UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/1

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Working Documents

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.0.1	Provisional Agenda
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.0.2	Presentation of the International Ocean Institute to the Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, with identification of areas of mutual interest and suggestions for co-operation

Agenda item 1

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.1	Status of Implementation of the Decisions of the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.2	Inventory of the Work in Chemicals Undertaken by Regional Seas Programmes
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.3	Ecosystem-based Management of Fisheries: Opportunities

	and Challenges for Coordination between Marine Regional Fisheries Bodies and Regional Seas Conventions
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.4	Ecosystem-based Management of Fisheries: The Way Forward
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.5	Opportunities for Cooperation and Co-ordination between Basel Convention on Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal and the Regional Seas Conventions

Agenda item 2

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.2.1	Feasibility for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment (UNEP Governing Council decision 21/13)
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.2.2	Proceedings of the First Feasibility Study for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment

Agenda item 3

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.3.1	Regional Seas and the Private Sector: The case of the Mediterranean region. Introductory note for a discussion

Agenda item 4

UNEP/IGM/2/4	Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion
UNEP/IGM/2/5	Proposal for a Systematic Approach for Co-ordination of Multilateral Environmental Agreements
UNEP/IGM/4/	The Decision-Making Process of Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Case for Enhanced Coordination
UNEP/IGM/4/	Implementing the Clustering Strategy for Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Framework
UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/7	Improving the Implementation of the Global Programme of

	Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities through Coastal and Ocean Governance

Agenda item 5

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.5.1	A Summary of Critical Problems and Issues Facing Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

Information Documents

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/1	List of Documents
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/2	Caspian Sturgeon Resources: Stakeholders' Meeting (Palais de Nations, 12-13 July 2001)
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/3	Geographical Overlapping between Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans and Marine Regional Fisheries Bodies
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/4	Provisional List of Participants
UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/5	Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the Secretariat of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific
UNEP(DEC)/RS.3.8	Report of the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/10	Report of the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
UNEP(DEC)/RS.3.1.1	Status of Implementation of the Decisions of the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
UNEP/IGM/2/INF/3	International Environmental Governance: Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.0.1

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Provisional Agenda

CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

6 November 2001

Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Background:

The regional seas programme, initiated in 1974, has remained the central UNEP programme providing the major legal, administrative, substantive and financial framework for the implementation of Agenda 21, and its chapter 17 on oceans in particular. It is today an integral part of UNEP's Water Policy and Strategy. The regional seas programme is based on periodically revised action plans adopted by high-level intergovernmental meetings and implemented, in most cases, in the framework of legally binding regional seas conventions, under the authority of the respective contracting parties or intergovernmental meetings.

Currently, 17 regions are covered by adopted action plans and twelve of the action plans are supported by regional seas conventions. The geographic regions considered as covered include: the Mediterranean, West and Central Africa, Eastern Africa, the East Asian Seas, the South Asian Seas, the North-West Pacific, the Persian and Arabian Gulf, the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, the South Pacific, the South-East Pacific, the Wider Caribbean, the Northeast Pacific, the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, the North-East Atlantic, the Baltic Sea and the Arctic. UNEP facilitated the negotiations of the 13 regional seas conventions and action plans in the developing world. Negotiations were recently completed on the newest regional seas convention, which is expected to be signed in a Conference of Plenipotentiaries in February 2002: the Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Northeast Pacific.

Whenever appropriate, the regional seas conventions and action plans have served as a main mechanism for implementing various ocean-related global initiatives and conventions. The more mature regional seas conventions have developed protocols complimentary to global conventions and agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), the Basel Convention, and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA). The overall coordination provided by UNEP ensures that the activities of the regional seas conventions and action plans that it has helped negotiate, although implemented regionally, remain essentially global in nature.

A focal area of UNEP is the strengthening of the regional seas conventions and action plans. The recommendations and cooperative arrangements emanating from the Second and Third Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, which took place respectively in The Hague, 5-8 July 1999 and in Monaco, 6-11 November 2000, have served as the blueprint for UNEP's ongoing efforts in the

strengthening of the regional seas conventions and action plans. Following The Hague meeting, in 1999-2000, UNEP has provided support to the thirteen regional seas conventions and action plans in the developing world. UNEP has also encouraged orizontal cooperation between the mature and less developed regional seas programmes.

Our efforts continue in strengthening the implementation of the African regional seas conventions and in 2001 the Joint Umbrella Mechanism for the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions became operational.

During 2000-2001, UNEP as Secretariat of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) and through its GPA Coordination Office in The Hague, the Netherlands, has focused its efforts on three main issues: (i) implementation of the GPA strategic action plan on municipal wastewater and development of its associated Recommendations for Decision-Making on Municipal Wastewater; (ii) further development of the GPA clearing-house mechanism (including the central node, pollutant source category nodes and regional nodes) for exchange and mobilization of experience and expertise and capacity-building; and (iii) global and regional preparatory processes and activities leading to the first intergovernmental review meeting on implementation of the GPA, which will take place immediately after this Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans.

Objectives of the Meeting

As stressed at the 20th Session of the Governing Council (Nairobi, 1-5 February 1999), a top priority of UNEP's Subprogramme on Environmental Conventions is the continued revitalization and strengthening of the regional seas conventions and action plans. Specifically, the Governing Council in decision 20/19A stressed "the need for the United Nations Environment Programme to strengthen the regional seas programme as its central mechanism for implementation of its activities relevant to chapter 17 of Agenda 21".

To this end, this meeting of the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans has the following specific objectives:

- To channel more effectively UNEP programmatic support to the regional seas conventions and action plans, particularly in areas that are complimentary to UNEP's programme of work (2000-2001 and 2002-2003);

- To promote horizontal ties among regional seas conventions and action plans;

- To strengthen the linkages between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the GPA through agreed upon concrete actions, particularly regarding the role of the secretariats in the implementation of the UNEP/GPA Strategic

Action Plan on Sewage, the GPA clearing-House and the 2001 GPA Intergovernmental Review Meeting;

- To strengthen the linkages between the regional seas conventions and action plans and other global conventions and agreements, specifically the CBD, CITES, the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals, the Basel Convention, the IMO conventions and the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

- To review follow-up to the recommendations of the Second and Third Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans.

Special objective: The Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions have also become an important forum for discussing priority issues of common concern among the directors of the secretariats of regional seas secretariats. The Monaco Meeting, which brought together the directors or bureau members of the world's seventeen regional seas conventions and action plans, as well as the directors or representatives of eight global environmental agreements, agreed that a major objective of the Fourth Global Meeting should be the initiation of a dialogue with the private sector. For this meeting, representatives of the shipping, oil and chemicals industries have been invited to participate in this initial dialogue, with a view to engaging private industry more actively in support of regional seas conventions and action plans.

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Wednesday, 21 November 2001

09:00 - 09:30 **Opening of the meeting**

a. Introductory Statement by the Representative of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

b. Statement by the Representative of the Government of Canada

09:30 - 10:30 **Special guest**: Professor Elisabeth Mann Borgese, Honorary Chair of the International Oceans Institute (IOI), who will address the meeting on areas of mutual interest and suggestions for co-operation

10:30 - 13:00 **Agenda item 1**: Progress Report on Follow-up to the Decisions of the 2nd and 3rd Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (The Hague and Monaco)

a. Follow-up to the consultation held in Monaco on Sturgeon

b. Progress in the implementation of the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN)

c. Intergovernmental Review of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities

13:00 - 14:30 Lunch Break

14:30 - 18:30 **Agenda item 1 continued**:

d. Joint UNEP/FAO Paper on Ecosystem-Based Management of Fisheries: Opportunities and Challenges for Coordination between Marine Regional Fisheries Bodies and Regional Seas Conventions

e. Opportunities for Cooperation between the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements

of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal and the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

Thursday, 22 November 2001

09:00 - 13:00 **Agenda item 2:** Global Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment

a. Collaboration between the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO - Global Ocean Observing System (IOC-GOOS) and the regional seas conventions and action plans

b. Re-tooling of the Global International Water Assessment (GIWA)

c. Implementation of UNEP Governing Council Decision 21/13 on the Global Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment

13:00 - 14.30: Lunch Break

14:30 - 18:30 **Agenda item 3:** Panel discussion on cooperation between the private sector and the regional seas conventions and action plans--a dialogue with representatives of the shipping, oil and chemicals industries

Moderator: Lucien Chabason, Coordinator of the Barcelona Convention Secretariat, who will initiate the dialogue with a presentation on cooperation with the private sector in the implementation of the Mediterranean Action Plan.

Panelists:

Ian White, Managing Director, The International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Ltd. (ITOPF)

Masamichi Hasebe, Legal Counsel, International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC)

Eric Calonne, General Manager, Environment and Safety, TotalFinaElf; and Chair of the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA) Global Initiative and Vice-Chair of IPIECA's Oil Spill Working Group

Chemical Industry Representative (to be confirmed)

Alfredo Ruiz, President, Latin American Crop Protection Federation (LACPA) (to be confirmed)

Friday, 23 November 2001

09:00 - 10:30	**Agenda item 4**: The on-going discussions on international environmental governance: the role of regional seas conventions and action plans
10:30 - 13:30	**Agenda item 4**: Round-table discussion with secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans
13:30 - 15:00	Lunch Break
15:00 - 18:30	**Agenda item 5**: Adoption of the report of the meeting
18:30	**Agenda item 6**: Closure of the meeting

Participants invited :

1. Coordinators of Secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans:
   a. Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona)
   b. Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (Abidjan)
   c. Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi)
   d. Kuwait Regional Convention for cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution
   e. Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden Environment (Jeddah)
   f. South Asian Seas Programme (SACEP)
   g. East Asian Seas Action Plan
   h. North-West Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP) (UNEP/DEC serves as interim Secretariat)
   i. Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region (Noumea)
   j. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific (Lima)
   k. Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean (Cartagena)
   l. Convention for the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (Bucharest)
   m. Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki)
   n. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (Paris) (OSPAR)
   o. Programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)
   p. Caspian Environment Programme
   q. Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Northeast Pacific

2. Representatives of international organizations
   a. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
   b. Secretariat of CITES
   c. Secretariat of the Law of the Sea
   d. Secretariat of the Rotterdam Convention
   e. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)

f. UNESCO/IOC (Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission)
g. International Maritime Organization (IMO)
h. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)/Marine Environmental Studies Laboratory
i. World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
j. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)
k. Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities
l. UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC)
m. International Oceans Institute (IOI)
n. Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC), North American Free Trade Association

3. Regional Fisheries Bodies[1]

a. Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)
b. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)
c. International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission (IBSFC)
d. Latin American Fisheries Development Organization (OLDEPESCA)

4. Industry

a. The International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Ltd. (ITOPF)
b. International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC)
c. TotalFinaElf and the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)
d. Canadian Chemical Producers Association (CCPA)
e. Latin American Crop Protection Federation (LACPA)

[1] The Permanent Commission of the South Pacific (CPPS), which is the secretariat of the Southeast Pacific regional seas convention and action plan, is also a regional fisheries body.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.0.2

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Presentation of the International Ocean Institute to the Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, with identification of areas of mutual interest and suggestions for Co-operation

IOI Headquarters
Malta, October, 2001

Presentation of the International Ocean Institute to the Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (Montreal 21 – 23 November, 2001), with identification of areas of mutual interest and suggestions for Co-operation

BACKGROUND

1. In 1967 Ambassador Arvid Pardo introduced in the General Assembly of the United Nations the concept that parts of the Ocean are the Common Heritage of Mankind. It was followed in 1970 by the first Pacem in Maribus Conference in Malta which emphasized the need to explore the philosophical and ideological parameters of the concept of the Common Heritage of mankind as well as its legal and economic content and institutional regulations. It was felt that the issues needed sustained research and progressive development which could best be achieved by an international institute.

2. Accordingly the International Ocean Institute (IOI) was officially established at the University of Malta in 1972 with the assistance of UNDP. The Founder was Professor Elisabeth Mann Borgese.

3. The mission of IOI is to promote education, training and research to enhance the peaceful and sustainable use of ocean and coastal spaces and their resources, their management and regulation as well as the protection and conservation of the marine environment, guided by the principle of the Common Heritage of Mankind.

GOALS

4. The goals of the IOI are to:

   (i) Enhance the ability of developing countries to develop and manage their own resources sustainably for their own benefit, to establish self-reliant development, and help with education and eradication of poverty from community to national level;

   (ii) Enhance abilities for self-reliant development at community level, taking into account the diversity in developing as well as developed countries, including control and protection of natural resources for future generations; the eradication of poverty in coastal areas; and mitigation of and adaptation to natural hazards;

   (iii) Enhance participation of people, in particular women, and youth in development projects which take into account environmental issues;

   (iv) Establish sustainable mechanisms able to tackle inter-related social, environmental and economic issues in an integrated fashion.

APPROACH

5. The approach by which the IOI gradually achieves its goals includes:

(i) Strengthening of institutions through capacity building, sharing and dissemination of information and generating incentives and contact between local and national authorities;

(ii) Establishing partnerships and networks with the IOI Operational Centres, other NGOs, donors and between authorities and communities;

(iii) Increasing awareness and understanding of the sensitivity and the importance of the Coastal Zone and the marine environment for sustainable development, through demonstrations, training, provision of educational material and information to local NGOs, schools and authorities;

(iv) Encouraging self-reliant development of sustainable livelihoods by means of aquaculture, farming, value-added processing of resources, protection of water resources and application of traditional and new technology;

(v) Emphasising decentralized decision making to local authorities and communities, and implementation of agreements, regulations, and development projects with the involvement of the private sector;

(vi) Increasing the abilities at local and national level to transfer and apply scientific (social and natural sciences) knowledge and information, from generators to users, through hands-on training, case studies, and demonstration sites; and providing incentives through linkages to other sites, and to international agreements and commitments.

ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

6. For more than two decades the IOI has been implementing its mission with the concern of future generations through an interdisciplinary and comprehensive approach.

7. The IOI has prepared working papers for the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III: 1973-1981), the Preparatory Commission for the International Seabed authority, for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (1982 - 2001) as well as for various governments. It has contributed to the UNICPOLOS establishment, and actively participated in its sessions so far, and to the deliberations of the Independent World Commission on the Oceans (1994-1998) and provided consultants to UNEP, the World Bank, the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee (AALCC).

8. The IOI's activities include training projects, information dissemination, conferences, research and publications.

   - Training of decision-makers and professionals, mainly from Developing Countries, through short and long duration interdisciplinary courses in ocean and coastal management;

- Transformation of training and education activities into distance learning courses delivered through the IOI Virtual University for ocean governance;

- Development work among coastal communities with the objective of improving their livelihoods while restoring and preserving coastal ecology, risk assessment of coastal management;

- Organization of the annual *Pacem in Maribus* (Peace in the Oceans) conference and other seminars and workshops;

- Research on a variety of ocean-related areas such as international and regional agreements and policies on oceans and the coastal zone; on regional and sub-regional co-operation and on scientific and technological approaches to sustainable management of living and nonliving marine resources; and sustainable livelihoods in coastal communities;

- Education and awareness-creation about ocean resources, marine and coastal environments, and the need to care for them; development of a global network of universities to provide through distance-learning a master degree in ocean governance;

- Technology evaluation, transfer, and analyses of the effects thereof.

9. The IOI provides different services which include advice, consultancy, evaluation and assessment and information exchange regarding ocean and coastal environments;

10. Information about IOI, its activities and services can be found on the IOI
    Website: http://www.ioinst.org
    e-mail: ioimla@kemmunet.net.mt

IOI OPERATIONAL CENTRES

11. Implementation of the IOI programmes is being achieved through the network of IOI Operational Centres. These are established through a formal agreement with the institution hosting the center. This is normally a university. The network is global and covers a wide spectrum of ocean affairs. The current Operational Centres and Affiliates and their host institutions are presented in Table 1. The Headquarters is based in Malta, through an agreement with the Government of Malta.

Name of Operational Centre or Affiliate	Name of Host Institution
IOI – Canada	Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada;
IOI – China	National Marine Data and Information Service, State Oceanic Administration, China;
IOI – Costa Rica	Universidad Nacional, Costa Rica
IOI – Pacific Islands	University of the South Pacific

IOI – India	Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India;
IOI – Japan	Yokohama City University, Japan
IOI – Malta	University of Malta, Malta;
IOI – Black Sea	National Institute for Marine Research and Development 'Grigore Antipa', Romania;
IOI – Senegal	Centre de Recherches Oceanographiques de Dakar – Thiaroye (CRODT), Senegal
IOI – Southern Africa	University of Western Cape, South Africa
IOI – Eastern Africa	The Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KIMFI), Mombasa, Kenya
IOI – Ukraine	Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas (IBSS), Sevastopol, Ukraine;
IOI – Russia	P.P. Shirshov Institute of Oceanology
IOI – Western Africa	Nigerian Institute for Oceanography and Marine Research (NIOMR), Lagos, Nigeria;
IOI - Thailand	Office of Thai Marine Policy and Restoration Committee (OTMPRC), Bankok, Thailand
IOI – Caspian Sea	Astrakhan State Technical University (ASTU), Astrakhan, Russia
IOI – Volga River Basin	Nizhny Novgorod State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering (NNSUACE)
IOI-Indonesia	Centre for Marine Studies, University of Indonesia

12. Each Centre is autonomous. It identifies its own local, national and regional priorities for research, capacity building and development, while benefiting from the support of the overall IOI network. A regional approach to research and capacity building enables the Institute to draw upon the different strengths of the Operational Centres to cater to the needs identified within each region. Each Centre is run by a Director, who is also a staff member of the Host institution. There is a small staff and a number of experts and volunteers on call. The directors are members of the IOI Planning Council, which meets annually.

13. Through its many training activities the IOI has contributed to the development of a professional cadre of people in many developing countries, knowledgeable with respect to UNCLOS, UNCED and ocean governance and sustainable development. In our work in countries and regions we are also maintaining contacts with the alumni of the IOI courses, and are involving them to the extent possible in the activities in the field.

14. The management of IOI and co-ordination and harmonization of the work of the Operational Centres and of other IOI activities is achieved by the IOI Headquarters established in Malta. The overall policy-making body is the Governing Board which also has the financial responsibility. The Planning council reviews and prepares workplans and budgets for submission to the Board.

CO-OPERATION

15. UNCED emphasized the importance of creating close, mutually beneficial links of co-operation between governmental and non-governmental organizations in order to share more effectively knowledge and experience and avoid duplication of efforts. In line with the recommendation the IOI co-operates actively with other organizations and institutions. The mission of the Institute and the very nature of it lays the foundation for such a co-operate approach. At the same time the identity of the IOI as an organization is maintained.

16. First and foremost is co-operation and indeed linkages with the agencies and programmes of the United Nations system. The IOI has observer status with UNESCO, IMO, UNCTAD, and ECOSOC and hence CSD and UNICPOLOS. Agreements on co-operation have been signed with UNEP, UNU and IOC. Bonds of co-operation have been established with regional intergovernmental bodies of the UNEP Regional Seas programme, with the UN Commission on Economic Co-operation, and with such bodies as ICES, PICES, IOMAC and with many NGO's of a national international nature, e.g. ACOPS, HELMEPA, Women in Fisheries Network, WIOMSA. The IOI has a long-standing co-operation with UNEP, in different activities (see under Regional Approach)

17. Growing steadily and responding to global changes, IOI is now aiming at a multiplier effect to its spectrum of activities . It plans to move from direct training to train-the-trainers; from direct implementation to projects of offering advisory and consultative services in areas of ocean governance, coastal management and risk assessment; from a network of centers to a network of clusters and affiliates. IOI is also developing online and distance education systems as parts of the IOI Virtual University.

18. The IOI network and UNEP infrastructures established within the Regional Seas programme provide for complimentary mechanisms with global coverage. We have here potentially a cohesive and comprehensive system capable of co-operating equally well with intergovernmental systems and the private sector and provide services to decision-makers, scientists and the public at large.
19. The next few years offer a unique opportunity to further develop IOI and UNEP co-operation. This could involve in particular the UNEP Regional Seas programme and the GPA-LBA as well as joint inputs to the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. The co-operation could focus on, training and education as human resource development.

20. Several issue-oriented activities are planned for the coming years, in the implementation of which IOI and UNEP may co-operate with mutual benefit and in addition make a sound contribution to strengthening the UNICPOLOS and transforming it into a fully representative forum for the ocean, also as a follow-up to UNCED92 and the 2002 World Summit.

PACEM IN MARIBUS

21. *Pacem in Maribus* is the name of the annual Conference organized by IOI with the objective to deal with aspects of ocean governance at the global, regional and national level based on the principle of the Common Heritage of Mankind. The IOI has organized 28 Pacem in Maribus Conferences thus far in all parts of the world. They are respected as important events in elucidating threats to the world's ocean as well as the potential of ocean resources to sustain humankind. *Pacem in Maribus* Conferences and the work of the IOI are inextricably linked up. Countries and individuals draw inspiration from the research done in conjunction with Pacem in Maribus meetings and new seminal ideas emerging here from. The last three Conferences in 1998, 1999 and 2000 took place respectively, in Canada, Fiji and Hamburg. The 2001 Conference was planned for 7 – 10 November 2001 in Dakar, Senegal but has been rescheduled to a more convenient time in view of the current world situation. It will be the first PIM Conference in the new millennium, in which the sustainable use of ocean space and resources will be a increasingly important component of the local, national, regional and global systems of economic and sustainable development, the conservation of the environment, and human security.

