

iAtlantic Capacity Building Workshop on Ocean Governance

Date: 09.10.2022

Duration: 10.00 – 16.30

Location: Jurerê Beach Village, Florianópolis, Brazil

Facilitation: Matthew Gianni (DSCC), Ben Boteler, Luise von Pogrell (TMG Think Tank), David Johnson, and Vikki Gunn (Seascope Consultants), José Ángel Pérez (UNIVALI)

Website: <https://www.iatlantic.eu/events-calendar/ocean-governance-training-workshop/>

Background:

The workshop will provide information on the importance of "translating" scientific findings to policy and regulatory action. We will discuss the various means and methods of identifying the scientific information that policymakers and regulators are likely to find relevant and the means by which to effectively interject the information into regulatory processes. We will discuss a number of such processes, for example regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) in the Atlantic that regulate bottom fisheries for their impacts on vulnerable marine ecosystems and the current negotiations at the International Seabed Authority (ISA) to develop regulations needed to protect and preserve the marine environment from the harmful effects of mining activities. We will provide 'real world' examples from these and other organisations on how science has been used to inform the debates and negotiations regarding conservation and sustainable use of the marine environment.

Please note, the working language will be English.

Documents:

- How to write an elevator pitch: session one exercise guidance document
- Science to policy makers: session two exercise guidance document

Agenda

10.00 – 10.30	Welcome and introduction
	<p>Facilitation</p> <p><i>Luise von Pogrell</i></p> <p>Introduction of iAtlantic, presenting aims and structure of workshop</p> <p>Introduction of presenters</p> <p>Tour de table: participants present themselves, their background, and expectations for the Workshop</p>
10.30 – 11.30	Presentations and discussions
<p>30 min (incl. Q&A)</p>	<p><i>International Ocean Governance/ current challenges and opportunities to bringing science to policymakers</i></p> <p><i>Matthew Gianni</i></p> <p>Overview of deep-sea mining negotiations and the International Seabed Authority (ISA)</p> <p>Deep-sea fisheries and measures adopted by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs)</p> <p>Biodiversity Commitments/ UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration</p> <p>Negotiations on the new UN treaty for marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ)</p>
<p>30 min (incl. Q&A)</p>	<p><i>David Johnson</i></p> <p>Negotiations on the new UN treaty for marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ)</p> <p>The ocean and climate change dialogue of the UNFCCC (UN Climate Change treaty)</p> <p>UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) process for describing ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs)</p> <p>Global Biodiversity Targets and Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Decision under negotiation for adoption by the 15th Conference of Parties to the CBD</p> <p>UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development</p>



11:30 - 11.45	Break
11.45 - 12.30	Presentations and discussions
20 min (incl. Q&A)	Ocean Governance in Brazil: the regional and national scale <i>José Ángel Pérez</i>
25 min (incl. Q&A)	From Science to Policy: Lessons from Atlas, iAtlantic and other projects <i>Vikki Gunn</i> Stakeholder engagement Bringing science to policy makers Design of co-creative research and participatory processes
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch break
13.30 – 15.30	Group work: bringing scientific research to policy makers
55 min	Group discussions with a focus on deep-sea research and bringing scientific research to the attention of policy makers <i>Ben Boteler</i> <u>Session 1: Creating a science pitch - convince policy makers that your work is important (individual work)</u> Introduction to exercise (5 min) Writing exercise: Write a 3 min ‘elevator pitch’ on one key message you are your research that policy makers need to understand and its implications for policy (20 min) Opportunity to present pitch and receive feedback by facilitators (30 min)
10 min	<i>David Johnson</i> Science to policy: challenges and opportunities
55 min	<u>Session 2: Pathways to policy - bringing your science to where it is needed</u>

	<p>(group work)</p> <p>Introduction to exercise (5min)</p> <p>Participants will be given an exercise to work on in groups, applying the newly acquired knowledge from the morning session with the focus on identifying necessary steps and the right format to communicate science to an appropriate policy platform (a checklist will provide guidance and the groups will be supported by the facilitators)</p>
15.30 – 15.50	Break
15.50 – 16.20	Reporting back to plenary and closing discussion
16.20 – 16.30	Personal reflections and development of take-home messages

Speakers

Matthew Gianni (DSCC)

Matt is an independent consultant, advisor and advocate for marine conservation based in the Netherlands. He is a co-founder of the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition and currently serves as its Political and Policy Advisor. He has been involved in international fisheries and marine conservation policy, law and treaty negotiations for almost 30 years at the United Nations General Assembly, UN summits, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, regional fisheries management organizations and the International Seabed Authority.

