Ladies and Gentlemen,
Dear friends,

How can use of the oceans be regulated? How can the damage inflicted upon them be prevented? How can more responsible and sustainable practices be promoted?

In short, how can our civilisation and the seas on which it depends be reconciled?

Ladies and Gentlemen, these are the issues bringing us together today. For me, they are fundamental and I would like to express my deepest thanks to the Dräger Foundation and its directors, who took the initiative for this meeting following on the previous ones in 2011 and 2012.

These issues are key for the environmentalist that I am, who for years, has made nature conservation, and the seas in particular, a permanent commitment.

They are also key for the Head of State that I am, the leader of a small country whose panorama is entirely maritime and whose past, present and future merge with the sea that borders it.

But these issues are also, and more importantly, key for the whole of humanity, who needs to understand that today, as in each phase of its development, the sea carries as many threats as it does opportunities.

Every human-being needs to understand this. Not only the 40% of us who live less than 60 kilometres from the coast, or even the 80% of the global population who, by the end of this century, will be living together on a coastal strip of 100 kilometres.

Maritime issues stretch far beyond local or regional matters, as they determine the major balances of the planet. Biological balance of course, but also climatic, economic and strategic balances.

This needs to be repeated without respite because we are currently faced with dangers of a new dimension.

Firstly there is pollution - land-based or marine - weakening the ecosystems, threatening species and compromising the future of entire regions.
Secondly there is overfishing, which is slowly emptying the seas of their inhabitants, disrupting biological cycles and calling the future of humanity into question, while our food requirements are ever-increasing.

Then there is the exploitation of off-shore fossil resources, especially oil, which is placing new threats over certain particularly vulnerable regions such as the Arctic.

Finally, and most importantly, there is the growth in man-made greenhouse gas emissions with its consequences on the climate and the atmosphere, as well as on the oceans, whose acidification has already reached unprecedented levels in the history of the Earth and is endangering several aspects of underwater life.

In addition to the above identified concerns, there is another problem threatening the oceans: inadequate governance which is inappropriate to these new dangers.

Our international system is struggling to take environmental issues into consideration. These issues are outside the frameworks on which the institutions governing them were founded. Extending beyond borders, driven by an extremely long time frame which does not accept short-term interventions, and above all presuming global action, environmental protection often remains the blind angle of our political systems.

Of course, significant progress has been made over the last few years. Having attended all the major international meetings focused on these issues since the Rio Summit in 1992, I have witnessed the radical changes in mentality that have occurred over the past twenty years. From the United States to China, a new awareness has emerged, which is driving public opinion and, although to a varying and uneven extent, political leaders.

But this momentum is not enough to overcome the inertia of a multilateral system which continues to prioritise national interests. Unfortunately we see this at every international summit: it is difficult to take action faced with a complex and global issue, when the political tools we have available are still essentially national.

This is all the more evident in the case of the oceans, whose situation should call for bold, binding, sometimes painful solutions in the short term, which require strong political will. Despite the progress I mentioned, this remains a problem, as do the international tools and instruments we have available.

The main one is of course the Montego Bay Convention.
The Principality of Monaco, which was one of the first States to sign this Convention, has seen the many areas of progress it has generated over the last thirty years. The definition of the continental shelf and exclusive economic zones, together with the institution of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, represent considerable progress enabling us to address some of the issues encountered by the seas.

But we realise that this text is inadequate in a number of areas, such as the issue of an extended continental shelf, which is currently at the heart of a great deal of questioning, as it determines the ability of States to appropriate offshore resources. More generally, the status of the high seas and the ocean floor is inadequately defined in this Convention.

This is compounded by a global governance framework that is fragmented between several institutions. The FAO is responsible for fisheries management, UNEP for the environment, IMO for shipping, UNESCO for scientific issues... And this institutional fragmentation results in a juxtaposition of international conventions applicable to the marine environment: the Montego Bay Convention therefore, but also the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, just to mention the main ones, not forgetting of course the multiple fisheries agreements...

The proliferation of the parties involved has led to ineffectiveness and wasted energy, due to the lack of a unified work programme and clearly identified authorities.

Consequently, the temptation to hope that all the problems faced by the oceans can be solved by a new global treaty is great - one which will cover the issue of ocean governance, exploitation and regulation. But such hope risks leading to disillusion.

We can all remember the disappointment that has accompanied the majority of the most recent international meetings concerning the environment. The current crisis situation, which is pushing each Nation to focus first and foremost on defending its immediate interests, cannot, I think, be resolved in the short term. Even if the global economic situation improves, which everyone hopes will happen of course, it is unlikely that many sovereign States will easily give up certain privileges for the sake of the greater interest of future generations.

That is why, without however abandoning the hope of a potential universal agreement involving a series of long and uncertain negotiations around the Montego Bay Convention, I believe it is relevant to look for ways of making good use, on an ad hoc basis, of the tools we have at hand.
For example, this is what the Principality of Monaco and my Foundation did three years ago with regard to the bluefin tuna, by bringing its situation to the attention of CITES whose binding powers could have prohibited its international trade. Attacking the key cause of the overfishing of this species could have enabled us to ensure that it is safeguarded. Unfortunately, we came up against the determined opposition of certain States that benefit from such commercial trade...

But this initiative has clearly shown that some current texts could result in action, if there is a clear will. The success, within these same walls, of efforts for the conservation of certain shark species has recently proved this. But over and above the final decision made by CITES, the awareness and media coverage that we managed to generate, resulted in the competent bodies finally imposing the control and monitoring measures that scientists have been recommending for many years: we have witnessed the initial positive results since last year.