22. The purpose of the Conference is to demonstrate and reinforce the realization of the importance of the ocean, its coasts, resources and their sustainable development for the African peoples. Adoption of UNCLOS and the agreement on EEZ provided a unique opportunity for developing countries in Africa to become real owners of many coastal area resources of great significance for economic development.

23. It is expected that the Conference will bring together African representatives from all relevant sectors to formulate jointly a Strategy for sustainable development of coastal and marine resources of the African nations. This shall respond to the African needs and harmonise with international conventions and agreements which together provide for an international legal framework of governance. We invite the co-operation of UNEP in this effort.

IOI VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY

24. Since its establishment the focus of the IOI was on training, education and research. The last decade of the 20th century was marked by the revolutionary technological changes in information collection and sharing. It created an opportunity for adapting traditional ways of teaching and learning to technological developments so as to meet effectively the needs in developing an integrated culture of knowledge, inclusive and accessible to all. The need for restructuring of higher education is felt globally.

25. The IOI accepted this challenge by creating a special mechanism called the International Ocean Institute Virtual University, for ocean governance. This education and training mechanism is being created through the existing IOI network of education, training and research centers with expertise in ocean, coastal and marine-related affairs and governance, covering all relevant sectors and disciplines. It utilizes the most advanced

technologies of distance learning and teaching, combined with person-to-person teaching relationships in traditional classroom settings and internships.

26. The IOIVU is an open-ended, expanding network of autonomous institutions, clustered around the initial nucleus of IOI Operational Centres and their host institutions. The number of partner institutions, mostly universities, both in developed and developing countries is growing. The IOIVU does not substitute the existing network of universities. It will rather contribute to and strengthen this network. The IOIVU will not compete with existing universities, but supplement them through the consolidation, optimization and full utilization of the unique structure and accumulated global experience. The VU concept here does not just mean to go Internet, but is rather a structure and approach by which the educational activities and programmes of the IOI Network of Operational Centres and of their prestigious host institutions can be combined into one focused mechanism and purpose and also coupled with activities of other academic centers of excellence, to provide a truly international and interdisciplinary curriculum.

27. The Virtual University will accept students globally and award an interdisciplinary, internationally recognized master's degree. Students from all parts of the world do not have to move away from their home and employment, except possibly for a short internship period; they can recognize some parts of the studies as coming from their own region, country and culture; they do not have to experience the cultural shock associated with living for an extended period in a foreign country away from their roots. The students will be at the graduate and mid-level career level.

28. The establishment of the IOIVU is also an example responding to the call of Agenda 21, Chapter 36, for an integrated and comprehensive education process as a cross-sectoral theme such as its required for implementation of most of Agenda 21.

29. The IOIVU will offer a broad range of programmes with an interdisciplinary curriculum that includes:

    - Masters or Advanced Graduate Degree Programmes in Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea;
    - Advanced Training Programmes in specific subjects through existing or new courses of the IOI Network and/or Host Institutions of the Operational Centres;
    - Upgrading and Supplementary Education Programmes though specialized short courses.

30. The course packages for these programmes is partly drawn from courses available on line or through participating institutions, and are also new developments. They will fall into one of three categories:

    - Courses providing generic, overall knowledge, based on mainstream, accepted understanding of ocean processes and legal and institutional arrangements;

- Courses giving special knowledge on ocean subjects of a regional nature, such as semi-enclosed seas, upwelling systems, Large Marine Ecosystems, legal, social and economic instruments or subjects, or EEZ rights;
- Courses giving knowledge about local, national, sub-regional conditions, cultures, social systems, or traditional knowledge.

31. The Master's Degree Programme has three components:

- A number of core courses and optional courses will have to be completed, each one with an established number of credits. Core courses can be taken through distance-learning arrangements. Optional courses can be taken through any one of the IOI Operational centers and/or their host institutions;
- An internship period of the duration of one academic quarter, which can be completed in any of the IOI Operational Centres or possibly suitable in external organization (UN institutions such as UNCTAD, DOALOS, IMO, UNEP, or private sector);
- The writing of a thesis, under the direction of a supervisor, and subject to acceptance by a thesis committee consisting of members of the Virtual University faculty plus an external examiner.

32. Core courses include the following subjects:

- UNCLOS and UNCED: Ocean Governance and the Law of the Sea;
- Coastal Community development;
- Marine and Coastal Resources economics;
- Integrated management of marine pollution, in particular related to land-based sources;
- Spatial information management and decision making support;

In addition there are a number of optional courses of a more specialised nature.

33. The programme will take 1 – 2 years of study to complete, and can also function for part time students. Information about the project is available on the IOI website: http://www.ioinst.org and www.ioivu.org.

34. Undertaking the task to establish such a "Virtual University" is extremely ambitious, challenging and innovative. Success of the project can be achieved only through co-operative and collaborative actions. On a wider perspective all the governments, organisations and peoples interested in the implementation and enforcement of UNCLOS, UNCED 92 and related agreements and conventions, can be seen as interested beneficiaries of the project.

35. The partners in this project include the IOI Operational Centres, their Host institutions and co-operating universities. The UNU, WMU, United Nations University for Peace, UNESCO have confirmed willingness to co-sponsor and co-operate in the IOIVU. Furthermore the developing and developed countries where there is the need for the

capacity development are partners, and the students and the related employers. We also invite the co-operation of UNEP through the Regional Seas Programme.

36. The development of the IOIVU also fully corresponds to one of the conclusions of the International Year of the Ocean (IYO) that the ocean governance and protection starts from the classroom and that new innovative approaches in training and education should become part and parcel of all capacity building efforts. In fact IOIVU is a follow-up of the IYO.

37. The new institutional academic arrangement proposed by IOI responds to a number of challenges facing all of us such as interdisciplinarity and integration; "globalisation" and inter-dependence and decentralisation; financial restraints and constraints.

38. Co-operation in finding solutions to these problems is essential. Through a contribution to the restructuring of the higher education, the IOIVU gives an innovative approach to the sharing of knowledge on the ocean environment and its resources. The IOIVU needs to establish links and cooperation with the private sector.

REGIONAL APPROACH

39. Apart from the development of human resources, the IOI system is endeavoring to address many global issues such as: poverty eradication; resources management; sustainable livelihoods; mitigation of and adaptation to natural hazards; participation of women in poor developing countries in ocean and coastal affairs; risk management and its application in integrated coastal management; and others of scientific, political, economic and social nature. Although the issues are global their resolving is often achieved through the regional approach, as regionalisation in certain aspects provides a better structure than globalisation for the management of the ocean's resources. In fact regional development and co-operation is of fundamental importance for successful implementation of not only the UNCLOS but also of all UNCED and post UNCED conventions, agreements and action programmes. This approach reflects better the geographic scale of most problems of marine resources and ecosystems. The IOI follows the principle: "To think globally and implement regionally!".

40. The IOI has a few regional activities which are considered as success stories, e.g. the eco-villages project in India supported by German GTZ and Japanese funding, with the focus on the problems of coastal communities and the role of women in the coastal area protection and management; project on sustainable livelihoods in coastal communities and Integrated Coastal Area management in South Africa supported by UNDP; development of models for community participation in Integrated Coastal Zone management and re-establishment of coastal community developments after hazardous events like hurricanes in Central America. These activities provided a wide window of opportunity to respond quickly and efficiently to regional concerns and needs and establish open and meaningful discussions with experts and the public.

41. However much more can be done through concerted joint efforts of severalpartners. The regional mechanisms established and operational through UNEP as well as IOC can help to realise the full potential of such co-operation in the context of regional systems for sustainable development. There are several regions where the IOI and UNEP have mutual interests and where regional experience and knowledge can be complimentary. The work of IOI started in the Mediterranean. The early results of its studies there in the 70s provided support to the initiation of the UNEP Regional Seas Programme for the Mediterranean.

42. The IOI and UNEP have cooperated throughout their time of existence. This cooperation has focused on the Regional Seas Programme. In the end of the 1990s a joint review of the situation in 5 regions was implemented, resulting in a series of published over-views. There is great potential for continuing this cooperation. A possibility is now presenting itself for Africa. The two forthcoming PIM Conferences, with related IOI Meetings, will be held there, in Senegal and in South Africa.

43. These activities we are endeavouring to link to other ocean and coastal zone related affairs in Africa. The IOI would be most interested in exploring possibilities of cooperating with the UNEP Regional Seas Conventions, the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions. We have initial contacts with AMCEN, but these need to be followed up. Cooperation could be enhanced in the East Asian Regions. We now have an IOI Centre in Bangkok where the UNEP Regional Office also is based.

44. The focus of our cooperation could in all cases be human resources development. However, the activities can be diversified. They can include networking, partnership in the IOIVU, regional seminars such as the Mediterranean one in Malta. We are planning such a strategy seminar as part of the Conference in Dakar, with the aim to contribute to the development of an African Strategy for Oceans and Coasts. The IOI would welcome co-operation with UNEP Regional Seas through the Abidjan and possibly also Nairobi Conventions in this effort.

45. The IOI also has strong interest in extending its cooperation with the private sector. We have experiences from joint activities, involving the tourism, shipping, insurance and re-insurance sectors. A proposal has been launched for continued co-operation with the insurance industry. This may also find partnership with the GPA-LBA Coordination Office.

46. The IOI efforts in the Mediterranean Sea, Black and Caspian Seas may be linked with the activities of regional commissions on marine environment and sustainable development and with the process of "revitalisation of the Regional Seas Programme" triggered by the requirements of the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities.

47. The IOI has recent experience in co-operating with UNEP Regional Seas through the Mediterranean Action Plan and the GPA-LBA Coordination Office in the Seminar on Mediterranean Basin – wide Co-development and Security, carried out in Malta, 21 – 24

September 2000. The IOI will be most interested in continuing this cooperative process. The IOI has 2 Operational Centres in the Black Sea. It would be of interest to explore interaction with the UNEP activities there.

48. So far IOI had no activities in the Caspian Sea. However, the establishment of the IOI Affiliate Centre in Astrakhan hosted by the Astrakhan State Technical University reflects the interest of the region in IOI and vice-versa. There are several international organisations implementing projects in the Caspian Sea basin – WMO, UNEP-Caspian Environmental Programme, IAEA, IOC-Floating University Project and others. UNESCO is studying the possibilities of launching a demonstration project within the Volga River and Caspian Sea basin. The IOI would welcome cooperation with CEP, and one joint activity is being explored.

49. The IOI is interested to join its efforts with UNEP through the Regional Seas Programme, and work together in meeting the needs of the bordering nations in marine and coastal resources management and protection, marine policy and capacity building.

50. Many of the activities of IOI are of interest also to other governmental and non-governmental organisations and it may be timely to consider an innovative approach of co-operation by creating tripartite or multi-partite projects which may involve UNEP, EU, IMO, UNDP, IOC and others.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.2

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Inventory of the Work in Chemicals Undertaken by the Regional Sea Programmes

Prepared for the Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, Montreal, Canada, 21-23 November, 2001

1. The Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, held in Monaco on 6-10 November 2000, requested UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions (DEC) to prepare an inventory of the work in chemicals undertaken by the regional sea programmes. The inventory is to serve as an information base for collaborating on mutually supportive activities with the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. Decision 21/28, taken at the 21st meeting of the UNEP Governing Council on 5-9 February 2001 mirrors this recommendation. The two global chemical conventions and regional sea programmes are invited to work closely together in the implementation of capacity building and information exchange activities to assist countries in meeting their obligations.

2. In January 2001 DEC in collaboration with UNEP Chemicals initiated a survey of secretariats of regional sea conventions and partner conventions, and coordinators of regional sea programmes and action plans, to obtain information to compile the inventory. As guidance to respondents, each was asked to report activities in a number of broad areas.

   These areas are:

   specialized training and capacity building initiatives,
   facilitation of integrated chemicals management at the national level,
   information and data base development,
   chemical source identification and quantification,
   environmental sampling and analysis (air, water, soil, biota),
   waste management,
   risk assessment,
   risk management (control of releases, regulations, institutional/financial mechanisms),
   emergencies preparedness and response,
   support to conventions.

3. The Third Global Meeting of Regional Sea Conventions and Action Plans did not place any limits on the scope of the inventory. The term "work in chemicals" was not defined. The survey itself did not specify which chemicals should be included, in order not to eliminate any particular type of chemical work in the first version of the inventory.

4. Respondents reported not only activities on chemicals now listed for control under the two global chemical conventions, but also activities on unlisted chemicals, such as heavy

metals and other organic compounds, which are of regional, and potentially of future global concern. Work on nutrients, radioactive chemicals, petrochemicals and a variety of hazardous wastes were included in some responses. This allowed a broad inventory to be compiled, which will be useful for collaboration with the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, as well as the Basel Convention and other conventions.

5. The secretariats of the ten regional sea conventions, listed below, responded to the survey:

   a) Convention for Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (Abidjan Convention),

   b) Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Costal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention),

   c) Convention for the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (Bucharest Convention),

   d) Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention),

   e) Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment (Jeddah Convention),

   f) Kuwait Regional Convention for Co-operation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution (Kuwait Convention),

   g) Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific (Lima Convention),

   h) Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention),

   i) Convention for the Protection of Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific (Noumea Convention),

   j) Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the North East Pacific.

   The coordinators and secretariats of the four regional sea partner programmes and conventions also responded to the survey:

   k) Caspian Environment Programme,

   l) Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention),

m) Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention),

n) Programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) and the Arctic Marine Assessment Programme (AMAP).

Although there are no conventions in place in the following three regions, there are regional action plans, with programme coordinators for each. They were also invited to participate in the survey.

o) South Asian Seas Action Plan,

p) East Asian Seas Action Plan,

q) North West Pacific Action Plan.

OBJECTIVE OF THIS REPORT

6. The primary objective of this report is to start to construct the inventory, and suggest how the chemical work might be displayed. This is not a comprehensive inventory because it is based on one survey, and not all of the activities have been identified. Inventories are inherently dynamic in nature, and for this reason the current version of the inventory should be viewed as preliminary and should be updated regularly. Suggestions should be made for improvement in its format and content.

RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

7. A number of secretariats provided detailed responses in the format requested, along with supporting reports and documents. Others only provided reports and documents, from which DEC was asked to extract relevant information. DEC also used some information found on regional sea web sites and in regional sea publications to augment what was provided through the survey. A few respondents report either no, or very limited, ongoing regional, cooperative chemical work because their programmes are still in the formative stages. For some of these regional programmes, preliminary studies of sources and levels of chemical pollution have been conducted by individual countries prior to the establishment of active regional programmes. This information is included in the inventory since it is the only information available for these regions.

8. Respondents replied using the terminology most familiar to them to describe their chemical work. For example, some respondents mentioned "identifying pollution risk" and an interpretation had to be made as to whether the work was related to identifying major sources of chemicals, or to classical assessment of risk to ecosystems or to human health. "Pollution load" is another one of the terms that need interpretation to ensure a common understanding. No attempt was made to bring uniformity to the terminology in this version of the inventory. Uniformity of terminology should be considered for future versions.

9. Some respondents described chemicals in terms of their properties (e.g. acidity, alkalinity) or their characteristics (e.g. toxcity, teratogenicity) or their physiological behaviour (e.g. hormone disrupters, substances that act synergistically), or as substances that can degrade or transform into hazardous substances. Others used common chemical or chemical class nomenclature. For this inventory, the chemicals of concern are presented as reported recognizing that this may result in some duplication that will have to be reconciled in a later version.

10. The objective of regional sea conventions, action plans and programmes is to control pollution and protect the marine and coastal environment. The conventions all include generic commitments to manage chemicals. In many cases these commitments are reflected in protocols, agreements and annexes on one or more of seven priority issues; pollution from oil and harmful substances, land-based pollution, special protected areas and wildlife, radioactivity, transboundary movement of wastes, offshore exploration and exploitation, and dumping at sea. These generic commitments to undertake chemical work are not included in the inventory. Only work that is reported as actively in the planning stage, on going, or completed is included in the inventory.

11. When strategic regional or national action plans or programmes are reported to be in place or under development, they are included in the inventory, since formulating these plans and programmes is in itself a chemical activity. Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses (TDA) are also included. A TDA is a scientific and technical assessment of water related environmental problems, their causes, and impacts, both environmental and economic, at national, regional and global levels, taking into account the social-economic, political and institutional systems within a riparian country.

12. Information on hazardous chemical waste activities is included in the inventory. The Stockholm Convention includes measures to reduce or eliminate releases from chemical stockpiles and wastes. Under the Stockholm Convention, a clear distinction is made between a stockpile and a waste. A stockpile that can no longer be used according to any specific exemption or acceptable purpose specified in the convention is deemed to be a waste.
13. Since the Stockholm Convention calls for close cooperation with the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and their Disposal on matters related to the disposal of waste persistent organic pollutants, collaboration with regional sea programmes on mutually supportive chemical waste management activities will include the Basel Convention.

14. Radioactive chemicals are explicitly excluded from the Rotterdam Convention and implicitly excluded from the Stockholm Convention. Since some respondents reported that radioactive chemicals entering the marine environment are of particular concern in their region, related work is included in the inventory so that consideration can be given to collaboration with other relevant conventions and organizations.

OVERVIEWS OF CHEMICAL WORK

15. This section of the report gives overviews of the chemical work under each programme. The chemical work is further separated into sub-categories, which are presented in matrix format, in Tables 1-11 to show more clearly where regional sea programmes are involved in similar types of work.

Regional Sea Conventions

Abidjan Convention

16. A 1999 report on land-based sources of pollution and related activities in the west and central Africa region identifies the decline in water quality due to sewage, and pollution from industrial and agricultural activities, as the issues of greatest concern for the region. Various analyses of marine, coastal and fresh water have been conducted in the region by individual countries, showing that the loads of heavy metals and toxic organic chemicals, including dioxin, are generally small, with some exceptions. Measurements have also been made of chemicals in sediments and marine organisms. There are no ongoing chemical activities under the Abidjan Convention.

Barcelona Convention.

17. The Mediterranean Action Plan, under the Barcelona Convention, is a cooperative effort by member countries to address environmental degradation. MED POL, one component of the Mediterranean Action Plan, is a programme for the assessment and control of pollution from land-based sources, dumping at sea and hazardous waste. MED POL carries out capacity building and training on chemical analysis, data management and other technical aspects.

18. A comprehensive 25-year Strategic Action Programme to address pollution from land based sources has been developed as a component of MED POL. The programme defines activities such as establishing science-based guidelines, emission and discharge limits, and environmental quality criteria, and sets targets for substances that are toxic, persistent, and bio-accumulate. Heavy metals, organohalogen compounds, and radioactive substances are included. The hazardous waste component of the programme focuses on obsolete chemicals, used lubricating oil, and batteries.

19. An operational document has been prepared for the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme through National Action Plans. Most of the elements of the operational programme are in the planning stage and yet to be implemented. Sector programmes, some on chemical topics, such as mercury, cadmium, lead, pesticides, are to be prepared starting in 2001 as a prerequisite. Prohibition of manufacture, trade and new uses of PCBs is to be considered. The programme envisions capacity building to develop and make available inventories of new and innovative technologies. It is

proposed that national baseline budgets should be developed for chemicals of concern. The budget is the amount of a chemical released in the baseline year against which future release reduction commitments will be measured. Monitoring, capacity building, public participation, reporting, and establishing guidelines are key elements of National Action Plans.

Bucharest Convention.

20. Under the Black Sea Environmental Programme, a Transbounday Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) has been conducted on the causes of the chemical pollution, and measures have been suggested to eliminate them. Routine and special chemical monitoring programmes have been in operation since1993. An assessment of the levels of chemicals in the Black Sea was published in 1999. Training programmes on sampling, analysis, and quality control and quality assurance have been carried out. Funding has been approved from the GEF and the European Commission for chemical information and data base development. Chemical source identification and quantification has been done under the Black Sea Assessment Programme. Data on contaminant discharges from a variety of sources is compiled. A regional oil and chemical spill contingency plan has been developed.

21. The 1996 regional Strategic Action Plan for rehabilitation of the Black Sea indicates that an assessment of transboundary airborne pollution is to be undertaken. High priority "hot spots" for chemical discharges have been identified, and they will be reduced through National Black Sea Strategic Action Plans. The regional Strategic Action Plan calls for harmonized water quality objectives for various water uses, and discharge monitoring, and proposes regulating discharges through a permit system, backed up by an enforcement mechanism. Harbour reception facilities for chemicals are to be installed by 2002. A Black Sea Monitoring System will measure biological effects and key contaminants, and State of Pollution of the Black Sea reports are to be published. A protocol is to be adopted on the transboundary movement of hazardous waste.

Cartagena Convention.

22. The principal chemical work planned under the Land Based Sources Protocol is the improved management of the run-off of pesticides. This will be a GEF-funded project. The focus is on the development and implementation of practices and measures to control pesticide use in agriculture, including a national component, within the framework of National Action Programmes, to strengthen regulatory systems, promote integrated pest management, and the use of economic instruments. A regional cooperative component will evaluate the pesticide load in the sea, and related chemical transport mechanisms. Common regional regulations and economic instruments will be established.

Jeddah Convention.

23. A Regional Programme of Action for land based sources of pollution is being developed. No chemical monitoring activities have been initiated under the Jeddah Convention. A regional chemical monitoring program is in the formative stage in cooperation with the Mediterranean programme. Some member states are involved in persistent organic pollutants related work.

Kuwait Convention.