Ben Boteler (TMG Think Tank)

Ben Boteler's work at TMG covers regional ocean governance for the high seas. His research focuses on the socioeconomic uses and benefits of the marine environment, and facilitates the development of comprehensive, cross-sectoral approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity.

Luisse von Pogrell (TMG Think Tank)

Luisse is a Research Associate at TMG Think Tank for Sustainability working on ocean governance issues. Before that, she worked at the Institute of Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS) with a focus on deep seabed mining issues.

David Johnson (Seascope Consultants)

Prof. David Johnson is an independent marine conservation consultant. He is a Director of Seascope Consultants and Coordinator of the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative. Former



Executive Secretary to the OSPAR Commission (2006-2012), David has an academic background and was previously a Royal Navy officer. He works at the interface of marine science and policy, has undertaken high-level consultancies for a range of UN agencies, is actively contributing to key current ocean governance negotiation processes, and has an extensive publication record.

Vikki Gunn (Seascope Consultants)

Dr. Vikki Gunn trained as a geologist and completed her PhD in mining geology and petrology at the University of Southampton in 2002. Shortly afterwards, Vikki took up a position as a Project Manager at the National Oceanography Centre, and now has 20 years' experience in managing EC-funded multidisciplinary marine research, dating back to the EUROSTATAFORM project in Framework Five. She was the Project Manager for the FP6 HERMES project and supervised the project management team for the FP7-funded HERMIONE project, as well as leading the outreach and training activities for HERMIONE. Vikki also has over 4 years' experience as the senior administrator and divisional manager for the Directorate of Science and Technology at the National Oceanography Centre in Southampton (2009-2013). Vikki joined Seascope Consultants in 2013, bringing expertise in project coordination, communication, stakeholder liaison, project planning, reporting and reviews. She managed the EU H2020 MIDAS project on deep-sea mining and currently provides programme management and coordination support for the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI). She also led the knowledge sharing activities for the H2020 STEMM-CCS project, and currently coordinates the work on capacity building, policy, stakeholder engagement and outreach in the iAtlantic programme.

José Ángel Pérez (UNIVALI)

Dr. José Ángel Pérez currently works at the School of Marine Science and Technology, University of Vale do Itajaí (Univali). Angel does research in Biological Oceanography, fisheries research and deep-sea biology. He coordinates the South-West Atlantic component of the iAtlantic Project.

How to write an elevator pitch: session one exercise guidance document

Objective:

The aim of this session is for each participant to write a short (2-3) minute elevator pitch about their research and findings (or one selected aspect of their work) which they believe is important for current or future policy developments. For example, does a critical ecosystem require further protection; should a human activity be limited or stopped from a defined area; or is more knowledge and information required before an activity should take place?

What is the purpose of an elevator pitch?

You certainly know the (scientific) value of your own research. However, to verbally communicate the relevance of your work, especially to a policy maker, in a brief amount of time is incredibly difficult. Having a well-practiced “elevator pitch” prepared will enable you to create interest in your research and the importance of your findings for policy.

The aim of an elevator pitch is to introduce yourself, effectively communicate one or two key points from your research and form a connection with your listener. The term elevator pitch comes from the fictional scenario of riding the elevator with someone you have been hoping to meet and share your findings with. On average, an elevator ride takes under a minute, leaving you with very little time to pitch yourself and your key point(s) before that person gets off the elevator again.

In this short moment, what do you want to say?

