

Response to Ota, Allison and Fabinyi on ‘Evolving the narrative for protecting a rapidly changing ocean, post COVID-19’.

Authors: Laffoley, D.^{1*}, Baxter, J.M.², Amon, D.J.³, Claudet, J.⁴, Hall-Spencer, J.M.^{5,6}, Grorud-Colvert, K.⁷, Levin, L.A.⁸, Reid, P.C.^{5,9}, Rogers, A.D.^{10,11}, Taylor, M.L.¹², Woodall, L.C.¹³ and Andersen, N.F.^{14, 15}

* corresponding author

Affiliations:

¹ IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), 28 rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland.

² Marine Alliance for Science and Technology for Scotland, School of Biology, East Sands, University of St Andrews, Fife KY16 8LB, UK.

³ Department of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, London, Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD, UK.

⁴ National Center for Scientific Research, PSL Université Paris, CRIOBE, USR 3278 CNRS-EPHE-UPVD, Maison des Océans, 195 rue Saint-Jacques, 75005 Paris, France.

⁵ School of Marine and Biological Sciences, University of Plymouth, PL4 8AA, UK.

⁶ Shimoda Marine Research Center, University of Tsukuba, Japan.

⁷ Department of Integrative Biology, Oregon State University, 3029 Cordley Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331, USA

⁸ Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, 92093-0218 USA

⁹ The Continuous Plankton Recorder Survey, Marine Biological Association, The Laboratory, Citadel Hill, Plymouth PL1 2PB, UK.

¹⁰ Somerville College, University of Oxford, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6HD

¹¹ REV Ocean, Oksenøyveien 10, NO-1366 Lysaker, Norway.

¹² University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK

¹³ Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Zoology Research and Administration Building, 11a Mansfield Rd., Oxford OX1 3SZ.

¹⁴ Department of Environment and Geography, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK.

¹⁵ Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Penryn, TR10 9FE.

Dan Laffoley <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6338-6244>,

John Baxter <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0847-3318>,

Joachim Claudet <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6295-1061>

Jason M Hall-Spencer <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6915-2518>

Lisa A. Levin <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2858-8622>

Philip C. Reid <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7728-6746>

Alex D Rogers

Lucy C Woodall <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7295-7184>

Kirsten Grorud-Colvert <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4234-4499>

Diva Amon: 0000-0003-3044-107X

Michelle L. Taylor 0000-0001-7271-4385

Natalie Andersen <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1288-2568>

In responding to Laffoley et al. (2020) on ‘Evolving the narrative for protecting a rapidly changing ocean, post COVID-19’, Ota, Allison & Fabinyi (2021) raise three risks that the ‘One Ocean’ concept may convey: 1) it could undermine the adaptability to local contexts in solutions to sustainability problems; 2) it might give the false impression that benefits from the ocean are equitably shared by all; and 3) it potentially overlooks the diversity of knowledge systems and values. We fully agree that local adaptation, equity, and recognition of local knowledge and values are key for pathways towards sustainability transformations.

We present the ‘One Ocean’ concept as an important underpinning for these efforts, not as mutually exclusive to their realization. We state that the ‘One Ocean’ concept is needed to “address the whole Earth-ocean system for better and more equitable social, cultural, economic, and environmental outcomes” (Laffoley et al., 2020). The wholesale impacts we are having on the ocean from climate change and biodiversity loss are having synergistic and overarching effects that encompass local, regional, and global issues and affect all people on Earth, especially those who are most marginalized.

Just as with carbon dioxide emissions that spread from the northern hemisphere throughout the entire atmosphere, the damage done to one part of the ocean often affects other regions and their peoples. Thus, as with climate change itself, the responsibility for high-income nations is disproportionately large when it comes to funding and implementing global to local solutions (Sterling et al., 2020), which must focus on those most impacted. Put simply, strong ocean connections, achieved through mixing, circulation, animal migrations and human activities means that perturbations in one place will affect distant waters and distant peoples. This is emphasized in our paper, as is the need to work across all scales of society and governance.

Since equity and justice are clearly lacking in the distribution of benefits from the ocean (Bennett et al., 2021), the ‘One Ocean’ concept can help in the recognition of the ocean as a common good, not just for the privileged few. This would support the need for preservation and expression of local values, protection of traditional and Indigenous uses of the ocean, and the need to create better instruments for benefits-sharing at multiple scales. The recognition that we share a single planet does not intrinsically overlook the existence of the diversity of local knowledge systems, values, and lifeways, just as for the ‘One Ocean’ concept. Centralized governance and power relationships can undermine such expression which is why polycentric governance which involves a wider range of actors to participate in decision making is increasingly adopted (Rudolph et al., 2020). Further, the recognition that we all share a single ocean can help in the preservation and expression of local values.

The pace of ocean change is accelerating. Identifying and implementing sustainable pathways is urgent, across all scales. Increased levels of ambition are strongly needed to counter the growing impact of ongoing climate disruption and biodiversity loss. The ‘One Ocean’ concept and narrative can help engage stakeholders at all organizational scales. If we wait for too long, even all our ambitions will not be enough to overcome the problems. If we do not have a predominant focus on

a single ocean and ensure there is a clear narrative as a pathway to deliver the necessary actions, then history shows that those problems simply will not be prioritized and addressed. To meet our collective goals, there is therefore an imperative to drop the 's' and embrace the one ocean view.

References

Bennett, N.J., Blythe, J., White, C.S. & Campero, C. (2021). Blue growth and blue justice: Ten risks and solutions for the ocean economy. *Marine Policy*, 125, 104387.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104387>

Laffoley, D., Baxter, J.M., Amon, D.J., Claudet, J., Hall-Spencer, J.M., Grorud-Colvert, K. et al. (2020). Evolving the narrative for protecting a rapidly changing ocean, post COVID-19. *Journal of Aquatic Conservation*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3512>

Ota, Y., Allison, E.H. & Fabinyi, M. (2021). Evolving the narrative for protecting a rapidly changing ocean, post COVID-19. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 1-2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3568>

Rudolph, T.B., Ruckelshaus, M., Swilling, M., Allison, E.H., Österblom, H., Gelcich, S. et al. (2020). A transition to sustainable ocean governance. *Nature Communications*, 11, 3600. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17410-2>

Sterling, E.J., Pascua, P., Sigouin, A., Gazit, N., Mandle, L., Betley, E. et al. (2020). Creating a space for place and multidimensional well-being: lessons learned from localizing the SDGs. *Sustainability Science*, 15, 1129–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00822-w>