24. Under the Kuwait Action Plan, monitoring of contaminants in the marine environment has been carried out for many years, however the data has not been put into a report. Surveys of land based activities, and of persistent organic pollutants, have been carried out by most Parties and a regional report will be forthcoming. A regional report on the state of the marine environment for the year 2000 has been published, which shows the major contributors to the pollution load into the marine environment. Petroleum refineries are the major contributors to the oil and metals load. Spilled petroleum products are the largest single source of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) in the environment.

25. A contaminant-screening project measured heavy metals in seawater, sediment, and biota. Petroleum hydrocarbons have been measured in seawater, sediment and biota. One study of human exposure to mercury has been conducted. Halogenated methanes, mainly bromoform, have been measured in the region of power and desalination plants. The pesticide DDT, DDE and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) have been measured in sediments and biota. Toxicity testing of sediment and seawater, and some studies of effects of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and DDT on the marine environment, have been conducted. Radioactive substances have been measured in the marine and coastal environment.

Lima Convention.

26. Under the Regional Plan of Action, various regional workshops and training courses on analytical methods for monitoring pollutants and on the treatment and disposal of waste have been organized. In 1995, a regional training course was held on analysis of pesticides and PCBs in organisms and marine sediments. Under the Regional Action Plan, to assure standardized operation of the laboratories to support the Regional Pesticides Surveillance Network, analytical instruments were placed in five scientific institutions to enable member states to monitor pesticides in the marine environment. National laboratories monitor pesticides and PCBs in sea-water, biological organism and sediments. In the 1970s, restrictions were placed on the use and sale of certain pesticides, especially organochlorine and organophosphorus pesticides. Pesticide monitoring data is available in a report on the "State of the Marine Coastal Environment in the South East Pacific- 2000".

Nairobi Convention.

27. Early surveys of land-based pollution of the in-shore waters of eastern Africa implicate nutrients as the principal cause of water pollution in the coastal and marine environment. Activities have been undertaken to build the regional capacity for water quality monitoring for nutrients, including inter-laboratory comparison studies. A nutrient monitoring programme has been established.

28. The current survey shows very limited chemical and hazardous waste related activities under the Nairobi Convention. One project to dispose of waste and retired pesticides in two island states is reported, but details are not provided. Regional exchange of hazardous waste (metal, oil and plastics) is ongoing.

Noumea Convention.

29. The response to the survey covered chemical work under the Action Plans of both the Noumea (regional seas) and Waigani (hazardous waste) Conventions. In-country training courses are on going for government officials on the management of hazardous chemicals (e.g. POPs), hazardous wastes and contaminated sites. Support has been provided for preparation of National Chemical Profiles in Pacific Islands Countries. Hazardous waste management strategies are being developed for Pacific Island Countries.

30. Under the Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme (PACPOL Project), work is underway on regional and national marine chemical spill contingency plans; improving ship's waste management in the Pacific; and environmental guidelines for Pacific Islands ports and regional marine pollution surveillance. There is also a Pacific Regional Wastes Awareness and Education Programme. There is a Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Island developing States, and a community based project on the impact of waste disposal on drinking water. Legislation on the management of hazardous chemicals is being developed.

Convention for the North-East Pacific.

31. A convention, an action plan, a regional programme of work, and a diagnostic study of sources of land based pollution for the convention area have only recently been agreed. No joint chemical work has been initiated. An earlier evaluation of pollution in the northeast Pacific region indicates that the most dangerous waste in the region is obsolete pesticides, and waste from hospitals, energy supply plants, the chemical industry, mining and oil exploitation. Information is lacking on the amount of this waste. Pesticides, heavy metals, and radioactive substances have been measured in seawater, fresh water, sediments and marine organisms by member countries.

Partner Programmes and Conventions

Caspian Environment Programme.

32. The Caspian Environment Programme chemical work is in support of producing an update of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA). A basin wide land based source assessment report has just been completed, and a report on the impact of agro-chemicals on the Iranian coast is awaited, to support the TDA. A state of the environment report is to be produced by the end of 2002.

33. A Strategic Action Programme is being prepared. It will include criteria and procedures for regional environmental monitoring, common reporting standards for state of the environment and compliance information, action on regulatory and supporting institutional development to ensure harmonized regional environmental management systems, guidance on standards, testing procedures, and quality control systems for national reference water quality laboratories. National Action Plans are to be completed by March 2002.

34. The Caspian Environment Programme is a phased approach, based on initially establishing environmental standards. The first phase is focusing on monitoring to collect information to prioritize issues related to marine pollution from rivers, coastal industries, and maritime activities. The Caspian Sea is currently undergoing an increase in eutrophication, and water pollution by heavy metals and other chemicals. Difficulties have been encountered in assessing the reliability of currently available information on seawater quality, and on point source and other emissions. A five-country GEF funded monitoring project is being planned to provide a baseline against which marine pollution data can be assessed.

35. Under the Programme, major pollution risks are to be identified, and an industrial source chemical database is to be developed. Regular seawater monitoring expeditions are to be designed. Regional reference laboratories are to be established. Information sharing between government, industry and the public is to be encouraged. The national legislative and regulatory base is to be reviewed for gaps and inconsistencies, a plan is to be drawn up for regional collaboration to amend the legislation, and enforcement strategies are to be developed. Seminars will be held on modern environmental practices. Topics proposed are procedures for development of emissions standards and identification of priority pollutants, strengthening of the legal and institutional framework for environmental management, including permitting and enforcement procedures, environmental management of off-shore oil exploration, and improved environmental practices in refineries and the petrochemical industry.

Helsinki Convention.

36. A project team consisting of members of all contracting Parties implements the hazardous substances objectives of HELCOM, the convention's governing body. Data on hazardous substances in marine organisms, and on radioactive substances, is being collected under the COMBINE Monitoring Programme and an operational database is maintained. A database for water-borne pollution load monitoring is under

development. HELCOM co-ordinates training courses and inter-laboratory calibration exercises on the measurement of chemicals in marine organisms. Data collected under the COMBINE Monitoring Programme are used for periodic assessments of the state of the Baltic Sea marine environment.

37. Monitoring of discharges and emissions within the Baltic Sea drainage area is mainly carried out within the Pollution Load Compilation (PLC) Programme, which is divided into two sub-programmes. PLC-Water deals with monitoring of discharges into water and monitoring of river load, and includes heavy metals. Data collected under the PLC programme are used for periodic PLC updates. The next PLC update will cover the emissions and discharges during the year 2000. PLC-Air deals with monitoring of emissions to air and deposition to water, including heavy metals and some persistent organic pollutants. The reliability of the data for many of these parameters is still quite low. Fairly good estimates are available for cadmium, lead and mercury, and lindane.

38. Assessments of the state of the Baltic marine environment are made at regular intervals, with "Recommendations" for legislative, administrative or other relevant measures to prevent and eliminate pollution. Recommendations are a tool used in implementing the Convention. Governments of the Contracting Parties must reflect Recommendations in their national plans.

39. Eight chemical-related Recommendations have been issued pertaining to

    elimination of discharges of DDT,
    elimination of the use of PCBs and PCTs,
    reduction of mercury from dentistry,
    limitation of discharges of cadmium from land-based sources,
    reduction of diffuse emissions from used batteries containing heavy metals,
    the reduction of mercury from light sources and electrical equipment,
    approval of pesticides for use in the catchment area of the Baltic Sea,
    anti-fouling paints containing organotin compounds.

    Another Recommendation being formulated deals with hazardous substances.

OSPAR Convention.

40. The main work related to chemicals is the implementation of the OSPAR Strategy with regard to Hazardous Substances, aimed at preventing pollution of the maritime area by continued reduction of chemical discharges, emissions and losses. The ministerial Sintra Statement on preventing and eliminating pollution reinforces this commitment.

41. A selection and prioritization mechanism for hazardous substances (DYNAMEC) is used to update regularly the OSPAR List of Chemicals for Priority Action, which is the starting point for implementing the OSPAR Strategy. Nine background documents on priority substances *inter alia* describe the identification and quantification of sources of chemicals. Background documents for mercury and organic mercury and tin

compounds, and musk xylene were adopted in 2000. In 2001 background documents were adopted for brominated flame retardants, nonylphenol and nonylphenol ethoxylates, short chain chlorinated paraffins, pentachlorophenol, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and polychlorinated biphenyls. Sixteen other background documents will be developed in the next two years

42. A guidance document is being developed on risk assessment methodology for the marine environment, which complements two current documents on risk assessment for new and existing chemicals. This guidance document will be applied in the development of background documents on priority chemicals, which will identify the control actions that should be undertaken. The OSPAR Convention is not concerned specifically with waste management, however, there are OSPAR "measures" (decisions that are legally binding) that relate to waste management, e.g. on the phasing out of PCBs and hazardous PCB substitutes. The Sintra Statement commits specifically to assess endocrine disrupting chemicals.

43. Environmental sampling and analysis of air, water, soil, and biota is carried out under the OSPAR Convention through the Joint Assessment and Monitoring Programme (JAMP) established in 1985, and currently under revision. Under the JAMP, several guidelines for monitoring of chemical contaminants in water, biota and sediment have been established. OSPAR has also adopted a Coordinated Environmental Monitoring Programme (CEMP, 1999). Riverine and direct inputs into the maritime area are reported by contracting Parties on an annual basis. Atmospheric inputs into the marine environment are also monitored on an annual basis under the Coordinated Atmospheric Monitoring Programme (CAMP).

44. There is a "Quality Status Report 2000" for the marine environment in the convention area, and separate quality status reports for its five regions. Other reports are available on topics such as priority substances, best available techniques and best environmental practice, and on annual discharges and emissions. Chemical databases within OSPAR, such as the Riverine Input Database (RID), are usually for internal use only. Under DYNAMEC, OSPAR is currently developing and plans to publish a List of Substances of Possible Concern, including a database of fact sheets for these substances.

45. Emergencies preparedness and response is not included in the activities of the OSPAR Commission. The OSPAR Secretariat acts as the Secretariat for the Bonn Agreement for Cooperation in Dealing with Pollution of the North Sea by Oil and Other Harmful Substances (1983). The Bonn Agreement Counter Pollution Manual contains guidelines and descriptions for co-operation when two or more North Sea Countries (and the EU) participate in a joint action to combat spills of oil and other harmful substances at sea.

46. Capacity-building, including training, are carried out by Parties under their international co-operation and development programmes.

47. Work to provide support to the Caspian programme, and the Bucharest and Abidjan Conventions, was reported. OSPAR also participates in activities of the Intergovernmental Review of the Global Programme of Action to Protect the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, the Interregional Forum of Marine Conventions in Europe, the European Environment Agency, and the UNECE.

Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME), and the Arctic Marine Assessment Programme (AMAP).

48. PAME and AMAP are two of the four working groups reporting to the Arctic Council, which is a non-binding arrangement among eight Arctic rim countries. PAME and AMAP were originally established under the former Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy. These working groups implement the Arctic Council's 1998 Regional Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment. In implementing the Regional Programme of Action, a phased approach will be used, with the initial phase focusing on POPs and heavy metals, which present a major pollution threat to the Arctic marine environment.

49. AMAP integrates monitoring and assessment activities to provide information for producing assessment reports on the status and trends of the conditions of Arctic ecosystems. AMAP identifies possible causes for changing conditions, detects emerging problems, suggests their possible causes, and identifies the potential risk to Arctic ecosystems and to indigenous peoples and other Arctic residents, and recommends actions to reduce the risks.

50. The chemicals of priority concern are persistent organic contaminants (POPs), heavy metals, radioactivity, as well as those responsible for acidification and arctic haze and, in a sub-regional context, oil pollution. Effects of pollution on the health of humans living in the Arctic, including effects due to increased UV radiation as a result of ozone depletion, and climate change, have special priority in the future work of AMAP. Combined effects of pollutants and other causes of stress on both ecosystems and humans are addressed.

51. AMAP has designed and implemented a coordinated programme to monitor the levels of pollutants, assess the effects of pollution in the Arctic environment (the atmospheric, terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments, and human populations), and instituted a process to produce assessment reports. Assessments are performed according to agreed guidelines and are based on data already published in scientific literature, data from the AMAP monitoring programme, and traditional knowledge.

52. The monitoring work within AMAP is based primarily on national and international monitoring and research programs. The aim is to harmonize them. Each country defines its own National Implementation Plan to meet the AMAP monitoring objectives. Bilateral and multilateral cooperative monitoring projects are carried out within each of the participating countries and across borders. Efforts continue to harmonize existing and new programs with respect to methodologies and quality assurance.

53. AMAP's assessments are based to a large extent on information and results from recent largely unpublished monitoring and research work. Data from such activities are compiled with routine monitoring data within AMAP Thematic Data Centres, and made available to scientists engaged in AMAP assessments under strict conditions that protect the rights of data originators. These conditions are described in AMAP's data policy documentation.

54. PAME addresses policy and non-emergency pollution prevention and control measures related to the protection of the Arctic marine environment from both land-based and sea-based activities. PAME is giving immediate priority to seeking support for the Russian National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment, promoting active involvement in raising funds, promoting technical assistance, and encouraging private sector and International Financial Institutions interest.

Regional Action Plans

South Asian Seas Action Plan.

55. No information on chemical activities was received for the South Asian Seas Action Plan.

East Asian Seas Action Plan.

56. No joint chemical work is being carried out under this Action Plan. The priorities for the region are sewage and sediment.

North-West Pacific Action Plan.

57. Joint chemical work has not yet been initiated under this new Action Plan.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SURVEY RESULTS

58. Table 1 indicates which programmes are undertaking work in the areas specified in the survey. Except for the newer regional sea programmes in east and south Asia, and in the North West Pacific, all are involved in assessment work, initially to measure and monitor chemicals in the environment, and determine their sources. The more advanced programmes have regional action strategies and plans in place, and on that basis are undertaking many different kinds of cooperative work aimed at reducing the risk from chemicals. National action plans, based on regional plans, have been instituted for several of the well-established programmes. Most regions have determined the major chemicals or classes of chemicals of concern, and some have set priorities. Some capacity building initiatives are underway. The management of hazardous chemical waste is a component of some regional sea programmes, but no work was reported on chemical disposal.

59. Data bases and information sources are being developed only by the more advanced programmes. The Bucharest, Noumea/Waigani, and OSPAR Conventions also report work on emergency preparedness and response for hazardous chemical spills. Only the Barcelona and OSPAR Conventions report work to support other conventions. None of the regions reported work to facilitate integrated national chemical management.

60. Table 2 shows the chemicals of concern in each region. This information was not specifically requested in the survey. It is compiled from an analysis of all of the available information for each region. The survey reveals that the following seventeen classes of chemicals threaten the marine and coastal environment in the various regions.

Persistent bioaccumulative toxic substances (PBTs)*
Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
Pesticides
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)
Heavy metals and organo-metallic compounds
Other organo halogens
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)
Radioactive material
Fertilizers and other nutrients
Hazardous waste (e.g. obsolete chemicals, used lubricating oil, batteries)
Toxic, teratogenic, or mutagenic compounds
Cyanides and fluorides
Acids and alkalies
Chemicals from petroleum production and exploitation
Hormone disrupting chemicals
Substances that act synergistically
Substances that degrade or transform

*includes POPs, pesticides, PCBs, and heavy metals

61. Pesticides and persistent organic pollutants (POPs), two classes of chemicals slated for control under the Stockholm Convention, are reported to be a concern in many regions. There is not much work reported on the other chemicals listed for control under the Stockholm Convention - dioxins, furans, and hexachlorobenzene - which are chemicals that may be formed and released unintentionally in industrial processes.

62. Many chemicals listed in the Rotterdam Convention - pesticides and other chlorinated organic compounds, and mercury and its compounds - are chemicals of concern to regional sea programmes.

63. Table 3 shows the capacity building work identified. Capacity building comprises a number of initiatives that may be undertaken by a country or countries with more advanced programmes to help others to fulfil their obligations under a convention. Regional sea programmes and global chemical conventions are specifically mandated to

work closely together on the implementation of capacity building, including information exchange. Capacity building in chemical management is necessary for the successful implementation of both regional sea programmes, and the Stockholm and Rotterdam Conventions.

64. Capacity building is carried out through key activities such as institutional strengthening, technology transfer, sharing information and knowledge, and conducting training sessions, workshops and seminars. Technology transfer encompasses not only the transfer of equipment, but also information and knowledge necessary to enable the technology to be used effectively and in a sustainable manner.

65. The survey shows that capacity building activities under regional sea programmes are limited to only a few areas. Most of the activity is in training where, according to Table 4, the focus is environmental sampling, laboratory analysis, and quality assurance and quality control programs. Training is particularly important to help ensure that reliable monitoring data is produced. This kind of training is reported for the Barcelona, Bucharest, Lima, and Helsinki Conventions, and the Caspian Programme. A few initiatives to build capacity for data management, chemical waste management, and development of legislation and regulations are also reported. The Caspian Environment Programme reports that it provides training on best available technology (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP).

66. Table 5 shows the risk assessment-related activities in each region. In order to assess the risk to the environment and human health from chemicals, an assessment is made of the hazard posed by the chemicals in question and the risk of exposure to them. Monitoring, and developing inventories of technologies, pollution loading, industries, point and diffuse (non-point) sources of emissions, and chemical uses are activities undertaken by regional sea programmes in support of the determination of hazard. Some programmes are also engaged in setting priorities for certain sources and chemicals.

67. Table 6 shows the many different types of monitoring work underway, including ambient air, seawater, river water, air emissions, deposition to water, direct liquid discharges and emissions, surface water run-off, sediments, and marine organisms. Seawater monitoring is carried out in most regions, and many are also monitoring marine organisms to determine the levels of chemicals and their effects. The Caspian Programme, and the Arctic Council's PAME/AMAP report that they are establishing reference chemical analytical laboratories, and quality assurance and quality control programmes.

68. Table 7 shows the various types of reports produced under regional sea programmes. Reports on the state of the marine environment are prepared for the Baltic, Black, Caspian and Mediterranean seas, the ROPME sea area, and the north-east Atlantic and Arctic oceans. Other types of reports - on chemical levels, trends, emissions, and land-based sources - are also produced in some regions. The OSPAR convention is the only one that produces reports on individual priority substances, and on best available technologies and best environmental practices to control chemical releases.

69. Tables 8 and 9 show the diverse kinds of the work being done to manage chemical risks. Most regions have regional strategic or action plans in place. In the Mediterranean, Caribbean, Caspian, Baltic and Arctic regions, where regional sea programmes are advanced, national strategies and action plans have been developed. Both technical means and legal instruments are being used in some regions, alone or in combination, to manage chemicals. Many programmes report that the review and updating of chemical legislation and regulations as an important activity. They report other work aimed at controlling chemical discharges, releases, and run-off; controlling chemical use, handling, production and trade; prevention of new uses of chemicals, and phasing-out current uses. Individual programmes report that they use best available technology (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP), implementation of environmental management programmes, integrated pest management, and economic instruments as risk management tools. The Barcelona, Bucharest, Noumea/Waigani, and OSPAR Conventions report work on management of hazardous chemical waste.

70. Many respondents reported on their work to develop standards, guidelines, indicators, and criteria for a variety of purposes, as indicated in Table 10. These apply to river quality, sea and coastal water quality, best available technology (BAT), best environmental practices (BEP), industrial point source discharges, industrial wastewater treatment, industrial air emissions, use of clean technology, standardizing definitions, the operation of reference laboratories, and to hazardous chemical waste management.

71. The most striking features of the regional sea programmes are the number of chemicals of concern, and the broad spectrum of activities that are ongoing.

POTENTIAL AREAS FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION

72. The Final Act of the Stockholm Convention, signed on 22 May 2001 includes the text of the convention and a series of resolutions to implement action on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) pending the convention's entry into force. The "Resolution on Interim Arrangements" invites UNEP to convene meetings of the International Negotiating Committee to oversee implementation of POPs activities in the period between signing and entry into force. Work of the International Negotiating Committee is to focus on facilitating rapid entry into force, and effective implementation of the convention once it is in force.

73. The International Negotiating Committee is instructed specifically to undertake, among other things, work in a number of areas where related work is planned or ongoing under regional sea programmes, and where collaboration between conventions and programmes could be considered. These areas include

capacity building,
technical assistance to Parties,

periodicity and format for reporting,
comparability of monitoring data,
best environmental practices (BEP),
best available technology (BAT),
evaluation of the need for continued use of the pesticide DDT .

74. Parties to the Stockholm Convention will be required, when the convention comes into force, to identify chemical stockpiles and chemical wastes, and manage them in an environmentally sound manner. Cooperation with the Basel Convention on matters related to POPs waste disposal is required by the Stockholm Convention. Regional sea programmes could consider undertaking work to help identify waste chemicals for disposal in the region.

75. Twelve POPs are already identified for action under the Stockholm Convention. The list is likely to increase once the convention is adopted. An annex to the convention gives specific criteria for assessment of the toxicity of individual POPs, and a procedure by which a chemical becomes a candidate for inclusion in the convention. It is anticipated that monitoring, assessment and other information produced under regional sea programmes will be an important component of any future submissions to include a new chemical under the Stockholm Convention.

76. Monitoring is an activity that all regional sea programmes must undertake. Collaboration on guidelines for monitoring, on standardized monitoring procedures and techniques, on the use of reference laboratories, and on database development and reporting should be considered. Several regional sea programmes have reported activities related to POPs analysis. Very few countries have the laboratory capacity for POPs analysis. Analysis of POPs is very costly, and laboratories sometimes disagree on analytical techniques and results. Collaboration on this type of training could also be considered.

77. The Stockholm Convention requires Parties to develop an implementation plan for the implementation of its obligations under the convention. National action plans developed under regional sea programmes will be supportive of this.

