts, M., Raitos, D.E., Rogers, A.,
56
57676 Samoilys, M., Sumaila, U.R., Tracey, S., Yool, A., 2019. Ecological connectivity between the areas
58
59677 beyond national jurisdiction and coastal waters: Safeguarding interests of coastal communities in
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 678 developing countries. *Mar. Policy* 104, 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.02.050>
1
2
3 679 Portman, M., Teff-Seker, Y., 2016. Remembering the Red Sea Marine Peace Park, in: Mackelworth, P. (Ed.),
4
5 680 Marine Transboundary Conservation and Protected Areas. Routledge, London, pp. 89–110.
6
7 681 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315724270-14>
8
9
10 682 Psaraftis, H.N., 2019. Speed optimization vs speed reduction: The choice between speed limits and a Bunker
11
12 683 Levy. *Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082249>
13
14
15 684 Reimer, J.M., Devilliers, R., Claudet, J., 2021. Benefits and gaps in area-based management tools for the
16
17 685 ocean Sustainable Development Goal. *Nat. Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00659-2>
18
19
20 686 Reusch, T.B.H., Dierking, J., Andersson, H.C., Bonsdorff, E., Carstensen, J., Casini, M., Czajkowski, M.,
21
22 687 Hasler, B., Hinsby, K., Hyytiäinen, K., Johannesson, K., Jomaa, S., Jormalainen, V., Kuosa, H.,
23
24 688 Kurland, S., Laikre, L., MacKenzie, B.R., Margonski, P., Melzner, F., Oesterwind, D., Ojaveer, H.,
25
26 689 Refsgaard, J.C., Sandström, A., Schwarz, G., Tonderski, K., Winder, M., Zandersen, M., 2018. The
27
28 690 Baltic Sea as a time machine for the future coastal ocean. *Sci. Adv.*
29
30 691 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aar8195>
31
32
33
34 692 Rilov, G., Fraschetti, S., Gissi, E., Pipitone, C., Badalamenti, F., Tamburello, L., Menini, E., Goriup, P.,
35
36 693 Mazaris, A.D., Garrabou, J., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J.,
37
38 694 Katsanevakis, S., 2020a. A fast-moving target: achieving marine conservation goals under shifting
39
40 695 climate and policies. *Ecol. Appl.* 30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2009>
41
42
43
44 696 Rilov, G., Fraschetti, S., Gissi, E., Pipitone, C., Badalamenti, F., Tamburello, L., Menini, E., Goriup, P.,
45
46 697 Mazaris, A.D., Garrabou, J., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J.,
47
48 698 Katsanevakis, S., Benedetti- Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J., Katsanevakis, S.,
49
50 699 Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Danovaro, R., Loiseau, C., Claudet, J., Katsanevakis, S., 2020b. A fast-moving
51
52 700 target: achieving marine conservation goals under shifting climate and policies. *Ecol. Appl.* 30, 1–14.
53
54 701 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2009>
55
56
57
58 702 Roberts, J., Chircop, A., Prior, S., 2010. Area-based management on the high seas: Possible application of
59
60 703 the IMO’s particularly sensitive sea area concept. *Int. J. Mar. Coast. Law* 25, 483–522.
61
62
63
64
65