How to prepare an elevator pitch?

Your elevator pitch may need to be a little flexible, depending on whom you are talking to and the given setting. Speaking about your research with a high-level politician at a networking event might be different than explaining it to a desk officer from your national government. Think about their professional role and why you are telling them about your research and adapt the focus of your pitch accordingly. Are you trying to convince someone that your findings are important for national level decision-making or for their technical decisions regarding the implementation of policy?

Regardless of who you are pitching to, adding context to your research and explaining why it matters is always a key component of gathering interest with your listener. Especially when talking to policy makers, you might want to set our work in relation to achieving benefits of ocean health and human well-being. Consider the bigger picture when articulating the purpose of your work.

The full extent of your research is likely too abstract to explain in 2-3 minutes. Remember, that your primary aim is trying to get your listener(s) interested in learning more about your work and scheduling a meeting with you.

Do's:

- Articulate the purpose of your work.
- Add context that demonstrates applicability to a broader topic / discussion/ problem.
- Eliminate jargon, acronyms, and detailed scientific terminology. Keep it as simple as possible.
- Add the most important keywords.
- Stay flexible. Monitor your listener's reaction and adapt your pitch if needed, e.g. ask a question/ let them ask a question or add an interest-sparking detail.
- Come up with a catchy analogy or visual image. Being able to relate to or visualise your work, will gain people's attention and make it easier for them to remember.
- Make eye contact and use natural body language to convey enthusiasm and create connection.

Don'ts:

- Don't just learn your pitch by heart. Think of your pitch as a piece of conversation rather than a presentation.
- Don't tell them everything there is to know. Stick to one or two key messages.
- Don't mention uncertainties and variants. While they are important, they will undermine your credibility (to non-scientists) and the perceived validity of your work.
- Don't talk too fast and allow small pauses. You are confronting your listener with new information that they will need time to absorb.

Additional Sources and examples:

Kwok, R. (2013): Two minutes to impress. Nature (Vol. 494)

<https://www.nature.com/articles/nj7435-137a>

Neuropsychologist Liza Cornet - winner of the National Famelab Science Pitching Competition 2020 shares 3 tips based on personal experience that can help you design your pitch. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pnzbdOI9Bw0>

Transforming your pitch into a presentation:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P_Wjamvzp4o

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pvjPzsLlyGw>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3RgUR2nVcjs>

Science to policy makers: session two exercise guidance document

Policy makers are busy people - but you have important findings that they need to learn about - how will you do this?

Objective:

The aim of this session is to identify potential pathways for researchers and scientists to bring their important findings into relevant policy discussions and thereby influence decision makers to make better, more informed decisions.

Instructions:

Form small groups to discuss and answer the following questions. For each question, a variety of considerations and tips are provided to help you think about how to address the question. Take notes in the space provided, including questions or uncertainties that might arise. Feel free to go online to investigate and learn more while working on the questions.

Present your group findings in a roadmap to bring your research to the attention of the appropriate policy makers. Report on what you were able to find during the exercise and what additional information you would need to obtain. There are likely to be more than one way - multiple pathways - to influence a regulatory process.

Note: You may want to return to some questions as the discussion progresses and reconsider earlier points. The pathway from research to impact is seldom linear. Research is not the only factor influencing policy design.

Identifying research findings important for policy

What is the policy relevant key message you want to communicate to policy makers?

What to consider:

Think about how your research findings are important to policy and policy makers, including what the anticipated use of your work would be, the potential policy impact you could make, and why your research should be taken up. Research can be used in different ways, such as to solve a specific problem, close a knowledge or information gap, or provide direction to a critical discussion or policy question. Research may be needed to meet existing requirements (e.g. targets, criteria, or indicators) or help to inform future policy implementation (e.g. design of measures or strategies for monitoring).

Tip: Focus on creating simple, key messages with explicit and defined messages for policy makers. Ensure that your messages are backed by scientific methods and clear results.

Identifying the appropriate policy process(es) for your findings

What is the appropriate policy process(es) where research findings could make an important difference?