78. Pesticides and heavy metals are a concern for every regional sea programme, and many of the same pesticides and heavy metals are listed in the Rotterdam Convention. Under the Rotterdam Convention, when a Party has undertaken a final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical, the Secretariat must be notified. The notification must contain specified information, such as on the physical-chemical, toxicological, and eco-toxicological properties of the chemical; its uses, hazards and risks; and information on alternatives such as integrated pest management, and industrial processes and practices, including cleaner technologies. Work on chemicals under regional sea conventions generates this type of information.

79. The effective implementation of the Basel Convention relies heavily on the capacity of regional and sub-regional organizations. Capacity building, especially training, is a

critical area for establishing links between the Basel Convention and the regional programmes, in key areas such as the environmentally sound management of wastes, the dismantling of ships, and the development and or updating of national waste legislation and regulations.

80. The inventory confirms that there are many opportunities for collaboration with the global chemical and hazardous waste conventions on regional and national chemical work. The inventory could be used initially in support of international harmonization of data collection and reporting, to promote mutual acceptance of data, and to develop internationally harmonized assessment methods and cooperation in conducting assessments.

UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.4

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Ecosystem-based Management of Fisheries: The Way Forward

1. At its ninth session, in July 2000, the Subcommittee on Ocean and Coastal Areas (SOCA) of the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development, operating under the umbrella of the UN Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), recognised the need and opportunities for an improved cooperation and coordination among the existing regional bodies and mechanisms dealing with the protection of the marine environment and management of fisheries. The session of SOCA felt that the challenge posed by the development of ecosystem approaches to fisheries management and integrated coastal management could be considered by regional seas conventions (RSCs) and regional fishery bodies (RFBs) as a potential platform for practical cooperation.[1]

2. As a first step in this direction a paper focusing on ecosystem based management in fisheries was jointly developed by FAO and UNEP. The purpose of the paper was to present considerations which can serve as the basis for potential cooperation between RFBs and RSCs. The paper described the concept of ecosystem-based fisheries management, the relevant mandates and activities of RFBs and RFCs and the relationship and mutual relevance of their work. Possible mechanisms for cooperation, and issues for future consideration, were identified. It was anticipated that such cooperation would be best carried out on a site-specific or regional basis, after the initial consideration at global level by RFBs and RSCs.

3. The paper was presented and reviewed at the Third Global Meeting of the Regional Seas Conventions, organised by UNEP (Monaco 6-9 November 2000) and the Second Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements, organised by FAO (Rome, 20-21 February 2001). Taking into account the comments, suggestions and amendments received at and after these meetings, the paper was revised and issued by UNEP as No. XXXX in the Regional Seas Reports and Studies Series. The revised paper is submitted as an information document for the present meeting.

4. The recommendations addressed to the RSCs and the RFBs that were reviewed by the meetings mentioned above included:

♦ Formalise the observer status of the RSCs at the meetings of the governing bodies of the RFBs and their technical subsidiary organs, and vice versa.

---

[1] Draft Report of the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas on its Ninth Session, London 26-28 July 2000, paras 96 and 97. The need for such cooperation has been also recognised by the RSCs: (i) *The First Inter-Regional Programme Consultation* (The Hague, 24-26 June 1998) identified "the lack of necessary interaction with the fisheries sector and other socio-economic sectors" as one of the "most fundamental problems hampering the implementation of the respective Regional Seas Programmes" and recommended that "agreements should be reached to incorporate the implications and concerns of the fisheries sector in the programmes". (ii) *The Second Global Meeting on Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans* (The Hague, 5-8 July 1999), considered how to "address more effectively the issue of the sustainable management of fisheries" by "integrating environmental considerations into the fishery sector". (iii) At the same meeting, the representative of the Alliance of Small Island States emphasised that a major challenge for SIDS is the need for development and management programmes aimed at achieving ecological and economical sustainable use of coastal and marine resources in several areas, including sustainable fisheries.

♦ Exchange data and information available at the level of RFBs and RSCs that may be of mutual interest.

♦ Establish joint advisory panels and organise joint technical meetings on subjects of mutual interest, as is presently the case between Helsinki and Ospar Commissions and ICES.

♦ Create formal agreements (e.g. memoranda of understanding) between relevant RSCs and RFBs specifying the scope and modalities of cooperation.

♦ Seek association and cooperation with the regional components of global programmes providing data and information relevant to ecosystem-based fishery management, such as GOOS.

♦ Design and implement joint programmes between RFBs and RSCs taking fully into account the respective mandates, objectives and scope of the RSCs and RFBs.

5. In the broader framework of ecosystem-based approach to the protection of the marine environment, UNEP is keen to see that the cooperation among the RSCs and the RFBs is pursued along the lines of these recommendation and intends to provide, within the limits of its available financial resources, support for such cooperation. In order to facilitate the coordination of the cooperation among the RFBs and the RSCs, UNEP would need to maintain an up to date information-base on the present status and planned development of this cooperation. Therefore, a questionnaire is attached to the present paper. The representatives of the RSCs are kindly asked to fill in the questionnaire during the meeting. The inputs received will be consolidated and reproduced as an annex to the report of the present meeting.

STATUS AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATION BETWEEN ..... AND THE RELEVANT FISHERY BODIES

Please, provide information on the present status of the implementation of each of the six recommendations and on the eventual plans for their implementation. Return the filled in questionnaire to the secretariat of the meeting. .

1. Formalise the observer status of the relevant RFBs at the meetings of the governing bodies of the convention/programme and their technical subsidiary organs.

(a) Present status:

(b) Planned:

2. Exchange data and information available at the level of RFBs and RSCs that may be of mutual interest.

(a) Present status:

(b) Planned:

3. Establish joint advisory panels and organise joint technical meetings on subjects of mutual interest.

(a) Present status:

(b) Planned:

4. Create formal agreements (e.g. memoranda of understanding) between relevant RSCs and RFBs specifying the scope and modalities of cooperation.

(a) Present status:

(b) Planned:

5. Seek association and cooperation with the regional components of global programmes providing data and information relevant to ecosystem-based fishery management, such as GOOS.

(a) Present status:

(b) Planned:

6. Design and implement joint programmes between RFBs and RSCs taking fully into account the respective mandates, objectives and scope of the RSCs and RFBs.

(a) Present status:

(b) Planned:

.....
(signature)

Date: .....

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.1.5

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Opportunities for Cooperation and Co-ordination between Basel Convention on Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal and Regional Seas Conventions

CONTENTS

	page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	**2**
1. BACKGROUND	**3**
2. THE BASEL CONVENTION	**3**
3. THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS	**7**
4. RELATIONSHIP AND MUTUAL RELEVANCE OF THE WORK CARRIED OUT UNDER BASEL CONVENTION AND THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS	**10**
5. CONCLUSIONS AND POSSIBLE OPTIONS FOR COOPERATION AND CO-ORDINATION	**12**
ANNEX 1: REGIONAL CENTRES OF THE BASEL CONVENTION	
ANNEX 2: REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND PROGRAMMES: BASIC FACTS	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present document has been prepared by the Secretariat of the Basel Convention as a contribution to the dialogue with the Secretariats of the Regional Seas Conventions about the areas and modalities for enhanced cooperation between the Basel Convention and the Regional Seas Conventions.

The document reviews the basic structures and provisions of the Basel Convention (Chapter 2) and the Regional Seas Conventions (Chapter 3), and the mechanisms used in their implementation, with special reference to issues and activities that may be relevant for enhanced cooperation between these conventions.

Chapter 4 highlights the relationship and mutual relevance of the work carried out under the Basel Convention and the Regional Seas Conventions, and refers to specific provisions and activities of the Regional Seas Conventions contributing to the regional implementation of the Basel Convention.

Chapter 5 explores the possible benefits from closer cooperation between the Basel Convention and the Regional Seas Conventions, and identifies four areas which could be tackled through cost-effective joint actions:

- *training related to waste management principles, procedures and technologies;*
- *public awareness raising;*
- *assistance in development of national legislation and regulatory measures related to waste management; and*
- *harmonisation of reporting requirements under the Basel convention and the protocols of the Regional Seas Conventions dealing with transboundary movement of wastes.*

Eight specific actions are recommended in the same Chapter as concrete steps towards an enhanced cooperation between the Basel Convention and the Regional Seas Conventions.

Two annexes are attached to the document providing information on the status of the Basel Convention Regional Centres the major Regional Seas Conventions.

1. BACKGROUND

The fourth meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal requested the Secretariat of the Convention to explore areas of cooperation with other international conventions and agencies.[1] The fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties reiterated this intention by requesting the Secretariat to establish, pursue and reinforce its closer collaboration with the relevant offices and programmes of UNEP.[2]

In view of the overlapping and complementary interests and goals of the Parties to the Basel Convention and the parties to the regional seas conventions, this document has been prepared by the Secretariat of the Basel Convention to facilitate the dialogue with the secretariats of the regional seas conventions about the areas and modalities of possible cooperation. Specifically, the paper is prepared for presentation to and consideration by the 4th Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions (Montreal, 21-23 November 2001). The views and the eventual recommendations of that meeting about the possible steps for closer cooperation between the Basel Convention and the regional seas conventions are planned to be incorporated in a revised version of the document which will be submitted to the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention to be held in December 2002 through the Convention's subsidiary bodies.

2. THE BASEL CONVENTION

Origins

The growing concern about the problems associated with management of hazardous wastes was first tackled in a systematic way at the global scale by the so-called 1981 Montevideo Programme[3] which led, in 1985, to the formulation of Guidelines and Principles for the Environmentally Sound Management of Hazardous Wastes (the Cairo Guidelines) and to subsequent negotiation of a global convention on the control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes.

The negotiations, carried out under UNEP's auspices, were completed by early 1989, when the **Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal** was adopted by a conference of plenipotentiaries.[4]

Status

The Convention entered into force, in May 1992, after its ratification by the 20th state. As at 1 November 2001, 147 countries and the European Union are parties to the Basel Convention.

Geographic coverage

The geographic scope of the Basel Convention is global. It covers the areas under national jurisdiction of the Contracting Parties, i.e. any land, marine area or air space over which Parties exercise administrative

---

1 Decision IV/4 of the Conference of the Parties.

2 Decision V/5 of the Conference of the Parties.

3 In May 1981, the Governing Council of UNEP called for an Ad Hoc Meeting of Senior Government Officials Experts in Environmental Law to identify subjects for global and regional cooperation in the elaboration of environmental law. The first meeting of the Experts (Montevideo, Uruguay, 28 October - 6 November 1981) adopted the Montevideo Programme highlighting issues such as the transport, handling and disposal of toxic and dangerous wastes, and recommended the preparation of specific guidelines to deal with this issues.

4 The Convention was adopted and signed in Basel, on 22 March 1989, by the representatives of 35 governments and the European Economic Community.

and regulatory responsibility in accordance with international law in regard to the protection of human health or the environment.

Basic provisions of the Convention

The Convention is a framework type of conventions, consisting of 29 Articles, a number of Annexes and a Protocol on Liability and Compensation.[5] The Annexes and the Protocol are integral parts of the Convention and are legally binding for the Contracting Parties that have ratified them.

The overall goal of the Convention is to protect human health and the environment against the adverse effects which may result from the generation, transboundary movements and management of hazardous wastes. It rests on two main pillars:

- a control system for transboundary movement of wastes, aiming at reduction of transboundary movements of wastes; and
- environmentally sound management of wastes, aiming at reduction of the quantity of wastes to a minimum.

Among the general obligations of the Parties are[6]:

- to exercise their right to prohibit the import of hazardous wastes;
- to prohibit or not permit the export of hazardous wastes to the Parties which have prohibited the import of such wastes;
- to prohibit or not permit the export of hazardous wastes not specifically prohibited by the importing country if the importing country has not consented in writing to the specific import;
- to ensure that the generation of hazardous wastes is reduced to a minimum;
- to ensure the availability of adequate disposal facilities for the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes;
- to prevent the export of hazardous wastes to the Parties which have prohibited such imports, or if it has reason to believe that the wastes in question will not be managed in an environmentally sound manner;
- to prevent the import of hazardous wastes if it has reason to believe that the wastes in question will not be managed in an environmentally sound manner;
- to deny permit for the export and/or import of hazardous wastes involving a country that is not Party to the Convention;
- to agree not to allow the export of hazardous wastes for disposal to Antractica; and
- to ensure that the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes only be allowed if: (i) the exporting country does not have the technical capacity and the necessary facilities in order to dispose of the wastes in an environmentally sound manner; or (ii) the wastes in question are required as raw material for recycling or recovery industries in the importing country.

The categories of wastes to be controlled or requiring special consideration, the list of hazardous characteristics, the disposal operations, the information to be provided on notification on the movement document, the arbitration procedures and other technical specifications relevant to the implementation of the Convention are contained in the annexes of the Convention.

Recognising the need to focus the Convention activities, the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties (COP5) adopted the Basel Declaration on Environmentally Sound Management which specifies a set of priorities on which the Convention is expected to focus during the first decade of the 21st century and reaffirms, as the fundamental aims of the Basel Convention, the reduction of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and other wastes subject to the Basel Convention, the prevention and minimisation of their generation, the environmentally sound management of such wastes and the active promotion of the transfer and use of cleaner technologies.[7]

---

5 The Protocol was adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (1999) and is not in force yet.

6 Article 4 of the Convention.

7 Paragraph 3 of the Declaration.

Programme of implementation

The Parties to the Convention have the primary responsibility for the implementation of the provisions of the Convention. In order to assist the Parties and facilitate the implementation of the Convention a Manual for the Implementation of the Basel Convention has been elaborated by the Secretariat and approved by the second meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties (COP2).[8]

In addition to the implementation of the Convention at the national levels, and the role the Secretariat plays in this implementation, from the outset a considerable role has been assigned by the Parties to the **Basel Convention Regional Centres**. Article 14 of the Basel Convention stipulates that "according to the specific needs of different regions and sub-regions, regional or sub-regional centres for training and technology transfer regarding the management of hazardous wastes and other wastes and the minimisation of their generation should be established."[9] The Centres are expected to operate, under the guidance of the secretariat, within the framework of an Action Plan common to all centres, approved by the Conference of the Parties and adapted to the specific needs and possibilities of the geographic regions and sub-regions covered by their activities.

The common role an functions of the Centres are tentatively defined as:

(a) Developing and conducting training courses, workshops, seminars and associated projects in the field of the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes, transfer of environmentally sound technology and minimization of the generation of hazardous wastes with specific emphasis on training the trainers.
(b) Gathering, assessing and disseminating data and information in the field of hazardous wastes and other wastes to Parties of the region and to SBC.
(c) Collecting information on new or proven environmentally sound technologies and know-how relating to environmentally sound management and minimisation of the generation of hazardous wastes and other wastes and disseminating these to Parties of the region at their request.
(d) Identifying, developing and strengthening mechanisms for the transfer of technology in the field of the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes or their minimization in the region.
(e) Providing scientific, technical and legal assistance and advice to the Parties of the region at their request, on matters relevant to the environmentally sound management or minimization of hazardous wastes, he implementation of the provisions of the Basel Convention and other related matters.
(f) Cooperating with the United Nations and its bodies, in particular UNEP and the Specialised Agencies, and with other relevant intergovernmental organisations, industry and non-governmental organisations, and, where appropriate, with any other institution, in order to coordinate activities and develop and implement joint projects related to he provisions of the Basel Convention.
(g) Developing within the general financial strategy approved by the Parties, its own financial strategy.
(h) Establishing and maintaining regular exchange of information and networking among the parties of the region relevant to the provisions of the Basel Convention.
(i) Encouraging the best approaches, practices and methodologies for the environmentally sound management and minimization of the generation of hazardous wastes and other wastes, e.g. through case studies and pilot projects.
(j) Organising meetings, symposiums and missions in the field, useful for carrying out these objectives in the region.
(k) Promoting public awareness.
(l) Mobilising human, financial and material means in order to meet the urgent needs at the request of the Party(ies) of the region faced with incidents or accidents which cannot be solved with the means of the individual Party(ies) concerned.
(m) Performing any other functions assigned to it by the decisions of the Conference of the Parties of the Basel Convention or by Parties of the region, consistent with such decisions.

---

[8] The manual is a detailed analysis of the actions expected to be taken by the Parties and describes in practical terms the legal, institutional and technical aspects related to the implementation of the Conventions.

[9] For information about the present status of the Centres and their activities see Annex 1.

Governance

The periodically held **Conference of the Parties (COP)** is the governing body of the Convention.[10] Five meetings of the Conferences of Parties were convened since the Convention entered into force.[11] The main task of the Conference of the Parties is to keep under continuous review and evaluation the effective implementation of the Convention, including:

- promote the harmonisation of appropriate policies, strategies and measures for minimising harm to human health and environment by hazardous wastes and other wastes;
- consider and adopt, as required, amendments to the Convention and its annexes;
- consider an undertake any additional action that may be required for the achievement of the purpose of the Convention;
- consider and adopt protocols as required; and
- establish such subsidiary bodies as are deemed necessary for the implementation of the Convention.

In the periods between COPs, general policy guidance and operational directions is provided to the Secretariat of the Convention by an **Expanded Bureau**, composed of actual members of the COP Bureau, chair persons of the subsidiary bodies and the previous Bureau members of the COP.

The implementation of the Convention is assisted by several subsidiary bodies established under the authority of COPs.[12]

Secretariat and coordination

The Secretariat of the Convention, headed by an Executive Secretary and administered by UNEP, was established in early 1993, in Geneva.[13]

The main substantive functions of the Secretariat include: (i) carrying out the implementation of the Convention as guided and decided by COPs and their subsidiary bodies; (ii) arranging and servicing the meetings of COPs and their subsidiary bodies; (iii) ensuring the necessary coordination with relevant international bodies; (iv) communicating with Focal Points and Competent Authorities established by the Parties; (v) providing information to the Parties on subjects identified by COPs; and (vi) assisting the Parties in matters specified by COPs.

The coordination of the Convention's implementation is achieved through activities at the national, regional and global levels.

At the national level, the Secretariat cooperates with: (i) the **Competent Authorities** designated by each Party to be responsible for receiving, informing and responding to the notification of a transboundary movement of hazardous wastes; and (ii) **Focal Points** responsible for transmission of information and communication with the Secretariat.

---

[10] The United Nations, its specialised agencies and any state that is not party to the Convention are invited to participate as observers at COPs. In addition, arrangements have been established for other bodies or agencies, whether international or national, governmental or non-governmental, to participate in the COPs as observers, provided they are qualified in the subject of hazardous wastes.

[11] COP1 in Piriapolis, Uruguay, 30 November – 4 December 1992; COP2 in Geneva, Switzerland, 21-25 March 1994; COP3 in Geneva Switzerland 18-22 September 1995; COP4 in Kuching, Malaysia 23-27 February 1998; COP5 in Basel, Switzerland, 6-10 December 1999. The convening of COP6 is planned for December 2002.

[12] The **Working Group for Implementation** meets between the meetings of the Parties. Its main task is to prepare issues for the consideration of the COPs. The **Technical Working Group** provides technical guidance on issues such as the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes, and criteria on suitability of wastes for recovery and recycling. The **Legal Working Group** was established to study issues related to the establishment of a mechanism for monitoring the implementation of and compliance with the Convention, illegal trafficking, and to examine issues related to the establishment of an emergency fund.

[13] Secretariat of the Basel Convention, UNEP, 15 chemin des Anemones, CH-1219 Chatelaine-Geneve, Switzerland, tel (+41 22) 917 82 18; fax 797 34 54, e-mail sbc@unep.ch, website www.basel.int

At the regional level, the Secretariat coordinates the work of the Basel Convention Regional Centres, operating in conformity with the decisions of the COPs and under the guidance of the Secretariat.

The coordination of action at a global level is achieved by decisions of COPs.

Funding

As a follow-up to a decision of the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties[14] a Trust Fund for the implementation of the Basel Convention has been established to provide financial support for the ordinary expenditures of the Secretariat. The appropriations of the Trust Fund are financed from contributions of the Parties to the Convention and contributions from countries that are not Parties to the Convention, other governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations and other sources. The contributions from the Parties to the Convention are expected to be based on the United Nations scale of assessment. The management of the Trust Fund has been entrusted to UNEP

By the same decision of COP1, a Technical Cooperation Trust Fund has been also established to assist developing countries and other countries in need of technical assistance in the implementation of the Convention. The sources of contributions and the management arrangement for the Fund are the same as in the case of Trust Fund for the Basel Convention.

3. THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS

Origins

The regional approach to the marine environment is not new. Initially it focused on bilateral and multilateral agreements related to regulation of navigation and fishing. However, starting from the late 1960s, with the growing concern about the impacts of marine pollution, it was recognised that - along the existing and evolving global agreements[15] - effective marine pollution control should be sought through region-specific agreements.

The first agreement of this type was successfully negotiated and adopted in 1972 (Oslo Convention). A strong boost to the development of similar agreements was given by the United Nations Conference on Human Environment (Stockholm, 1972) and by the negotiation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

UNEP played a leading role in initiating or supporting the negotiations of a number of regional seas conventions and provided the initial financial resources needed for their implementation, but there is also a number of conventions that evolved without UNEP's assistance.

Status

Presently, there are eleven major regional seas conventions in force that are designed for the protection of the marine environment: Helsinki (1974), Barcelona (1976), Kuwait (1978), Abidjan (1981), Lima (1981), Jeddah (1982) Cartagena (1983), Nairobi (1985), Noumea (1986), Bucharest (1992) and OSPAR (1992)[16]. In addition to the conventions in force, there are two regional seas conventions under negotiation: one for the Caspian Sea and another for the Northeast Pacific.[17]

---

[14] Decision 1/7.