Firm determination which is used properly can therefore lead to significant progress. This is also the case at local level. Although the threats hanging over us know no borders, many of them have identified and well-defined causes. And some can be adequately addressed, at least partially, by targeted initiatives.

I am thinking, for example, of coastal pollution. Its prevention depends most often on simple decisions, falling within the scope of mainstream national political authorities, and who can therefore take action, provided that the political will and economic means exist.

Governance efforts can also help drive things forward, as we can see today with the experiences conducted in fifty or so countries concerning "integrated" coastal zone management. The principle is simple: it involves building a partnership between all the players involved in this area in order to promote its sustainable economic development which takes into account biodiversity resources.

Off-shore too, local solutions, developed in a spirit of partnership, have widely proven their worth: such is the case in particular for marine protected areas.

Wherever they have been set up, their efficiency has been shown, whether in terms of biodiversity conservation, the regeneration of resources, the economic and social development of the local populations, or the implementation of innovative cooperation measures, preludes to a new governance of maritime areas.

In some protected areas, the fish stock per square kilometre has increased fourfold in just 5 to 10 years. Following the creation of protected sea areas, fishermen in the Solomon Islands and
Kenya have seen their income double in only 5 years...

Above all, these areas allow for the precious regeneration of wildlife, as we have seen in the Principality where my father initiated this practice over thirty years ago when he created one of the first protected coastal areas in Monaco: the Larvotto Reserve. The Principality also prompted the creation of one of the first preservation areas for marine mammals in the Mediterranean, the Pelegos Sanctuary, which was set up over ten years ago with France and Italy.

An increasing number of States, especially island states, such as Palau, the Cook Islands and the Republic of Kiribati, have now realised the value of such areas. They have been joined by larger-scale countries with greater influence, including Chile, which has created extensive marine areas, and the United States, which has already placed a large number of its maritime areas under protected status.

In total, marine protected areas have increased tenfold over the last decade and the UN estimates that 8.3 million square kilometres are now protected, yet this only represents 2.3% of the globe's oceans.

Therefore, we are still far from the 10% target set in Nagoya in 2010, and even farther from the 20%, which as far as I am concerned, is the level we need to reach in order to protect the oceans effectively. But all around the world, a sweeping movement is underway, which I believe needs to be brought to attention and given support.

Therein lies one of the key levers for improving ocean governance: concerted local action that paves the way for broader cooperation.

Because with marine protected areas, whose benefits are both ecological and economic, comes the prospect of new partnerships and new cooperation for the environment with private stakeholders, serving the populations.

In this context, the true appropriateness of a sustainable development solution comes to the fore. The appropriateness of a solution that does not entail decline or Malthusianism, but responsible growth - i.e. growth which is concerned as much about the well-being of those living today as about the well-being of those who will live tomorrow.

Many companies have already realised the huge potential offered by what is known as "blue growth", based on the responsible use of marine resources. Bio-resources which promise extremely encouraging results, both in terms of economic viability and ecological efficiency.
In many leading-edge sectors such as the chemical and pharmaceutical industries, as well as in the food industry, these new resources have already sketched the outlines of a new economic model which does not sacrifice the future for the present.

It may also be the case in the field of energy, where the use of tides, waves, currents or temperature gradients (as we do it in Monaco for half a century) offers interesting prospects.

This economic model, I believe, is one of the most important issue of this century. Because there is no point in building new ocean governance if this is done outside the realities of the current economy.

These realities are quite simply those of all the men and women living, working and inventing today, who aspire to a world where they can feed themselves, provide for their health and travel according to their needs.

These realities are those of human-beings that will never resign to their children living in worse conditions than they themselves.

Our civilisation is in fact essentially maritime-oriented, whether it comes to transport, energy or food. And it will become increasingly so over the next few decades.

That is why the governance we need to build, in a more efficient manner and as quickly as possible, has to be designed, developed and experimented in close and permanent cooperation with these economic players.

Their capacity to meet the needs of the populations is matched by their ability to invent new solutions for the challenges ahead.

Innovation by private players is, in this respect, a necessity that should be given everyone's support. And one of the responsibilities of the public authorities is to encourage blue growth at every level, by means of economic measures, public commissions, education and training, and above all by supporting research, which plays an irreplaceable role here.

Science is indeed the universal basis of both our knowledge and our capacity for invention. Yet, one of the greatest ills suffered by our oceans and against which we can act decisively, is still our lack of knowledge.

Our understanding of the seas is very limited. Only 10% of all marine fauna is listed and the area of deep ocean floor that we have actually explored with our own eyes barely represents the inner-urban area of a city such as Paris...
Due to this, little is still known about many slow, complex or emerging phenomena. Resolving them will require time, resources and perseverance.

For this, we need to support the scientific community, both politically and financially. This type of investment, we have to realise, is always the most profitable and the most necessary!

When saying this, I cannot help thinking of my great-great-grandfather, Prince Albert I, who was an ardent defender of the seas and one of the founders of modern oceanography. Among the first, he identified the key role of science in the construction of all ambitious action.

Through science, he understood that humanity would be able to acquire the means necessary to address the greatest difficulties it would face, in particular with regard to the mysteries of the oceans, where he knew a part of our future resides.

Presenting his work to the United States Academy of Sciences in Washington, he affirmed: "The time has come for global consideration of the key issues faced by the Ocean and which Humanity needs to embrace using the best means available because they will provide us with the progress that will enable us to vanquish our barbarism more quickly." This was at the end of the First World War, almost a century ago....

Today as in the past, this is the key issue at stake: to allow the sea to become a threat to our future, or to take on the challenge of blue growth and to find, thanks to sound and sustainable ocean management, the inspiration and drive to achieve a further step forward for humanity.

This is the challenge of this conference and the proof of its importance.

Thank you.