What to consider:

Discussions and critical topics may vary between local, national, regional and global governance levels. Are you aware of any ongoing policy discussions related to your research and findings? Can you identify what entity is responsible for your issue, and what structures and functions it has? Can you identify if there are legal provisions that your research is applicable to?

Tip: Within policy processes some countries (or country alliances) might have a strong position on the subject(s) relevant to your work. These countries might have critical influence within the policy discussion, or you may need to consider the reasoning for their position. Consider also whether you might have easier access to some states than others. Some States may hold more power than others on specific topics.

Identifying potential pathways to engage in policy process(es)

What pathways, such as scientific committees or advisory bodies, exist which you could use to engage in the policy process?

What to consider:

Decision making bodies (e.g. RFMO Commission, Conference of Parties, Council of the ISA etc.) within policy processes will likely have intermediate bodies or meetings to review scientific advice. These subcommittees, subsidiary bodies, etc, might first feed into Scientific Committee meetings through formal or informal working groups by reviewing scientific advice before the meeting of the decision making body. Consider also the agencies from the countries that participate in the various committees or bodies, e.g. fisheries ministry, environment ministry, national agency etc.. Consider also any intergovernmental or non-governmental observers participating in these processes – e.g. scientific organizations (e.g. DOSI), universities/research institutes or projects, environmental organizations/NGOs, intergovernmental organizations (e.g. FAO), industry associations.



Tip: Identify the bodies, when they meet and, if possible, the participation by type of participant in each (e.g. scientists only; country representatives only; open to non-state observers etc). Some of this information may be gleaned from looking at the reports of past meetings and their lists of participants. Possibly identify people from your network that already engage with these discussions and identify possible entry points.

Identifying the appropriate timeline for engaging in policy

Where in the policy process is there an opportunity to deliver your findings? (e.g., COP, scientific and technical body, science-focused subsidiary bodies, etc.)

What to consider:

Within policy processes, decision making bodies and subsidiary bodies may meet at regular, or irregular, intervals. It will be important to identify when these groups meet, including timelines (and rules) for e.g. submitting working documents or participating in their meetings. These processes can take weeks, months, or even years - so early identification of their timeline(s) will help to ensure important opportunities are not missed.

Tip: Map out a timeline for influence – the progression of the advisory processes - e.g. working group X feeds into subcommittee Y which feeds into the meeting of the Scientific Committee which formulates advice to the regulators/Contracting Parties).

Identifying the most effective ways to communicate your findings

What is the most effective format(s) to deliver your results into the policy process?

What to consider:

There are a number of ways in which you can bring your research findings to the policy process and should be based on the above (pathways, timelines, etc.) and what aim you are seeking to achieve. Some examples include:

- Through a science oriented or environmental NGO or industry association with observer status. How?
- Getting onto a government delegation. Which government agency or ministry. How?
- Presenting information at a 'side event' to a meeting.
- Through a university or research institute participating in or otherwise providing advice to national delegation or international regulatory process.

Tip: Communicating the relevance of your research might need to be tailored to different stakeholders or stakeholder groups. Consider how your findings relate to a broader topic and what benefits your results might offer a certain stakeholder group.



iAtlantic
INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT OF ATLANTIC
MARINE ECOSYSTEMS IN SPACE AND TIME

Identifying and anticipating challenges (optional)

What challenges might arise when engaging in the policy process(es)?

What to consider:

There may be challenges which impede the uptake of your results such as frequent staff changes (if you know of an upcoming change, ask to be introduced to their successor), diverging interests and timelines amongst key stakeholders, or the necessary time investment by researchers to translate the result and develop policy advocacy products for the different audiences.

Tip: Engage stakeholders in participatory approaches to coproduce knowledge and inform policy and thereby also build relationships and trust, produce outputs tailored to policy needs. Consider the policy makers' receptive capacity (some times are more busy than others, Capacity includes: the value placed on research by the organisation / individual policymakers, the tools and systems the organisation available to support research engagement; and the skills and knowledge of staff).