- 704 <https://doi.org/10.1163/157180810X525403>
1
2
- 305 Rohe, J., Schlüter, A., Ferse, S.C.A., 2018. A gender lens on women’s harvesting activities and interactions
4
506 with local marine governance in a South Pacific fishing community. *Marit. Stud.* 2018 172 17, 155–
6
707 162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40152-018-0106-8>
8
9
- 1008 Saunders, F., Gilek, M., Day, J., Hassler, B., Mccann, J., Smythe, T., 2019. Examining the role of integration
11
1209 in marine spatial planning: Towards an analytical framework to understand challenges in diverse
13
14010 settings. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 169, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.11.011>
15
16
- 17011 Scanlon, Z., 2018. The art of “not undermining”: Possibilities within existing architecture to improve
18
19012 environmental protections in areas beyond national jurisdiction. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*
20
21013 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsx209>
22
23
- 24014 Schmidt, S., Neumann, B., Waweru, Y., Durussel, C., Unger, S., Visbeck, M., 2017. SDG 14 Conserve and
25
26015 sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development, in: Nilsson, M.,
27
28016 Griggs, D., Visbeck, M., Ringler, C., McCollum, D. (Eds.), *A Guide to SDG Interactions: From*
29
30017 *Science to Implementation* . International Council for Science, Paris, pp. 174–214.
31
32018 Schmidt, Stefanie, Neumann, B., Waweru, Y., Durussel, C., Unger, S., Visbeck, M., 2017. SDG14 Conserve
33
34019 and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development, in: Griggs, D.J.,
35
36020 Nilsson, M., Stevance, A.-S., McCollum, D. (Eds.), *A Guide to SDG Interactions: From Science to*
37
38021 *Implementation*. International Council for Science, Paris, pp. 174–218.
39
40022 Sciberras, M., Jenkins, S.R., Mant, R., Kaiser, M.J., Hawkins, S.J., Pullin, A.S., 2015. Evaluating the relative
41
42023 conservation value of fully and partially protected marine areas. *Fish Fish.* 16, 58–77.
43
44024 <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12044>
45
46
47
48
49
- 50025 Secci, M., 2017. Survey and Recording Technologies in Italian Underwater Cultural Heritage: Research and
51
52026 Public Access Within the Framework of the 2001 UNESCO Convention. *J. Marit. Archaeol.*
53
54027 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11457-017-9174-y>
55
56
57
58
- 59028 Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, —
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 729 GEF, 2012. Marine Spatial Planning in the Context of the Convention on Biological Diversity: A study
 1 carried out in response to CBD COP 10 decision X/29. Montreal.
 2
 3
 4
 531 Singh, G.G., Cisneros-Montemayor, A.M., Swartz, W., Cheung, W., Guy, J.A., Kenny, T.A., McOwen, C.J.,
 6
 732 Asch, R., Geffert, J.L., Wabnitz, C.C.C., Sumaila, R., Hanich, Q., Ota, Y., 2018. A rapid assessment of
 8
 933 co-benefits and trade-offs among Sustainable Development Goals. *Mar. Policy*.
 10
 11
 1234 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.030>
 13
 14
 1535 Sowman, M., Sunde, J., 2018. Social impacts of marine protected areas in South Africa on coastal fishing
 16
 1736 communities. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 157, 168–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.02.013>
 18
 19
 2037 Stead, S.M., 2018. Rethinking marine resource governance for the United Nations Sustainable Development
 21
 2238 Goals. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2018.12.001>
 23
 24
 2539 Suárez-de Vivero, J.L., Rodríguez Mateos, J.C., Florido del Corral, D., Barragán, M.J., Calado, H.,
 26
 2740 Kjellevold, M., Miasik, E.J., 2019. Food security and maritime security: A new challenge for the
 28
 2941 European Union’s ocean policy. *Mar. Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103640>
 30
 31
 3242 The Aspen Institute, 2011. *The Shared Future: a report of the Aspen Institute Commission on Arctic Climate*
 33
 3443 *Change*. Washington, DC.
 35
 36
 3744 Thiele, T., Gerber, L.R., 2017. Innovative financing for the High Seas. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw.*
 38
 3945 *Ecosyst.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2794>
 40
 41
 42
 4346 UN, 2015. Development of an international legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on the conservation
 44
 4447 and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. *A/RES/69/292*.
 46
 4748 Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 19 June 2015.
 48
 49
 5049 UNEP, 2020. Zero draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, Convention of Biological Diversity,
 51
 5250 CBD/WG2020/2/3. Kunming, China.
 53
 54
 5551 UNGA, 2007. Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations General Assembly on Oceans and the
 56
 5752 Law of the Sea (10 September 2007), UN Doc. A/62/66/Add.2, paras. 122–161.
 58
 59
 6053 United Nations, 2020. Sustainable Development Goals [WWW Document]. *Sustain. Dev. Goals Knowl.*
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

754 Platf.
1
2
3755 United Nations, 2018. International legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the
4
5756 Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond
6
757 national jurisdiction, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 24 December 2017,
8
9758 A/RES/72/249 [WWW Document]. URL <https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/72/249> (accessed 12.10.20).
10
11
12759 United Nations, 2015. A/RES/70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
13
14760 Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Preamble. United Nations
15
16761 Gen. Assem. Resolut.
17
18
19
20762 Vince, J., Day, J.C., 2020. Effective integration and integrative capacity in marine spatial planning. *Marit.*
21
22763 *Stud.* 19, 317–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40152-020-00167-1>
23
24
25764 Winther, J.G., Dai, M., Rist, T., Hoel, A.H., Li, Y., Trice, A., Morrissey, K., Juinio-Meñez, M.A., Fernandes,
26
2765 L., Unger, S., Scarano, F.R., Halpin, P., Whitehouse, S., 2020. Integrated ocean management for a
28
29766 sustainable ocean economy. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-1259-6>
30
31
32767 World Bank, UNDESA, 2017. The Potential of the Blue Economy: Increasing Long-term Benefits of the
33
34768 Sustainable Use of Marine Resources for Small Island Developing States and Coastal Least Developed
35
36769 Countries, WorldBank.
37
38
39
40770 Wright, G., Gjerde, K.M., Johnson, D.E., Finkelstein, A., Ferreira, M.A., Dunn, D.C., Chaves, M.R., Grehan,
41
42771 A., 2019. Marine spatial planning in areas beyond national jurisdiction. *Mar. Policy.*
43
44772 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2018.12.003>
45
46
47773
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



Legend

- +3 Indivisible - Inextricably linked to the achievement of the target or goal
- +2 Reinforcing - Aids the achievement of the target or goal
- +1 Enabling - Creates conditions that further the target or goal
- 0 Neutral - The contribution to the target or goal is unknown / there is no apparent contribution

1 **Highlights**

- 2 1. Qualitative assessment of Area-Based Management Tools (ABMT) contribution to SDGs
- 3 2. Expert and literature review provided assessment with evidence from existing cases
- 4 3. We found high complementarity and synergy among different ABMTs for most SDGs
- 5 4. Fishery ABMTs, MPAs and MSP contribute mostly to SDG 14 *Life Below Water*
- 6 5. All ABMTs can significantly contribute towards SDG 13 *Climate action*

Author contributions

EG conceived and structured the research, coordinated all the activities, the assessment and the sub-teams work; EG and FM curated the ABMT review; EG, FM, SU co-chaired the 2 workshops for the internal expert assessment; EG, ZK, FM, ARF, SU co-lead the sub-teams; EG, CFZ, ZK, FM, BN, ARF, AQ, SU prepared, curated and edited the ABMTs assessment and related tables for the sub-teams activities; all the authors contributed to the assessment and produced the evidence of the ABMTs contribution towards the SDGs; EG prepared the first draft of the manuscript and the figures; all the authors contributed to the assessment and revised the manuscript.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:



Click here to access/download
Supplementary File
Appendix_tot_final.pdf





Click here to access/download

Data in Brief

DatainBrief_Gissi_Etal_JCP.zip