[15] E.g., the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil (adopted in 1954, London); the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (adopted in 1972, London); the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, adopted in 1973, London).

[16] The OSPAR Convention supersedes the Oslo (1974) and Paris (1978) Conventions.

[17] Detailed information on major regional seas conventions and agreements that may be relevant for their cooperation with the Basel Convention is contained in Annex 2.

Geographic coverage

The regional seas conventions cover the maritime areas under the jurisdiction of the contracting parties to these conventions, with the exclusion of internal waters in most cases. However, some conventions or the provisions of certain protocols or annexes associated with the conventions also apply to internal waters and, in one instance, even to the hydrologic basin and ground waters associated with the convention area.[18]

Basic provisions of the conventions

Most of the regional seas conventions considered in the present document, particularly those negotiated under the aegis of UNEP, are in the form of "comprehensive framework conventions", with articles of quite general nature which in themselves would have been of little practical value. However, the conventions are supplemented with several protocols and annexes specifying the concrete measures expected to be implemented by the parties to the conventions. The protocols and annexes constitute legally binding integral parts of the conventions.

A number of regional seas conventions, particularly those adopted in early 1970s, were amended or even entirely revised in order to reflect the broadening concern of the contracting parties for the complex problems of the marine environment.[19] The most radical change was the merging of two conventions into a new convention.[20] Further revisions and amendments are being considered for some conventions.[21]

The evolving concern for the protection of the marine environment is reflected in the various protocols and annexes that have been associated with the conventions. Initially they focused on cooperation in cases of pollution emergencies and control of pollution caused by dumping but today they cover a much broader gamut of issues.[22]

Action plans: programmes of implementation

All regional seas conventions are associated with specific programmes (most frequently in the form of an "action plan") supporting the implementation of the provisions of the conventions and their protocols. Most action plans, particularly those adopted under UNEP's aegis, follow the structure similar to the one adopted for the Action Plan for the Human Environment at United Nations Conference on Human Environment (UNCHE; Stockholm, 1972), although the specific activities for any region depend on the needs and priorities of that region.

The overall strategy followed by most regional seas action plans include, with slight modifications:

- Promotion of international and regional conventions, programmes, guidelines and actions for the control of activities leading to the degradation of the marine and coastal environment and for the protection and management of marine and coastal resources on a sustainable basis.

---

18 The geographic area covered by the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife of the Cartagena Convention includes: (i) waters on the landward side of the baseline from which the breath of the territorial sea is measured and extending, in the case of watercourses, up to the fresh water limit; and (ii) such related terrestrial areas (including watersheds) as may be designated by the party having sovereignty and jurisdiction over such waters.

19 For instance, the amendments and revisions of the Barcelona (1995) and the Helsinki (1992) Conventions broadened the scope of the conventions, and modified the geographic area covered by one of the conventions.

20 The 1992 OSPAR Convention is more than a "mechanical" merger of the 1974 Oslo and the 1978 Paris Conventions. While the latter Conventions were designed to deal with the control of pollution caused by dumping and land-based sources, 1992 OSPAR is dealing, as signified by its title, with the protection of the marine environment in a broader context.

21 E.g., for the 1985 Nairobi Convention.

22 For details see Annex 2.

- Assessment of the state of the marine and coastal environment, of the trends in the quality of this environment, of the sources and causes of the degradation of the marine and coastal environment, and of the impact of this degradation on human health, ecosystems and amenities.

- Promotion of integrated management of geographic areas covered by the conventions and protocols.

- Support for education and training efforts in order enable the full participation of developing countries in the implementation of the conventions and in activities envisaged under the action plans.

While the focus of the first action plans was on the protection of the marine environment from pollution, the subsequently adopted action plans shifted their priorities to all issues relevant to the development and protection of the marine environment and their resources. The periodic revisions of the action plans broadened their scope in order to emphasise issues related to integrated management and use of coastal and marine environment along the lines recommended by Agenda 21 adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED; Rio de Janeiro, 1992). In some regions determined efforts are being made to pay more attention to the specific problems of small island states, to the management of associated river basins and to the potential effects of climate change. With a few exceptions, issues related to fisheries are among the only major issues that are not specifically covered, or are covered only in a marginal way, by the action plans.

Governance

The periodic meetings of the contracting parties to the regional seas conventions or, when the action plans are not associated with such conventions, periodic high-level intergovernmental meetings represent the highest authority guiding the action plans, determining the priorities which should be dealt with by the plans and allocating the financial resources to specifically agreed activities.

Various subsidiary bodies established by the contracting parties assist in the governance of the conventions and action plans.

Implementation

The provisions of the conventions, the decisions of the meetings of the contracting parties or the intergovernmental meetings, and the specific activities agreed as parts of the action plans are implemented by national authorities and institutions of the contracting parties.

Secretariats and coordination

UNEP provides the secretariat for four conventions and seven action plans described in the present document, either directly through its Headquarters in Nairobi or through semiautonomous "regional coordinating units" operating under the authority of the contracting parties and managed by UNEP on their behalf.[23] The other seven conventions and action plans have secretariats established and maintained by the contracting parties to these conventions.[24]

The secretariats provide overall guidance and coordination of agreed activities at the regional level. At the country level the internal coordination of these activities is achieved by national coordinators appointed by each contracting party.

For the implementation and coordination of some specific activities, particularly those linked with legally binding provisions (e.g., protocols adopted under he conventions), "regional activity centres" have been established by the decisions of the contracting parties. Most of these centres are national institutions

---

23 UNEP also coordinates and assists the development of two additional conventions (Caspian Sea and Northeast Pacific), an additional action plan (Northeast Pacific) and a "cooperative programme" (Upper South West Atlantic).

24 For more details about the secretariats see Annex 3.

with regional roles assigned to them by the meetings of the contracting parties and operate on a project funding basis.[25]

Funding

Seed money for the negotiation and initial implementation of the conventions and the associated action plans developed under UNEP's sponsorship was provided by UNEP. The common costs associated with the implementation of the conventions and their action plans (e.g., secretariat, meetings, coordination, training) are met through special trust funds established by the contracting parties of each convention. The implementation of the conventions and action plans at national levels is funded by individual governments, although through the trust funds considerable assistance is provided to developing countries. Additionally, there are projects that are financed or co-financed through resources obtained, on a project funding basis, from external sources (e.g., GEF, European Union) or specially earmarked government contributions.

4. RELATIONSHIP AND MUTUAL RELEVANCE OF THE WORK CARRIED OUT UNDER BASEL CONVENTION AND THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS[26]

The protection of the marine environment and its resources is a central issue around which the regional seas conventions and their action plans have been developed. The provisions of the conventions' articles referring to the control of pollution from various sources, to the management of wastes, and to the protection of specially vulnerable ecosystems, including their biological diversity,[27] reflect the scope of the conventions which is highly relevant and complementary to the broad goals of the Basel Convention and thus provide ample opportunities for effective cooperation.

Moreover, in the specific fields of the control of transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and the environmentally sound management of wastes, the regional seas conventions can be considered as the regional components of the Basel Convention. In turn, the Basel Convention can be considered as the global legal framework within which the regional seas conventions and programmes deal with the transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and the environmentally sound management of wastes at the regional level.[28] The basic prerequisite and requirement for such relationship and for an effective and harmonious cooperation between the Basel Convention and the regional seas conventions is that the provisions of the global and regional conventions should not be in conflict.[29] This does not require that the provisions of the global and regional conventions are necessarily identical. In fact, the provisions of

---

[25] For more information on the regional centres established under the regional seas conventions see Annex 2 of the Secretariat's paper on *Options for the Establishment of Basel Convention Regional, Sub-Regional and Regional Coordinating Centres and the Implications of Various Options.*

[26] It is beyond the scope of this document to analyse the relationship between the Basel Convention and the Bamako Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa.

[27] Protocols and annexes related to these issues are associated with ost of the conventions.

[28] A similar relationship exist between the regional seas conventions and some global conventions (e.g., the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and other Matter) and programmes (e.g., the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities – GPA/LBA).

[29] Article 11 on Bilateral, Multilateral and regional Agreements of he Basel Convention: "Parties may enter into bilateral, multilateral, or regional agreements or arrangements regarding transboundary movement of hazardous wastes or other wastes with Parties or non-Parties provided that such agreements or arrangements do not derogate from the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes or other wastes as required by this Convention. These agreements or arrangements shall stipulate provisions which are not less environmentally sound than those provided for by this Convention in particular taking into account the interests of developing countries." "The provisions of this Convention shall not affect transboundary movements which take place pursuant to such agreements provided that such agreements are compatible with the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes and other wastes as required by this Convention."

the regional seas conventions relevant to the transboundary movement of wastes and their disposal are in many respect stricter than those of the Basel Convention, in order to respond to specific regional needs and conditions.

Until the adoption of the Basel Convention in 1989, the regional seas conventions and their programmes did not pay specific attention to the control of transboundary movement of hazardous wastes. The only notable exception was the **Abidjan Convention** adopted in 1981. Being aware of the problems caused by wastes originating from some industrialised countries and illegally dumped in the coastal waters of West and Central African region, at the adoption of the Convention a conference resolution on "Right of Hot Pursuit" was passed. The resolution "recommends cooperation between States which are Parties to the Convention, in combating marine pollution by ships, considering in particular granting the right of hot pursuit in all waters within the geographic scope of the Convention, in respect of vessels caught in the act of polluting in waters falling under their jurisdiction".

Sensitised by the negotiation and adoption of the Basel Convention, and with reference to Article 11 of the Convention, the specific problems associated with transboundary movement of hazardous wastes gradually became more appreciated and the approach of the parties to the regional seas conventions towards these problems was gradually changed.

For instance, the **Barcelona Convention**[30] now contains a new Article 11 "Pollution resulting from the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal" specifying that: "The Contracting Parties shall take all appropriate measures to prevent, abate and to the fullest possible extent eliminate pollution of the environment which can be caused by transboundary movements and disposal of hazardous wastes, and to reduce to a minimum, and if possible eliminate, such transboundary movement." In addition, the Parties to the Convention, "taking into account the Basel Convention" and the relevant decisions of COPs, as well as the "Bamako Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa", adopted a **Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal.**[31] The Protocol and its annexes follow the Basel Convention and stipulates that: "Every State involved in a transboundary movement ensures that such movement is consistent with international safety standards and financial guarantees, in particular the procedures and standards set out in the Basel Convention" [32]. A review/assessment of the hazardous waste management practices is planned to be undertaken as the first specific activity under the Protocol.

A similar protocol, specifically dealing with the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and their disposal is planned to be developed under the **Jeddah Convention**.

The formulation of a protocol on transboundary movement of hazardous wastes was considered several time by the Parties to the **Cartagena Convention** but the Parties decided that, for the time being, it would be more appropriate to join the Basel Convention and implement it in cooperation with the Basel Convention regional and sub-regional centres relevant to the Wider Caribbean region.

A different approach for dealing with matters relevant to the transboundary movement of wastes and their disposal through regional seas conventions has been used by the **Noumea Convention** which is associated with **the Waigani Convention to Ban the Importation in Forum Island Countries of Hazardous Wastes and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific.**[33] Both conventions have the same constituency, are served by the same Secretariat and are implemented in the framework of the

---

30 As amended in 1995. Amendment not in force.

31 The Protocol was adopted in 1996. It is not in force.

32 Article 6, paragraph 5 of the Protocol.

33 The Convention was adopted in September 1995 and will enter into force upon the deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification/accession.

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), a solution that ensures the full integration of the concern for the transboundary movement of wastes into a regional seas convention.

SPREP has also developed a very close cooperation with the Basel Convention. A Memorandum of Understanding was signed, in 1996, between the Secretariats of SPREP and the Basel Convention. It provides a framework for a joint implementation of the Waigani and Basel Conventions in the form of technical and legal assistance to the Parties of both Conventions. A further Memorandum of Understanding was signed, in 2000, between UNEP and the Secretariat of SPREP calling "to fully implement the Waigani and the Basel Conventions through the strengthening of cooperation between the Secretariats of SPREP and the Basel Convention."[34]

Although under the **Helsinki Convention** there are no specific activities strictly related to the Basel Convention, in 1998 a project to control discharges, emissions and losses of hazardous substances has been formulated.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND POSSIBLE OPTIONS FOR COOPERATION AND CO-ORDINATION

The goals set by the regional seas conventions and the Basel Convention, and the activities carried out under these conventions, are partially overlapping and clearly indicate that there is a broad range of possibilities for an enhanced cooperation between them. The main benefits from such cooperation would be:

- a holistic and more integrated approach to the management of wastes at national, regional and global levels; and

- reduced duplication of work in the fields of mutual or overlapping interest to the Basel Convention and the regional seas conventions, resulting in a better and more effective use of available financial and manpower resources at national level as well as at the level of the secretariats of these conventions

The examples described in Chapter 4 of the present document indicate a generally positive, albeit somewhat slow development of collaborative arrangements between the Regional Seas Conventions and the Basel Convention, including the regional centres established under the Basel Convention. Taking into account the goals of these conventions and the programmes of their work, a more intensive collaboration would seem mutually beneficial, particularly in the following areas which could be tackled through cost-effective joint actions:

- training related to waste management principles, procedures and technologies;
- public awareness raising;
- assistance in development of national legislation and regulatory measures related to waste management; and
- harmonisation of reporting requirements under the Basel Convention and the protocols of the regional seas conventions dealing with transboundary movement of wastes.

A further benefit could be accrued by extending the cooperation between the Basel Convention and the regional seas conventions in the indicated areas to other global agreements and programmes relevant to waste management (such as: the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants; the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in

---

[34] The activities carried out in the framework of these Memoranda are numerous and include, inter alia: an assessment carried out by the Secretariat of the Basel Convention about the suitability of the Secretariat of SPREP to become the Secretariat of the Waigani Convention (1999); active participation of the SPREP Secretariat at COP5; active participation of the Secretariat of the Basel Convention in the Sub-Regional Awareness Raising workshop on PIC, POPs, and the Basel/Waigani Conventions (Cairns, Australia, 2001); development of a project proposal for the implementation of the Basel and Waigani Conventions in the SPREP region; consideration of the possible use of SPREP's Training and Education Centre to fulfil the mandate of the Basel Convention Regional Centre in the SPREP region.

International Trade; the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities – GPA/LBA).

Specific actions that may be considered in this direction:

- Formalise the observer status of the regional seas conventions at the meetings of the Parties to the Basel Convention and the relevant subsidiary bodies and structures coordinating the work of the Basel Convention regional centres, and vice versa.
- Exchange data and information of mutual interest and relevance available at the level of the secretariat of the regional seas conventions, and the Secretariat of the Basel Convention and at the Basel Convention regional centres.
- Establish joint advisory panels between the regional seas conventions and the Basel Convention, including the Basel Convention regional centres, and organise joint technical meetings on subjects of mutual interest.
- Create formal agreements (e.g., memoranda of understanding) between the regional seas conventions and the Basel Convention (and the Basel Convention regional centres, as appropriate) specifying the scope and modalities of their cooperation.
- Seek support for the jointly agreed activities of the regional seas conventions and the Basel Convention through multilateral association and cooperation with the relevant global conventions (such as the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships – MARPOL, and the London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter) and the regional components of global programmes (such as the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities - GPA/LBA, and the Global Ocean Observing System - GOOS).
- Design and implement joint programmes between the regional seas conventions and the Basel Convention (and the Basel Convention regional centres, as appropriate) taking fully into account the respective mandates, objectives and scope of these conventions.
- Coordinate the implementation of the protocols developed under the regional seas conventions for the control of transboundary movement of wastes and their disposal with the Basel Convention by adopting a common approach to their implementation and harmonising the reporting requirements.
- Develop such protocols for the regional seas convention which still do not have them as joint activities of the regional seas conventions and the Basel Convention.

ANNEX 1
REGIONAL CENTRES OF THE BASEL CONVENTION

Article 14 of the Basel Convention represents the legislative authority underlying the establishment of the Regional Centres. The Article stipulates that "according to the specific needs of different regions and sub-regions, regional or sub-regional centres for training and technology transfer regarding the management of hazardous wastes and other wastes and the minimisation of their generation should be established." [35]In consultation with the countries which expressed interest to host the centres, and through a series of feasibility studies, the potential host countries have been identified and endorsed by decision of the Contracting Parties.[36] The Parties have been urged to have as a goal the long-term sustainability of the Centres and the host countries have been invited: (i) to provide for the core staff and activities of the centres as their contribution in kind; and (ii) to prepare concrete project proposals for the establishment of their centres that could be considered by potential donors for funding, with the understanding that the centres should become financially self-sufficient within a specific time-frame.[37] The Secretariat of the Convention was urged to establish, pursue and reinforce closer collaboration of the centres with relevant organisations and programmes of the United Nations for the implementation of joint activities on training and technology transfer related to hazardous waste, and to explore the possibilities for the establishment of partnership with the industry sector, relevant non-governmental organisations and other stakeholders in the work of the centres.[38] The Secretariat was also requested to develop, in consultation with the representatives of the centres, a draft framework agreement, including a core set of identical basic elements for all centres, taking into account the specific needs and priorities in the respective regions.[39]

The present Annex summarises the status of the regional centres, evolved against the background outlined above, and provides a short description of their past and present activities planned in the coming months.

AFRICA

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Egypt

- Established in June 1998
- Hosted by: Cairo University
- Centre Location: Cairo Centre for Environmental Hazard Mitigation, Cairo UniversityP.O. Box 453, El-Orman, Giza, Cairo, Egypt, Tel. (202) 571 96 88, Fax. (202) 571 9687E-mail: samarzyad@usa.net
- Staff of the Centre: Director (Prof. Yehia E. Abdelhady)
- Activities: Training Course on hazardous wastes management and implementation of the Basel Convention (27 February – 1 March 2000) Planned training workshops: Identification of regional priorities and problems; Legal implementation of the Basel Convention; Environmentally Sound Management - What is hazardous waste? – details about generation, disposal, industry's role, and environmentally sound management. In addition to the training workshops, the Centre will carry out: Supplementary projects to the workshops and comprehensive studies; Assistance and advisory services; Promotion and public awareness; Information gathering and dissemination and Networking.

---

35 The common role and functions of the centres have been tentatively defined and are reviewed in Chapter 2 of the present document.

36 Decision III/19 of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties (1995).

37 Decision IV/4 of the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (1998).

38 Decision V/5 of the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (1999).

39 Ibid.

Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre, Nigeria

- The Centre is not yet officially established
- Proposed to be hosted by: Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA)- University of Ibadan Linkage Centre for Cleaner Production, Technology and Hazardous Waste Management, Nigeria
- Staff of the Centre: To be Headed by an Executive Director (yet to be appointed)
- Activities: None in the past. Planned: training and dissemination of information related to clean production technologies; electronic network of hazardous waste data, resources and information; protocols for monitoring and advising on illegal traffic on hazardous waste; harmonisation of hazardous waste classification and labelling procedure; and regional laboratory network to coordinate quality control procedure in hazardous waste analysis, and to develop testing criteria and methods.

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Senegal

- Established in 1998 by Decision of the Government
- Hosted by: IAGU (Institut African de Gestion Urbaine, Dakar)
- Centre Location: Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine (IAGU), B.P. 7263, Dakar, Senegal, Tel. (221) 824 44 24, Fax: (221) 825 08 26 E-mail: iagu@cyg.sn
- Staff of the Centre: Interim Coordinator (Mr. D. Doucouré)
- Activities: Workshop on Inventory of Hazardous Wastes (Dakar, 1999); Meeting of Board of Directors (1999); Support to National Project on PCB Management in Cote d'Ivoire (2000-2001); Regional Workshop on the Implementation of the Basel Convention and the Ban Amendment (February, 2002).

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, South Africa

- Established in June 2000
- Hosted by: Ministry of Environmental Affairs and Tourism/Vista University
- Centre Location : Vista University, Private Bag X634, Pretoria 0001, South Africa, Tel./Fax: (27-12) 320 57 59, Fax: (27-12) 52 4108/41 11 E-mail: john@acaleph.vista.ac.za
- Staff of the Centre: Executive Director (Dr. John Mbogoma), Senior Adviser (Mr. Danny Walmsley)
- Activities: First Training Course on Hazardous Waste Strategies (Pretoria 1-6 October 2000) attended by 35 participants from English-speaking African countries. In addition to training activities, the Centre is carrying out a number of information gathering and dissemination activities, developing networks, developing hazardous wastes projects and undertaking fund-raising activities.

ASIA

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, China

- Established in 1997
- Hosted by: Tsinghua University
- Centre Location: Environmental Engineering Building, No. 401, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, tel (+86 10) 62782029, fax (+86 10) 62772048, e-mail: jinhui@tsinghua.edu.cn
- Staff of the Centre: Director (Mr. Lu Xinyuan), Administrative Director (Dr. LI Jinhui)
- Activities: 1st Asia-Pacific Region Training Course on Hazardous Waste Management and Practice (8-12 March 1999); Asia-Pacific Regional Training Workshop on Hazardous Waste Management and Practice (8-12 November 1999); The Third Asia-Pacific Regional Training Workshop on Hazardous Waste management in Mining Industry (September 4-8 2000).

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Indonesia

- Established in August 1997 through the second meeting on the establishment of the Regional Centres for Training and Technology Transfer for Asia and Pacific Region in Jakarta
- Hosted by: Environmental Impact Management Agency (BAPEDAL)
- Centre location: Otorita Batam Bld. 5th Floor, Jl. D.1, Panjaitan Kav. 24, Jakarta 13410, Indonesia, tel. 62-21-8590 4932, fax. 62-21-8590 4932: The Environmental Management Center, Serpong, Jakarta. e-mail : haruki@indo.net.id
- Staff of the Centre: Director (Mr. Gempur Adnan, Director for Solid Waste and Hazardous Substances Management, BAPEDAL)
- Activities: Training Course on Hazardous Waste Management and the Implementation of the Basel Convention (Jakarta, 1 -5 May 2000) attended by 16 participants from countries in Asia and Pacific Region; Workshop on the Ratification and Implementation of the Basel Convention and its Ban Amendment (Bangkok, 3 – 5, May 2001) attended by participants from 16 Parties and non-Parties. Further training courses are planned, subject to availability of funds.

Basel Convention Sub Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, India

- Not yet formally established
- Hosted by Asian & Pacific Centre for Technology Transfer (APCTT), ESCAP (APCTT has been nominated as a host institution for the proposed centre)
- Proposed Centre Location: Qutab Institutional Area, P.O. Box 4575, New Delhi 110 016, India, tel (+91 11) 685 6276, fax (+91 11) 685 6274
- Activities: Expert Group Meeting in New Delhi, 4-5 October 2001; Review the needs assessment on training in environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes for SAARC countries (The report is under preparation); Identify regional training priorities; Strategic plan of activities for the proposed SAARC-SRTC.

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Slovakia

- Established in 1996.
- Hosted by: Slovak Environmental Protection Agency.
- Centre Location: Klobucnika 7/1, 81 101 Bratislava, Slovak Republic, Tel./fax: +421 2 544 32 023/ Tel./fax: +421 2 544 32 023/+421 2 544 195 05,), E-mail: silvan@sazp.sk, Tel, E-mail: adamostrowski@stonline.sk
- Staff of the Centre: Director (Mr. Juraj Silvan), Long-term Advisor (Mr. Adam Ostrowski)
- Activities: The centre started up its activities in February 1997. During that time it has held 10 training workshops for CEE countries on various technical and legal aspects of the Basel Convention and has carried out a number of waste related projects. In addition to training workshops, the Bratislava Centre provides practical assistance to the countries of the region, through: Supplementary projects to the workshops, as well as comprehensive studies; Assistance and advisory services; Promotion and public awareness; Information gathering and dissemination and Networking.

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Russia

- Established in 1996
- Hosted by: Center for International Projects, State Committee of the Russian Federation for Environmental Protection
- Centre Location: 105043 Pervomaiskaya Street, 58Bm, App 104-106, CIP, Moscow, Russia (or 117292 P.O.Box 165, CIP, Moscow, Russia), tel (+ 7 095) 165 05 62, fax 165 08 90, e-mail Cip.tse@g23relcom.ru
- Staff of the Centre: Director (Mr. Sergey E. Tikhonov)
- Activities: Regional Seminar on Institutional and Technical Aspects of the Implementation of the Basel Convention (Moscow, 4-8 May 1998) attended by 64 participants from 26 countries. Sub-regional Seminar on Management of Hazardous Wastes and their Transboundary Movements (Omsk, 27-30 June 2000) attended by 70 participants from 6 countries. Further training courses are planned, subject to availability of funds.

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Argentina

- Hosted by: Ministerio de Desarrollo Social y Medio Ambiente
- Centre Location: San Martin 459 –4° piso C.P. 1004, Buenos Aires,Argentina, Tel: 54 11) 4348 8458, Fax: (54 11) 4348 8305/4 348 84 25
- Staff of the Centre: Interim Coordinator (Mr. Miguel Angel Craviotto),
- Activities: Regional Workshop on Hazardous Waste Management and Treatment Technologies (December 2001)

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, El Salvador

- Established in 1999 by Decision of the Government
- Hosted by: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, San Salvador, El Salvador, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Centre Location: Edificio Torre El Salvador, Alameda Roosevelt, San Salvador,El Salvador, Tel. And Fax: (503) 260 5614, E-mail: opozono@salnet.net
- Staff of the Centre: Interim Director (Mr. Roberto Rivas)
- Activities: Workshop for the Implementation of the Basel Convention (1995), Workshop for the ESM of hazardous wastes and their minimization (2000); International Workshop for the Regional Centres of the Basel Convention, San Salvador (2000); Organization of national workshops for the Implementation of the Basel Convention in four countries, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala (pending); Regional Programme for the Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs in the context of the Stockholm Convention and the Basel Convention (2002); Set-up of a database and dissemination to countries; Preparation of an Action Plan for the Region for the Implementation of the Basel Convention; Coordination of project for the management of lead-acid batteries in Central America (2001); Regional Seminar on the environmentally sound management of batteries in the Caribbean and Central America, (2002

Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer, Trinidad & Tobago

- Established in 1998 by Decision of the Government
- Hosted by: Caribbean Institute for Research and Industry, Trinidad (CARIRI)
- Centre Location: c/o Tunpuna Post Office Trinidad and Tobago Tel. 868 662 7171 Fax: 868 662 9770
- Staff of the Centre: Interim Director (Mr. Liaquat Ali Shah CEO, CARIRI), Coordinator (Ms. Sharon Laurent

- Activities: Regional Seminar and International Forum on Asbestos Management (Trinidad, 1998), Regional Seminar on Inland Water Systems and Marine Environment (Trinidad, 1999); Meeting of the Advisory Council for the Regional Centre (Trinidad 2001); Regional Workshop for the ESM of lead-acid batteries for Central America and the Caribbean (Trinidad, 2001); Regional Inventory of Discarded Chemicals and Hazardous Wastes (2000, CEHI); Regional Workshop for National Reporting under the Basel Convention and Inventory of Hazardous Wastes, Trinidad (February 2002); Coordination of the Project for the ESM of lead-acid batteries in the Caribbean (2001); Preparation of an Action Plan for the implementation of the Basel Convention in the Caribbean (2002); Coordination of the Regional Project for the ESM of used oils in the Caribbean (CARIRI-CEHI,2002).

Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre, Uruguay

- Established in 1998 by Decision of the Government
- Hosted by: Focal point to the Basel Convention, Dirección Nacional de Medio Ambiente (DINAMA)
- Centre Location: Rincón 422, Piso 1, Montevideo 11000, Uruguay, Tel. (598 2) 916 8287/916 9127, Fax: (598 2) 916 8288, E-mail: suspel@adinet.com.uy
- Staff of the Centre: Interim Coordinator (Ms. Silvia Aguinaga), Assistants (Mr. Javier Martinez; Jaquelinne Alvarez
- Activities: Regional Seminar for Latin America for the monitoring and control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes (Montevideo,1999); Regional Workshop for South America on Support for the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs (March, Montevideo, 2002); Regional Workshop for South America on National Reporting under the Basel Convention and Inventory of Hazardous Wastes (Montevideo, 2001); UNEP/Chemicals Regional Workshop for South America on POPs (Montevideo, 2000); Development and maintenance of the web-page (English/Spanish) and dissemination of information to all Parties (1999-2001); Coordination of Awareness-raising programme in several countries in Latin America and Caribbean (2001).

ANNEX 2
REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND PROGRAMMES: BASIC FACTS

This Annex lists and provides basic information on the major regional seas conventions, agreements and programmes that may be relevant in considering the possibilities for cooperation with the Basel Convention.

A. CONVENTIONS IN FORCE AND THEIR PROGRAMMES

Abidjan Convention

- Title: Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region - adopted in 1981; in force since 1984
- Parties (21)[40]: Angola, Benin, **Cameroon,** Cape Verde, **Congo, Cote d'Ivoire,** Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, **Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea,** Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mauritania, Namibia, **Nigeria,** Sao Tome and Principe, **Senegal,** Sierra Leone and **Togo**[41]
- Depositary: Cote d'Ivoire
- Geographic coverage: The marine environment, coastal zones and related inland waters falling within the jurisdiction of the States of the West and Central African Region, from Mauritania to Namibia inclusive, which have become Contracting Parties to the Convention.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol concerning Cooperation in Combating Pollution in Cases of Emergency
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the West and Central African Region - adopted in 1981
- Secretariat: Regional Coordinating Unit for the West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF/RCU), UNEP, c/o Ministry of Construction and Environment, 20 B.P 650, Abidjan 20, Cote d'Ivoire, tel (225) 202 111 83 or 202 106 23, fax (225) 202 104 95, e-mail: biodiv@africaonline.co.ci

Barcelona Convention

- Title: Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean - adopted in 1976; in force since 1978; amended in 1995; amendments not in force yet
- Parties (21): **Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Libya, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Slovenia. Spain, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey** and the **European Union** [42]
- Depositary: Spain
- Geographic coverage: The maritime waters of the Mediterranean Sea proper, including its gulfs and seas, bounded to the west by the meridian passing through Cape Spartel lighthouse, at the entrance of the Straits of Gibraltar, and to the east by the southern limits of the Straits of the Dardanelles between Mehmetcik and Kumkale lighthouses. Except as may be provided in any protocol, the coverage does not include internal waters, wetlands, estuaries, seabed and its subsoil.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol for the Prevention and Elimination of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft or Incineration at Sea; (2) Protocol concerning Cooperation in Combating Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Oil and Other Harmful Substances in Cases of Emergency; (3) Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities; (4) Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean; (5) Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution Resulting from Exploration and Exploitation of the Continental Shelf and the Seabed and its Subsoil; (6) Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal
- Associated Action Plan: (i) Action Plan adopted in 1975; in 1995 revised as Action Plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Sustainable Development of the Coastal Areas of the Mediterranean (MAP Phase II), it includes the Barcelona Resolution and the Priority Fields of Activities for the period to the year 2005. (ii) Strategic Action Programme to Address Pollution from Land-Based Activities - adopted in 1997. (iii) Strategic Action Plan for the Conservation of Biological Diversity - being developed.
- Secretariat: Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan (MEDU), UNEP, P.O.Box 18019, GR 11610 Athens, Greece, tel (301) 7273 100, fax (301) 7253 196/197, e-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.org, website: www.medu.unep.org

Bucharest Convention

- Title: Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution - adopted in 1992; in force since 1994

---

40 All eligible parties are listed. Parties that ratified or acceded to the Convention are indicated in bold.

41 South Africa has expressed interest to accede the Convention.

42 Yugoslavia is eligible to become a Party to the Convention, if it applies.

- Parties (6) **Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey** and **Ukraine**
- Depositary: Romania
- Geographic coverage: The territorial sea and exclusive economic zone in the Black Sea proper of each Contracting Party, with the southern limit constituted for the purposes of the Convention by the line joining Capes Kelagra and Dalyan.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol on Protection of the Black Sea Marine Environment against Pollution from Land-Based Sources; (2) Protocol on Cooperation in Combating Pollution of the Black Sea Marine Environment by Oil and Other Harmful Substances in Emergency Situations; (3) Protocol on the Protection of the Black Sea Marine Environment against Pollution by Dumping
- Associated Action Plan: Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP) - adopted in 1993; Black Sea Strategic Action Plan - adopted in 1996
- Secretariat: (1) for the Convention[43]; (2) for the BSEP: Programme Implementation Unit (PIU), Black Sea Environmental Programme, Dolmabahce Sarayi, II. Harekat Köskü, 80680 Besiktas, Istanbul, Turkey, tel (90 212) 227 99 27/9, fax (90 212) 227 99 33, e-mail: semaacar@blacksea-environment.org

Cartagena Convention

- Title: Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region - adopted in 1983; in force since 1986
- Parties (28): **Antigua and Barbuda,** Bahamas**, Barbados, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic,** European Union, **France, Grenada, Guatemala,** Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, **Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands,** Nicaragua, **Panama,** St. Kitts and Nevis, **St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines,** Suriname, **Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, United States of America** and **Venezuela**
- Depositary: Colombia
- Geographic coverage: The marine environment of the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea and the areas of the Atlantic Ocean adjacent thereto, south of 30° north latitude and within 200 nautical miles of the Atlantic coasts of the Contracting Parties. The coverage does not include internal waters of the Contracting Parties.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol concerning Cooperation in Combating Oil Spills in the Wider Caribbean Region; (2) Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife; (3) Protocol concerning Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP) - adopted in 1981 and periodically revised
- Secretariat: Regional Coordinating Unit for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU), UNEP, 14-20 Port Royal Street, Kingston, Jamaica, tel ((1 876) 922 92 67/8/9, fax (1 876) 922 92 92, e-mail: uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com; website: www.cep.unep.org

Helsinki Convention

- Title: Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area - adopted in1974; in force since 1980; replaced by new convention adopted in 1992; in force since 2000
- Parties (10): **Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russian Federation** and **Sweden**
- Depositary: Finland
- Geographic coverage: The Baltic Sea and the entrances to the Baltic Sea bounded by the parallel of the Skaw in the Skagerrak at 57° 44.43'N, including the internal waters.
- Associated annexes: (1) Harmful substances; (2) Criteria for the use of Best Environmental Practices and Best Available Technology; (3) Criteria and measures concerning the prevention of pollution from land-based sources; (4) Prevention of pollution from ships; (5) Exemptions from the general prohibition of dumping of waste and other matter in the Baltic Sea Area; (6) Prevention of pollution from offshore activities; (7) Response to pollution incidents
- Associated Action Plan: Joint Comprehensive Environmental Action Programme (JCP) consisting of six elements - adopted in1992
- Secretariat: Helsinki Commission, Katajanokanlaitur 6B, 001600 Helsinki, Finland, tel: (358 9) 6220 2230, fax (358 9) 622 2239, e-mail: helcom@mail.helcom.fi, website: www.helcom.fi

Jeddah Convention

- Title: Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment - adopted in 1982; in force since 1985
- Parties (8): **Egypt,** Eritrea, **Jordan, Palestine (PLO), Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan** and **Yemen**
- Depositary: Saudi Arabia

---

[43] The Convention Secretariat (Secretariat of the Black Sea Commission) was established in mid-September 2000; it is expected to be operational in mid-October 2000. The PIU will become an autonomous dependent unit of the Convention Secretariat.

- Geographic coverage: The entire sea area bounded by the following rhumb lines: from Ras Dharbat Ali (lat. 16°39' N, long. 53°03,5' E), thence to a point (lat. 12°40' N, long. 55°00' E) lying ENE of Socotra Island, thence to Ras Hafun (lat. 10°26' N, long. 51°25' E). The coverage does not include internal waters of the Contracting Parties.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol concerning Regional Cooperation in Combating Pollution by Oil and other Harmful Substances in Cases of Emergency
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for the Conservation of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden - adopted in 1976; revised in 1995
- Secretariat: Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment Programme (PERSGA), P.O.Box 1358, Jeddah, 21431, Saudi Arabia, tel ((966 2) 651 4472), fax (966 2) 657 0945, e-mail: persga@computec.com.bh

Kuwait Convention

- Title: Kuwait Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution - adopted in 1978; in force since 1979
- Parties (8): **Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia** and **United Arab Emirates**
- Depositary: Kuwait
- Geographic coverage: Sea area bounded in the south by the following rhumb lines: from Ras Dharbat Ali in (16 deg 39 min N, 35 deg 3 min 30 sec E) then to a position in (16 deg 00 min N, 53 deg 25 min E) then to a position in (17 deg 00 min N, 56 deg 30 min E) then to a position in (20 deg 30 min N, 60 deg 00 min E) then to Ras Al-Fasteh in (25 deg 04 min N, 61 deg 25 min E) excluding the internal waters of the contracting parties.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol concerning Regional Co-operation in Combating Pollution by Oil and other Harmful Substances in Cases of Emergency; (3) Protocol concerning Marine Pollution resulting from Exploration of the Continental Shelf; (4) Protocol for the Protection of the Marine Environment against Pollution from Land Based Sources; (5) Protocol on Biological Diversity and Establishment of Specially Protected Areas (under development)
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Areas of Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates - adopted in 1978 and periodically revised
- Secretariat: Regional Organisation for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME), P.O.Box 26388, 13124 Safat, Kuwait, tel (965) 531 21 40-3, fax (965) 532 41 72, e-mail: ropme@kuwait.net

Lima Convention

- Title: Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific - adopted in 1981; in force since 1986
- Parties (4): **Chile, Colombia, Ecuador** and **Peru**[44]
- Depositary: Permanent Commission of the South Pacific
- Geographic coverage: The sea area and the coastal zone of the South East Pacific within the 200-mile maritime area of sovereignty and jurisdiction of the High Contracting Parties and, beyond that area, the high seas up to a distance within which pollution of the high seas may affect that area.
- Associated protocols: (1) Agreement and Supplementary Protocol to the Agreement on Regional Cooperation in Combating Pollution of the South East Pacific by Hydrocarbons or Other Harmful Substances in Case of Emergency; (2) Protocol for the Protection of the South East Pacific against Pollution from Land-Based Sources; (3) Protocol for the Conservation and Management of Protected Marine and Coastal Areas; (4) Protocol for the Protection Against Radioactive Contamination
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific - adopted in 1981
- Secretariat: Permanent Commission of the South Pacific (CPPS), Regional Coordinating Unit of the Plan of Action of the South East Pacific, Coruna 2061 y Whimper, Quito, Ecuador, fax (593 2) 562 786, e-mail: cpps@ecuanex.net.ec

Nairobi Convention

- Title: Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region - adopted in 1985; in force since 1996; revision being considered
- Parties (9): **Comoros, France, Kenya,** Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, **Seychelles, Somalia,** and **Tanzania**[45]
- Depositary: Kenya
- Geographic coverage: The marine and coastal environment of that part of the Indian Ocean situated within the Eastern African region and falling within the jurisdiction of the Contracting Parties to this Convention. The extent of the coastal environment to be included .... shall be indicated in each protocol to this Convention. Except as may be otherwise provided in any protocol, internal waters are excluded from the coverage.

---

44 Panama supports and participates in the Action Plan.

45 South Africa was invited to join the Convention.

- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol concerning Protected Areas and Wild Fauna and Flora in the Eastern African Region; (2) Protocol concerning Co-operation in Combating Marine Pollution in Cases of Emergency in the Eastern African Region
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region - adopted in 1985
- Secretariat: Regional Coordinating Unit of the Eastern African Region/Seychelles, UNEP Secretariat of the nairobi Convention and related Action Plan, POBox 487, Mahe Seychelles, tel (248) 32 45 25, fax (248) 32 45 73, e-mail: uneprcu@seychelles.net

Noumea Convention

- Title: Convention for the Protection of Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region - adopted in 1986; in force since 1990
- Parties (19): **Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France,** Kiribati, **Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand,** Niue, Palau, **Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands,** Tonga, Tuvalu, United Kingdom, **United States of America** and Vanuatu
- Depositary: South Pacific Commission
- Geographic coverage: The 200 nautical mile zone established in accordance with international law of the Contracting Parties in the South Pacific region and those areas of the high seas which are enclosed from all sides by these 200 mile zones. Except as may be otherwise provided in any protocol to the Convention, internal waters and archipelagic waters of the Parties are excluded from the coverage.
- Associated protocols: (1) Protocol for the Prevention of Pollution of the South Pacific Region by Dumping; (2) Protocol concerning Cooperation in Combating Pollution Emergencies in the South Pacific Region
- Associated Action Plan: Action Plan for Managing the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region - South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) - adopted in 1982
- Secretariat: South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), P.O.Box 240, Apia, Samoa, tel (685) 21 929, fax (685) 202 31, e-mail: sprep@samoa.net, website: www.sprep.org.ws

OSPAR Convention

- Title: Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic - adopted in 1992; in force since 1998 (supersedes Oslo Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft - in force since 1974; and Paris Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution from Land-Bases Sources - in force since 1978)
- Parties (16): **Belgium, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland** and **United Kingdom**
- Depositary: France
- Geographic coverage: The internal waters and territorial seas of the Contracting Parties, the sea beyond and adjacent to the territorial sea under the jurisdiction of the coastal state to the extent recognised by international law, and the high seas, including the bed of all those waters and its subsoil, situated within the following limits: (i) that part of the Atlantic Ocean north of 59° north latitude and between 44° west longitude; (ii) those parts of the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans and their dependent seas which lie north of 36° north latitude and between 42° west longitude and 51° east longitude, but excluding (a) the Baltic Sea and the Belts lying to the south and east of lines drawn from Hasenore Head to Gniben Point, from Korshage to Spodsbjerg and from Gilbjerg Head to Kullen, and (b) the Mediterranean Sea and its dependent seas as far as the point of intersection of the parallel of 36° north latitude and the meridian of 5°36' west longitude.
- Associated annexes: Five annexes. Annex V on the Protection and Conservation of the Ecosystems and Biological Diversity of the Maritime Area and a related Appendix - adopted in 1998, will enter info force as soon as ratified by at least seven contracting parties
- Associated Action Plan: OSPAR Action Plan 1998-2003 and long-term strategies related to (1) hazardous substances; (2) radioactive substances; (3) combating eutrophication; (4) protecting and conserving ecosystems and biological diversity; (5) environmental goals andmanagement mechanisms for offshore activities
- Secretariat: OSPAR Commission, 48 Carey Street, WC2A 2jQ, London, United Kingdom, tel (44 207) 430 5200, fax (44 207) 430 5225, e-mail: secretariat@ospar.org; website: www.OSPAR.org

B. PROGRAMMES AND ACTION PLANS WITHOUT CONVENTIONS

Action Plan for the Arctic Region

- Regional Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (RPA) - adopted in 1998 (by the Ministers of the Arctic Council)
- Participating countries (8): Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden and United States of America

- Secretariat: PAME (Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment) International Secretariat, Hafnastraeti 97, 600 Akureyri, Iceland, tel (354) 461 1355, fax (354) 462 3390, e-mail: pame@ni.is, website: www.grida.no/pame/

Action Plan for the East Asian Seas

- Action Plan for the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Areas of the East Asian Region - adopted in 1981
- Participating countries (10): Australia, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam
- Secretariat: Regional Coordinating Unit for the East Asian Seas Action Plan, UNEP, 10th floor, United Nations Building, Rajdamnern Avenue, Bangkok 10200, Thailand, tel (66 2) 281 24 28, fax (66 2) 267 80 08, e-mail: kirkman.unescap@un.org, website: www.unep.org/unep/regoffs/roap/easrcu/index.htm

Action Plan for the North West Pacific

- Adopted in 1994
- Participating countries (4): China, Japan, Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation
- Contact: Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP, P.O.Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya, tel (254 2) 62 242 4011, fax (254 2) 622 4300, e-mail: jorge.illueca@unep.org

Action Plan for the South Asian Seas

- Adopted in 1995
- Participating countries (5): Bangladesh, India, Maldives, Pakistan and Sri Lanka
- Secretariat: South Asian Cooperative Environmental Programme (SACEP), No. 10 Dickman's Road, Off Dickman's Road, Colombo 5, Sri Lanka, tel (941) 589 787, fax (941) 589 369, e-mail: ai.sacep@eureka.lk

C. EVOLVING CONVENTIONS, PROGRAMMES AND ACTION PLANS

Convention and Action Plan for the Caspian Sea

- Title (provisional): Framework Convention for the Protection of the [Marine] [Environment] of the Caspian Sea
- Parties (5): Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan. Russian Federation and Turkmenistan
- Associated programme: Caspian Environment Programme (CEP)[46]
- Contact for the Convention: Regional Office for Europe, UNEP, Case postale 356,15 Ch des Anemones, 1219 Chatelaine, Geneva, Switzerland, tel (41 22) 979 91 11, fax (41 22) 797 34 20, e-mail: unep@unep.ch
- Coordination of the convention's development: Regional Office for Europe, 15 ch Anemones, 1219 Chatelaine Geneve, Switzerland, tel: (41 22) 917 8111, fax (41 22) 917 8024, e-mail: frits.schligemann@unep.ch; Secretariat of CEP: Programme Coordination Unit, Government Building, U. Hadjibeyov 40, Baku 370016, Azerbaijan, tel/fax (99412) 971 785/86, e-mail: caspian@caspian.in-baku.com, website: www.caspianenvironment.org

Convention and Action Plan for the Northeast Pacific

- Title (provisional): Draft Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Areas of the Northeast pacific - draft Convention being negotiated; adoption foreseen during 2001
- Participating countries: Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico Nicaragua and Panama; the participation of Canada and the United States of America a possibility
- Geographic coverage: coastal waters under the national jurisdiction of participating countries
- Associated Action Plan: Draft Plan of Action for the Protection and sustainable Management of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Northeast Pacific Regional Sea - adoption foreseen in conjunction with the adoption of the Convention
- Contact: Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP, P.O.Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya, tel (254 2) 62 242 4011, fax (254 2) 622 4300, e-mail: jorge.illueca@unep.org

Cooperation Programme for the Upper South West Atlantic

- Under development, currently focusing on the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Sources and Activities
- Participating countries: Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay
- Contact: Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP, P.O.Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya, tel (254 2) 62 242 4011, fax (254 2) 622 4300, e-mail: jorge.illueca@unep.org

---

[46] An ongoing programme supported by the GEF and the European Union (TACIS). The relationship between the Convention and the CEP will be depend on the decisions about the institutional arrangements expected to be taken at the adoption of the Convention.

UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.2.1

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Feasibility for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment (UNEP Governing Council Decision GC 21/13)

This document was prepared by UNEP in cooperation with ACOPS on the basis of an analysis provided by the Advisory Committee of ACOPS

CONTENTS

	page
1. PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT	2
2. BACKGROUND	2
3. THE PRESENT SITUATION	3
3.1 GESAMP	4
3.2 Global Environment Outlook	6
3.3 GIWA	8
3.4 Global Ocean Observing System	9
3.5 GPA	11
3.6 Regional Seas Programmes	13
3.7 ICRAN	15
3.8 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	16
3.9 UN Atlas of the Oceans	17
3.10 IPCC	18
4. OPTIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A "REGULAR PROCESS" FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE OF THE GLOBAL MARINE ENVIRONMENT	20
4.1 Background against which the options should be considered	20
4.2 The options	25
5. CONCLUSIONS	26
6. RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE REYKJAVIK MEETING	27
ANNEX 1: Iceland Discussion Paper	
ANNEX 2: Decision 21/13 of UNEP Governing Council	
APPENDIX: Acronyms	

1. PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT

This document has been prepared as a contribution to the implementation of **decision 21/13 of UNEP Governing Council on Global assessment of the state of the marine environment.**

2. BACKGROUND

At the 7th session of CSD, Iceland suggested that an **Intergovernmental Panel on Marine Pollution** should be established jointly by UNEP, WHO, IMO, FAO, IAEA, UNIDO, IOC/UNESCO and WMO. The Panel's main objective was envisaged as carrying out comprehensive scientific assessments of the magnitude and potential impact of pollution on the marine environment and its socio-economic consequences for coastal communities and the international community at large. The proposed Panel would draw on work carried out by GESAMP and take into account the ongoing work of others (e.g.: GIWA, GOOS, GEMS/Water). UNEP and IOC/UNESCO were suggested to take a lead role in establishing the Panel, using the principles adopted by IPCC as a model.

Iceland's suggestion was further discussed at the twenty-first session of UNEP's Governing Council (February 2001), where Iceland presented a **discussion paper** (Annex 1) outlining several concerns and needs regarding sustainable use of the marine environment. Such concerns include the lack of overview, in particular on the links between the state of the marine environment and cross-cutting issues of human health, seafood safety and sustainable fisheries and the lack of coherence in the follow up at the international level and the development of policy recommendations based on the assessment reports. The impact of human activity (climate change, pollution, physical alteration and destruction of habitats) on the state of the marine environment at national, regional and global level needs to be regularly assessed and communicated to policy makers in an effective and authoritative manner. The paper also underscores the importance of, and need for government involvement in the ongoing assessment and monitoring process on a continuous basis.

Based on Iceland's recommendations, the Governing Council adopted a decision on **"Global assessment of the state of the marine environment"** (GC Decision 21/13, Annex 2).

The decision, among others, ***requests the Executive Director, in cooperation with IOC/UNESCO and other appropriate United Nations agencies, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and in consultation with the regional seas programmes to explore the feasibility of establishing a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment, with active involvement by governments and regional agreements, building on ongoing assessment programmes.***

Following the adoption of the Council's decision, UNEP, with its mandate for global environmental assessments (Nairobi Declaration 1997), implemented this decision in May 2001. A report was submitted by UNEP to the eleventh meeting of ACC/SOCA (May 2001) on the planned follow-up to the decision of the Council and the same report was used to inform UNICPOLOS-2 (May 2001) about the decision. UNEP also held further discussions with the Government of Iceland, and embarked on extensive consultations involving selected governments and a number of United Nations agencies, intergovernmental and

non-governmental organisations, scientific and other organisations, including the secretariats of relevant global environmental conventions and regional seas conventions and programmes. These consultations sought to explore the views of these agencies and organisations on the feasibility and need for the establishment of the assessment process recommended by the Council's decision.

On the basis of these discussions and consultations a draft paper was prepared by UNEP analysing the major existing assessment programmes, the options for establishment of a regular process for the assessment of the state of the global marine environment and the background against which the options should be considered. The draft paper served as the background document for an informal **consultative meeting** on "Feasibility Study for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment" convened and hosted by UNEP and Iceland's Ministry of Environment in Reykjavik, 12-14 September 2001.[1] The meeting reviewed: (i) Iceland's discussion paper considered by the 21st session of the Governing Council; (ii) decision 21/13 of that session of the Council; and (iii) the background document prepared by UNEP for the Reykjavik meeting.

The present document is based on the background document prepared by UNEP for the Reykjavik meeting. It includes a review of the main results and recommendations of that meeting and the activities planned as the next steps in the implementation of decision 21/13.

3. THE PRESENT SITUATION

Several organisations of the United Nations system, as well as a number of intergovernmental, international and national organisations (including non-governmental organisations) are actively involved in the assessment of the state of the marine environment,. The scope, focus, methodology, periodicity and the level of government involvement in these assessments vary, depending on the intended use of the assessments. Many of the assessments deal with the state of the marine environment only in the context of a more general assessment of the state of the environment, or focus only on a specific component of the marine environment.[2]

From the standpoint of decision 21/13, two type of assessment programmes and mechanisms deserve particular attention: (i) **global assessment programmes** with focus on marine environment; and (ii) **regional assessments** of the state of the marine environment that serve as the critically important inputs into the preparation of global

---

[1] The meeting was attended by the representatives of Germany, Iceland, Sweden, United Kingdom, Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), ACC Subcomittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas (ACC/SOCA), UNEP, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO (IOC), IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/WMO/WHO/IAEA/UN/UNEP Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP), International Ocean Institute (IOI), Global International Water Assessment (GIWA), World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat (AMAP), International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), East Asian Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (UNEP-EAS/RCU), Black Sea Regional Coordinating Unit (BS/RCU), Reef Check Europe, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (US/NOAA) and Marine Census Institute.

[2] Typical examples for the former are the assessments prepared in the framework of the Global Environment Outlook and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and for the latter the numerous assessments related to the state of fishery resources.

assessments. The most relevant of these programmes and the mechanisms supporting their implementation are described in the present Chapter.

3.1 GESAMP[3]

GESAMP is the only broadly-based independent multidisciplinary advisory mechanism supported by all agencies of the United Nations system with major interest in the scientific aspects of marine protection. It was established, in 1969, as an interagency group of 20-30 experts[4] appointed in their personal capacity by the agencies sponsoring GESAMP:

- to prepare periodic reviews and assessments of the state of the marine environment and to identify problems and areas requiring special attention; and
- to provide an independent advice to its sponsoring agencies on the scientific aspects of marine environmental protection.

With the support and services provided by its sponsoring agencies, and its well established links with the scientific communities, GESAMP has a long and distinguished history of preparing multidisciplinary scientific assessments of the state of the global marine environment[5] and of issue-specific global environmental problems[6]. Moreover, preparation of guidelines[7] and science-based policy-oriented assessments and recommendations feature also prominently among GESAMP's products.[8] GESAMP's definition of "marine pollution"

---

[3] The full official name of GESAMP is: IMO/FAO/UNESCO-IOC/WMO/WHO/IAEA/UN/UNEP Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection.

[4] The number of experts vary. Each sponsoring agency can appoint up to four experts who serve as GESAMP experts for a limited period of time only.

[5] Three assessments of the state of the global marine environment have been issued: Review of the health of the oceans (1982); The state of the marine environment (1990); A sea of troubles (2001). The scope of these assessments was evolving: the focus of the 1982 assessment was on scientific aspects of pollution and its impact on the quality of the marine environment, including non-commercial resources; the 1990 assessment attempted to include social and economic considerations; the 2001 assessment was a multidisciplinary policy-oriented assessment based on regional reports prepared in the framework of regional seas agreements and programmes, and it included extensive consideration of social and economic factors associated with the state of the marine environment, analysis of the problems related to fisheries and risks to human health, and a set of recommendations addressed to policy-makers.

[6] Studies in this category published during the last decade include topics such as: land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment (prepared at UNEP's request for the 2001 intergovernmental review meeting of GPA/LBA); review of nutrients as potentially harmful substances; evaluation of hazards of harmful substances carried by ships (prepared at IMO's request in support of conventions for which IMO acts as the secretariat); pollution modification of atmospheric and oceanic processes and climate; atmospheric input of trace species to the world oceans; long-term consequences of low-level marine contamination; coastal modelling; environmental impacts of aquaculture; significance of carcinogens as marine pollutants; impact of oil and related chemicals on marine environment; environmental consequences of anthropogenically discharged sediments to the coastal zone; invasion of the ctenophore *Mnemiopsis leidyi* in the Black Sea; sea-surface microlayer and its role in global change; hazard assessment of ship's cargoes.

[7] E.g.: Guidelines for marine environmental assessment (1994); Biological indicators and their use in the measurement of the condition of the marine environment (1995); Monitoring of ecological effects of coastal aquaculture wastes (1996); Contributions of science to integrated coastal management (1996).

[8] E.g.: Global strategies for marine environmental protection (1991), prepared as a special contribution to UNCED; Patterns, threat and development of a strategy for conservation of marine biodiversity (1997), prepared

provided the basis for legal definition of marine pollution in most international conventions dealing with the protection of the oceans, including UNCLOS.

The products of GESAMP are prepared by working groups[9] established by GESAMP and are subject to review, clearance and endorsement by annual sessions of GESAMP. Some of the more important reports of GESAMP are peer-reviewed before being finalised. The total number of experts involved in the work of GESAMP since its establishment is estimated as close to 1000. Experts include marine and atmospheric scientists, toxicologists, public health experts, economists, coastal engineers, resource managers and planners. Although experts are appointed in their personal capacity, many of them are part of or involved in national government structures.

The assessments and analyses of GESAMP are based on data and information available in open scientific literature, in regional reports[10], or available from reliable sources, including governments. GESAMP does not carry out any field or laboratory research, or monitoring/observation programme.

The work of GESAMP is coordinated by the Chair and Vice-Chair elected by the members of GESAMP for a two year period, and by the interagency secretariat consisting of the Administrative Secretary (provided by IMO) and the Technical Secretaries of GESAMP appointed by each of the sponsoring agency.

GESAMP is funded by the sponsoring agencies on an ad-hoc basis:

- each agency covers the costs associated with the experts appointed by them (travel and DSA in connection with the meetings of the working groups and the sessions of GESAMP; in some cases financial compensation is provided to the members of the working groups for the time devoted to GESAMP-related work and associated expenses);

- the meetings of the working groups and the annual sessions of GESAMP are hosted and serviced by the sponsoring agencies as in-kind contributions of the agencies;

- the part-time involvement of the Administrative Secretary and the Technical Secretaries of GESAMP is not costed; it is provided as in-kind contribution of the sponsoring agencies;

- the reports of GESAMP sessions and the products of GESAMP working groups are published, as non-commercial publications, by the agencies hosting the sessions or by the "lead agencies" of the working groups.

---

as a contribution to CBD; Safe and effective use of chemicals in coastal aquaculture (1997), prepared to meet the special needs of FAO.

[9] The working groups consist of members of GESAMP and additional experts selected according to the specific needs of a particular working group for expertise not available among the members of GESAMP. The size of the working groups vary between 4 and 15, depending on the nature and scope of the assessments or analyses they are working on. Most of the work is carried out by correspondence and meetings of the working groups (usually one meeting per year).

[10] Assessment reports produced in the framework of regional seas agreements and programmes are particularly valuable source of data and information for the preparation of GESAMP's global assessments of the state of the marine environment.

GESAMP is generally recognised[11] as a unique and important multidisciplinary advisory body within the United Nations system which provides its sponsoring organisations, and through them the governments, with high-quality independent scientific assessments of the state of the marine environment and advice on specific issues of interest to the sponsoring organisations. However, GESAMP has two major problems. The first of these problems is chronic: lack of adequate (i.e., regular and predictable) funding. The second problem relates to questions about the adequacy of GESAMP's present modus operandi.[12]

3.2 Global Environment Outlook

The Global Environment Outlook (GEO) was launched by UNEP, in 1995, as an open-ended project for comprehensive, integrated, policy-relevant assessments of the global environment, including the marine environment. It consists of:

- A global assessment process (the "GEO process") that is cross-sectoral and participatory. It incorporates regional views and perceptions, and builds consensus on priority issues and actions through dialogue among policy-makers and scientists at regional and global levels.

- GEO outputs, among which the periodic global GEO reports are the most prominent.[13] These reports review the state of the world's environment, identifying major environmental concerns, trends and emerging issues together with their causes and their social and economic impacts. The reports also provide guidance for decision-makers, such as the formulation of environmental policies, action planning and resource allocation.

The GEO process, which is funded by UNEP, is coordinated by a small team of 5 professionals (the "GEO Team") nested in UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment in Nairobi and is based on collaborative effort involving and supported by a range of partners around the world. The core of the process is a network of Collaborating Centres

---

11 By UNCHE, UNCED and CSD, among others.

12 The April/May 1996 session of CSD recommended "a review of GESAMP with a view of improving its effectiveness and comprehensiveness while maintaining its status as a source of agreed independent scientific advice" (paragraph 194(f) of A/51/645). An Evaluation Team, appointed in late 2000 by the sponsoring organisations, addressed these questions and concluded that "the United Nations, its member states and other organisations require an effective, efficient and independent group to provide advice on issues relating to marine environmental protection and management and sustainable development of marine resources and amenities based on sound scientific principles" and recommended that "GESAMP be continued to play that role" subject to "major changes necessary in the structure of GESAMP, its operational procedures and products". The recent session of GESAMP (New York, August 2001) and the agencies sponsoring GESAMP reacted positively to the recommendations of the Evaluation Team, but deferred to consider their implementation.

13 GEO-1, the first in the series of GEO reports, was published in 1997. It reviewed major environmental issues from regional and global perspectives, and made an initial evaluation of some of the existing policy responses that address priority environmental concerns. GEO-2000, the second in the report series, was published in 1999. It addressed three main areas: the state of the environment; trends and progress in policy development, including multilateral environmental agreements; and the future, with focus on emerging issues and region-specific alternative policies. The third in the series of GEO reports is planned to be published in early 2002 and will be available for distribution in most of the United Nations languages. In addition to the reports in the GEO global series, special reports addressing the problems of small island developing states (SIDS) have been prepared for the Caribbean, South Pacific and Western Indian Ocean regions.

consisting of multidisciplinary institutes with a regional outlook that work at the interface between science and policy. The Centres, in turn, work with other institutions in their respective regions in order to bring together the required expertise to cover all the relevant environmental sectors. By providing the bulk of regional inputs,[14] the Centres play an increasingly important role in preparing the global GEO reports, thus combining top-down integrated assessments with bottom-up environmental reporting. In addition to the Collaborating Centres, a number of Associated Centres contribute to the assessment and provide specific inputs into the GEO process in their specialised areas of expertise.[15],[16]

Working groups have been established to provide advice and support to the GEO process by helping to coordinate the work of the Collaborating Centres and advising on methodological issues.[17] The working groups are set up by meetings in which all Collaborating Centres participate. Each group elects its Group Leader and develops its own terms of reference. The business of the working groups is conducted by correspondence and meetings, as appropriate.

Regional consultations are an essential feature in the preparation of GEO assessments. They are organised as an integral part of the GEO process and are attended by government-nominated participants and representatives of the respective Collaborating Centres. In addition to regional consultations and various review procedures,[18] other type of consultative mechanisms are also used in order to ensure the broadest possible dialogue[19] between scientists and policy-makers on which the process is based, help guiding the assessment process and are used to review the drafts of the reports.[20]

3.3 GIWA

---

[14] In addition, data and information are also contributed by a number of United Nations agencies participating in the UNEP-coordinated United Nations System-Wide Earthwatch.

[15] Twenty two Collaborating Centres and eleven Associated Centres participated in the preparation of GEO 2000. The number of Centres participating in the preparation of GEO-3 has been increased.

[16] The selection of the Collaborating and Associated Centres is made by UNEP, as the organisation coordinating the GEO process. The initial selection was based on the report of an evaluation team that has visited various regions to assess the prospective members of the network of centres. The centres deemed as potentially suitable were invited to submit project proposals which served as the basis for the formalisation of the centres' association with the GEO process. The work on GEO-3 is more decentralised: Regional Coordinators were selected for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and North America to manage, under the overall coordination of UNEP's Headquarters, the GEO process and production of inputs into GEO-3 through Collaborating Centres they have identified.

[17] GEO-2000 was supported by four working groups (modelling, scenarios, policy, data). The number of working groups supporting GEO-3 was increased to nine.

[18] Early drafts of the GEO reports are circulated for review and comments to regional, global and thematic reviewers selected by UNEP and the Collaborating Centres.

[19] More than 800 people have contribute to and participated in the preparation of GEO 2000.

[20] For instance, in addition to regional consultations and regional reviews carried out during the preparation of GEO-3: (i) four experts have been commissioned to review the complete draft of the report and draw out key findings and recommendations; (ii) using a questionnaire combined with the Delphi approach the innovative views and environmental policy issues will be identified; (iii) a group of regional and international policy and research organisations (RING) will carry out a policy analysis relevant to substantive chapters of the report; and (iv) a High Level Policy Expert Meeting will be convened to consider the results of activities described in (i)-(iii)above.

GIWA, the Global International Waters Assessment, is a four-year project with the overall objective to develop a comprehensive strategic assessment that may be used by GEF and its partners to identify priorities for remedial and mitigatory actions in international waters, designed to achieve significant environmental benefits, at national, regional and global levels. To meet this objective, the project aims to produce a fully comprehensive and integrated assessment of global international waters, encompassing the ecological status of and causes of environmental problems of transboundary freshwater basins and their associated coastal and ocean systems. The assessment is expected to be carried out from the perspectives of: water quality and quantity; associated biodiversity and habitats; their use by society; the societal causes of the regionally identified issues and problems; and scenarios of future conditions based on projections of demographic, economic and social changes associated with the processes of human development.

The geographic scope of the project is global with regional focus.[21]

The substantive scope of the project includes an integrated assessment of the environmental, managerial, scientific, legal, social and economic aspects of water-related environmental problems. The environmental and socio-economic impacts will be analysed form the standpoint of five "major concerns": (i) freshwater shortage; (ii) pollution; (iii) habitat and community modification; (iv) unsustainable exploration of fisheries and other living resources; and (v) global change. A causal chain analysis for the identified major concerns will be an integral part of the analysis.

A detailed "assessment protocol" has been develop in the initial phase of the project to guide the assessment process and ensure the global comparability of results obtained from sub-regional assessments. GIWA is not foreseen as primarily a data gathering exercise. It will gather only that information required to complete a stepwise, iterative analysis of transboundary water-related problems and their causes. This information will be used to generate scenarios reflecting continuation of current practices, and adoption of environmentally sustainable alternatives.

The project is implemented by UNEP in cooperation with the University of Kalmar, in Sweden. The overall coordination of the project is provided by a small Core Team of professionals hosted by the University of Kalmar. The implementation of the project is guided and supervised by a Steering Group chaired by the representative of UNEP.[22] A broadly based "GIWA Assembly" is planned to be convened (Kalmar, 9-11 October 2001) to review the results of GIWA obtained until now and the problems of international waters in general.

The project is carried out by a network of GIWA Focal Points (one for each of the 66 sub-regions), Regional Task Teams (one for each of the 9 regions) and Thematic Task Teams,

---

[21] A region by region assessment of the ecological status and causes of degradation of transboundary water systems is envisaged in 9 regions subdivided into 66 sub-regions. The sub-regions will be the basic units of assessment.

[22] The Steering Group meets regularly, every 12-18 months, to review the progress of the project, consider and endorse the management plan of the project (including its workplan and budget), and agree on the network of collaborating institutions. The Group consists of representatives from UNEP, GEF, UNDP, World Bank, University and City of Kalmar, Government Sweden, GESAMP, SCOPE, ACOPS, WWC, ICSU, NOAA, SIDA and FINIDA.

with full involvement of national scientific and technical experts, managers and policy-makers.[23]

GIWA is funded by GEF, UNEP and national counterpart contributions. The projected level of in-cash and in-kind funding for the project, over a 49 month period, is about US$ 13 million.

This project was expected to commence in March 1999, and to be completed by February 2003. However, for various reasons, the implementation of the project is behind the envisaged timetable.

3.4 Global Ocean Observing System

The Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) is being developed by IOC(UNESCO), UNEP, WMO, FAO and ICES as a complex modular system for collection, analysis and distribution of data and information related to oceans.[24] The overall goal of the GOOS is to detect and predict changes in the state of marine, and estuarine ecosystems and to improve predictions of global climate change and its effects on people and ecosystem goods and services. The specific goals of GOOS are defined as:

- to specify, in terms of space, time, quality and other relevant factors the marine observational data needed on a continuing basis to meet the common and identifiable requirements of the world community of users of the oceanic environment;[25]
- to develop and implement an internationally coordinated strategy for the gathering, acquisition and exchange of these data;
- to facilitate the development of uses and products of these data, and encourage and widen their application in use and protection of the marine environment;
- to facilitate means by which less-developed nations can increase their capacity to acquire and use marine data; and
- to coordinate the ongoing operations of the GOOS and ensure its integration within wider global observational and environmental management strategies.

The operational activities of GOOS include:

---

[23] The Sub-regional Focal Points and the members of the Regional Task Teams (10-15 individuals) are appointed in their personal capacity by the Steering Group at the recommendation by the Core Team. The Regional Task Teams consist of 10 to 15 individuals who may also serve as Sub-regional Focal Points. The Focal Points and members of the Regional Task Teams include government-nominated experts and experts of international standing from the appropriate regional scientific community. The Regional Task Teams are hosted by appropriate institutions or organisations providing logistic and financial support for the work of the Teams. The Thematic Task Teams are being established to review and assess, at a global level, specific issues and problems, such as transboundary freshwater basin management, climate variability and change, societal driving forces causing water-related problems.

[24] GOOS, together with the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) and the Global Terrestrial Observing System (GTOS), is one of the three major components of the Global Observing Systems (GOS).

[25] The products and services of the GOOS are designed to meet the needs of a wide range of users and customers: marine scientists, climatologists, resource managers (including fisheries), public health authorities, planners, the industrial sector (e.g. tourism, maritime transport), government agencies, and policy-makers.

- a data collection network;[26]
- data and information management;
- data analysis, and preparation and dissemination of GOOS products;
- modelling;[27] and
- training, technical assistance and technology transfer.

Presently, GOOS is being developed by the Ocean Observation Panel for Climate (OOPC)[28] and the Coastal Ocean Observation Panel (COOP) in two related and convergent modules: (i) a basin scale module that is primarily concerned with the ocean-climate system (improved weather forecasting and long-term climate predictions; and (ii) a coastal module that is primarily concerned with local manifestations of large-scale changes occurring in the ocean basins, coastal drainage basins, and airsheds (improved detection and prediction of changes caused by anthropogenic and natural forcing).

The Initial Observing System of GOOS is planned to incorporate, enhance and supplement a large number of existing programmes and activities, most of them presently implemented under the aegis of IOC.[29]

The coastal module of GOOS is planned to be an end-to-end system (measurements-data management-analysis), sustained in perpetuity, integrated (physical, biological and chemical measurements and data processing) and user driven. Three main themes will be addressed: (i) coastal marine services; (ii) ecosystem and public health; and (iii) living marine resources. Active cooperation is developing between the coastal module of GOOS and the regional seas programmes in the Baltic, Mediterranean, Pacific, Black Sea, North Sea and the Caribbean regions.[30]

The Health of the Ocean (HOTO) module of the GOOS is of particular relevance in the context of the present document. It intends to provide, according to a strategy formulated in 1996, the basis for determining prevailing conditions and trends in the marine

---

[26] The measurements and observations of the GOOS will be systematic, routine, cost-effective, high-quality, sustained for the long-term, available in a timely manner, and relevant to users' needs.

[27] The GOOS approach requires the rapid transmission(ideally: real- time transmission) of observational data to computerised data assembly centres, where the data can be processed through numerical models leading to assessments or forecasts.

[28] The climate module of he GOOS is the ocean component of the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS), which makes for an integral relationship between the two observing systems. Their joint work in this area is carried out through OOPC, jointly sponsored with the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP).

[29] Including: the fixed and drifting buoy programmes; meteorological measurements from the WMO's Voluntary Observing Ship programme and disposable bathytermograph measurements from the IOC/WMO Ship of Opportunity Programme; IOC's tide gauges programme (GLOSS); satellite observations (ocean topography, ocean vector winds, sea surface temperature, ocean colour, sea-ice, fronts and currents, and plumes), water sampling surveys (physical and chemical data); ocean plankton surveys; biological monitoring of coral reefs (Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network).

[30] For instance: In 1997, MedGOOS was established, with full support of the Secretariat of the Barcelona convention, to improve local and regional scale physical and ecological monitoring and modelling of the Mediterranean. The Secretariat of MedGOOS is in Malta. The EC-funded Mediterranean Forecasting System Pilot Project is implemented by MedGOOS. The Baltic Operational Oceanographic System (BOOS) is another example how will be HELCOM assisted with advanced integrated data products and assessments based on measurements made by HELCOM agencies and supplemented by the agencies working under BOOS.

environment in relation to the effects of anthropogenic activities, particularly those resulting in the release of contaminants to that environment.

GOOS is being implemented through an overall coordination of IOC and active participation of national institutions and research centres which serve as the primary source of data and information on which GOOS is based. Financial support for the work of these institutions and centres is provided by the relevant national authorities and is supplemented with resources obtained from other sources on a project funding basis.

GOOS is primarily not an assessment programme, as understood in the context of decision 21/13. Nevertheless, it is described in the present document as it is among the more important mechanisms that could, once fully developed and operational, provide data and information needed for a regular process for assessment of the state of the marine environment, and thus should be considered as an essential component of this process.

3.5 GPA

The Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA) was adopted, in 1995, as an action-oriented programme "designed to assist the states in taking actions individually or jointly within their respective policies and resources, which will lead to the prevention, reduction, control and/or elimination of the degradation of the marine environment, as well as to its recovery from the impacts of land-based activities" and "to be a source of conceptual and practical guidance to be drawn upon" in this respect.

The objectives of the GPA[31] are:

- at the national level: to develop comprehensive, continuing and adaptive programmes of action within the framework of integrated coastal area management which should include, inter alia, provisions for: (i) identification and assessment of problems; (ii) establishment of priorities; and (iii) setting management objectives for priority problems;

- at the regional level: to strengthen and, where necessary, create new regional cooperative arrangements and joint actions to support effective action, strategies and programmes for: (i) identification and assessment of problems; and (ii) establishment of targets and priorities for action; and

- at the international level: to strengthen existing international cooperation and institutional mechanisms and, where appropriate, to establish new arrangements, in order to support states and regional groups to undertake sustained action to address impacts upon the marine environment from land based sources.[32]

---

31 Only the objectives relevant in the context of decision 21/13 are emphasised.

32 As part of GPA's activities at the international level, the establishment of a clearing-house was envisaged. It is conceived as a referral system through which decision makers at the national and regional level are provided with access to current sources of information, practical experience and scientific and technical expertise relevant to developing and implementing strategies to deal with the impacts of land-based activities. The data directory of the clearing-house is organised, in close cooperation with the relevant international organisations, by source-category, cross-referenced to economic sectors, with information on current sources of information, practical experience and technical expertise. Global and regional organisations, national

The implementation of GPA is coordinated by UNEP, as the Secretariat of the GPA, through the GPA Coordinating Office located, since 1998, in The Hague. The organisations and structures of the regional seas programmes, those under UNEP's ambit as well as those independent from UNEP, represent the basic mechanisms for developing and implementing the GPA. A number of international organisations supports and actively participates in the implementation of the GPA[33], particularly the clearing-house mechanism.

The assessment of the state of the marine environment, as it relates to the impact of land-based activities, is one of the three main activities of the GPA Coordination Office.[34] During the period 1996-1999, eight regional workshops of government-designated experts were convened within the framework of UNEP's Regional Seas Programme[35] to discuss and finalise regional assessments on land-based activities, including prioritisation of sources of pollution both at the national and regional levels. Ten regional assessments[36] and regional programmes of action resulted from these workshops. At the global level, GESAMP was asked by UNEP to prepare, taking into account the regional assessments, a global assessment of the impact of land-based activities on the marine and coastal environment[37] for the forthcoming intergovernmental review meeting on the implementation of GPA (Montreal, 26-30 November 2001).

The implementation of the GPA is financially supported from a number of sources: UNEP; special contributions from governments; agencies collaborating on the clearing-house; contributions from regional seas programmes. The national programmes of action are implemented and funded by the relevant government departments. GEF support was made available for a regional project. The assessment programme undertaken in the framework of the GPA was largely funded by UNEP, including the work carried out for GPA by GESAMP. The contributions from partnership with the private sector are, for the time being, below the expected level. In general, the limited availability of, or access to adequate financial resources is one of the major impediments hindering the implementation of the GPA at all levels.

3.6 Regional Seas Programmes

---

governments, the private sector and non-governmental organisations were envisaged to be involved in the development of the data directory.

33 WHO, IAEA, IMO and FAO. For each source category UNEP or one of the UN bodies acts as the "lead agency".

34 The other two activities are: mobilising action at local, regional and global level; and evaluating progress and further development of GPA. For more details about the past activities of the GPA see the progress report prepared for the Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Implementation of the GPA (document UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/3).

35 Workshops have been organised for the following regions: South-East Pacific; ROPME Sea Area and Red Sea and Gulf of Aden; East Asian Seas; Eastern Africa; South Asian Seas; West and Central Africa; Upper South-West Atlantic; and South Pacific.

36 The assessments have been published by UNEP in the Regional Seas Reports and Studies series and are also available on the GPA website: www.gpa.unep.org.

37 See section 3.1 of the present document.

UNEP played a leading role in initiating or supporting the negotiations of a number of regional seas conventions but there is also a number of conventions that evolved without UNEP's assistance.[38]

The conventions cover the maritime areas under the jurisdiction of the contracting parties to these conventions, with the exclusion of internal waters in most cases. However, some conventions or the provisions of certain protocols or annexes associated with the conventions also apply to internal waters and, in one instance, even to the hydrologic basins and ground waters associated with the convention area.

Most of the regional seas conventions, particularly those negotiated under the aegis of UNEP, are in the form of "comprehensive framework conventions", with articles of quite general nature which in themselves would have been of little practical value. However, these conventions are supplemented with several protocols and annexes specifying the concrete measures expected to be implemented by the contracting parties.[39]

All regional seas conventions are associated with specific programmes (most frequently in the form of an "Action Plan") supporting the implementation of the provisions of the conventions and their protocols. Most action plans, particularly those adopted under UNEP's aegis, follow the structure similar to the one adopted for the Action Plan for the Human Environment at United Nations Conference on Human Environment (UNCHE; Stockholm, 1972), although the specific activities for any region depend on the needs and priorities of that region.[40]

The overall strategy followed by most regional seas action plans include, with slight modifications, four elements. One of them is particularly relevant in the context of the present document[41]:

---

38 Presently, there are eleven major regional seas conventions in force: Helsinki (1974), Barcelona (1976), Kuwait (1978), Abidjan (1981), Lima (1981), Jeddah (1982) Cartagena (1983), Nairobi (1985), Noumea (1986), Bucharest (1992) and OSPAR (1992). In addition to the conventions in force, there are two regional seas conventions under negotiation: one for the Caspian Sea and another for the Northeast Pacific.

39 A number of regional conventions, particularly those adopted in early 1970s, were amended or even entirely revised in order to reflect the broadening concern of the contracting parties for the complex problems of the marine environment. The most radical change was the merging of two conventions into a new convention. Further revisions and amendments are being considered for some conventions.

40 While the focus of the first action plans was on the protection of the marine environment from pollution, the subsequently adopted action plans shifted their priorities to all issues relevant to the development and protection of the marine environment and their resources. The periodic revisions of the action plans broadened their scope in order to emphasise issues related to integrated management and use of coastal and marine environment along the lines recommended by Agenda 21 adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED; Rio de Janeiro, 1992). In some regions determined efforts are being made to pay more attention to the specific problems of small island states, to the management of associated river basins and to the potential effects of climate change.

41 The other three elements are: (i) promotion of international and regional conventions, programmes, guidelines and actions for the control of activities leading to the degradation of the marine and coastal environment and for the protection and management of marine and coastal resources on a sustainable basis; (ii) promotion of integrated management of geographic areas covered by the conventions and protocols; and (iii) support for education and training efforts to make possible the full participation of developing countries in the implementation of the conventions and in activities envisaged under the action plans.

- Assessment of the state of the marine and coastal environment, of the trends in the quality of this environment, of the sources of the degradation of the marine and coastal environment, and of the impact of this degradation on human health, ecosystems and amenities.[42]

The periodic meetings of the contracting parties to the regional seas conventions or, when the action plans are not associated with such conventions, periodic high-level intergovernmental meetings represent the highest authority guiding the action plans, determining the priorities which should be dealt by the plans, and allocating the financial resources to these activities. Various subsidiary bodies established by the contracting parties assist in the governance of the conventions and action plans.

The provisions of the conventions, the decisions of the meetings of the contracting parties or the intergovernmental meetings, and the specific activities agreed as parts of the action plans are implemented by national authorities and institutions of the contracting parties.[43]

UNEP provides the secretariat for four conventions and seven action plans, either directly through its Headquarters in Nairobi or through semiautonomous "regional coordinating units" operating under the authority of the contracting parties and managed by UNEP on their behalf.[44] The other seven conventions and action plans have secretariats established and maintained by the contracting parties to these conventions.

The secretariats provide overall guidance and coordinates the agreed activities at the regional level. At the country level the internal coordination of these activities is the responsibility of national coordinators appointed by each contracting party.

For the implementation and coordination of some specific activities, particularly those linked with legally binding provisions (e.g., protocols adopted under the conventions), "regional activity centres" have been established by the decisions of the contracting parties. Most of these centres are national institutions with regional roles assigned to them by the meetings of the contracting parties and operate on a project funding basis.

Seed money for the development of the conventions and the associated action plans developed under UNEP's sponsorship was provided by UNEP. The common costs associated with the implementation of the conventions and their action plans (e.g., secretariat, meetings, coordination, training) are met through special trust funds established by the contracting parties of each convention. The implementation of the conventions and action plans at the national levels is funded by individual governments, although considerable assistance is provided to developing countries also through the trust funds established under the conventions. Additionally, there are projects that are financed or co-financed

---

[42] Two regional assessments are quoted as examples for the type of periodic reports produced by the regional seas programme: The State of the Marine and Coastal Environment in the Mediterranean Region (MAP Technical Report No.100, UNEP, Athens, 1996). Quality Status Report 2000 (OSPAR Commission, Paris, 2000).

[43] More than 100 countries are parties to one or several conventions and participate in the action plans.. The number of national institutions participating in the implementation of the action plan is estimated as over 500. The European Commission is party to several of the regional seas convenions.

[44] UNEP also coordinates and assists the development of two additional conventions (Caspian Sea and Northeast Pacific), an additional action plan (Northeast Pacific) and a "cooperative programme" (Upper South West Atlantic).

through resources obtained, on a project funding basis, from external sources (e.g., GEF, European Union) or specially earmarked government contributions.

3.7 ICRAN

The International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) is a joint initiative by several partners.[45] It is designed to reverse the decline in the health of the world's coral reefs.

ICRAN was launched through a one-year "start-up phase" that is followed by a four-year (2000-2004) "action phase" according to a "Strategic Plan". The Plan envisages a set of inter-inked, highly complementary activities that will enable the proliferation of good practices for coral reef management and conservation. Strategic on-the-ground action is combined with assessment and information to enhance effective management of people's actions and their impacts upon coral reefs.

The "Strategic Plan" of ICRAN is based on three main components: (i) implementation; (ii) assessment; and (iii) communication. UNEP, through the regional seas programmes, focuses on the implementation, ICLARM on assessment and CORAL on communication components of the Plan.

The expected products and outcomes of ICRAM are:

- A global system of model Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) and Marine Protected Area (MPA) sites, and mechanisms to ensure that coastal communities around the world near coral reefs can learn from the models and implement similar efforts.
- Documented improvement in management practices and coral reef health.
- A set of public information materials, including best-practice guidelines for coral reef management, as part of a compiled global atlas of information for coral reef management.
- Enhanced awareness of coral reef conservation and proper management through world-wide public information campaign.
- "ReefBase", the global repository for data on coral reefs.
- Enhancement of the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN) to provide critically needed data on coral reef health and on the status of reef-dependent peoples.
- Training materials tailored to the needs of coral reef managers.
- Establishment of a Coral Reef Fund and mechanisms to support coral reef management and conservation.

---

[45] The founding partners of ICRAN include: the International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM), UNEP, the World Resources Institute (WRI), the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), the Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN), the International Coral Reef Initiative – Coordinating Planning Committee (ICRI-CPC) and the Coral Reef Alliance (CORAL).

The United Nations Foundation (UNF) provided the means to initiate the start-up phase of ICRAN's core activities. Counterpart funding is expected to support the activities envisaged under the action phase.

3.8 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) is a four-year process (2001-2005). It is designed to improve the management of the world's natural and managed ecosystems by helping to meet the needs of decision-makers and the public for peer-reviewed, policy-relevant scientific information on the condition of ecosystems, consequences of ecosystem change, and options for response. The primary target audience for the global findings of MA will be the parties to the ecosystem-related conventions.

The design of MA consist of a comprehensive global assessment as well as sub-global assessments of conditions and change in ecosystems in selected individual communities, countries and regions.

A Board representing the key users of the MA has been established to govern the MA.[46]

The MA will be carried out by an international network of experts organised in four expert working groups focused on conditions, scenarios, response options, and sub-global assessments.[47] Each working group will be co-chaired by leading natural and social scientists from industrial and developing countries. The working groups will contain a geographically balanced group of experts from universities, the private sector, government and civil society. An "Assessment Panel" will be established, comprised of the chairs of he working groups.

During the first year, MA will focus on the development of an internally consistent set of methodologies for conducting the assessment at local, national, regional and global scales.

The assessment reports will undergo extensive peer review. Reviewers from all countries will be nominated by scientists, governments, business and civil society. The review process will be developed and overseen by the MA Board and an independent review body.

The MA is planned to be closely coordinated with other global assessment processes, including GEO, GIWA and IPCC, and will work closely with research programmes such as the IGBP and IHDP and the Global Observing System (GTOS, GCOS, GOOS).

Six different institutions will provide core administrative, logistical and technical support to the working groups that will undertake the assessment. UNEP will administer the majority of the core financial support and employ the Director of MA who will be based at the

---

46 The Board includes representatives of the CBD, CCD and Ramsar conventions, national ministries, UN agencies, civil society, and the private sector. The Board members representing institutions (including the conventions) were selected by those institutions. In addition, 10 "at large" members were selected by the exploratory Steering Committee and an additional 10 members were chosen by the Board at its first meeting. The Board's Co-Chairs, representatives of the CBD, CCD, Ramsar, UNEP, GEF and the United Nations Foundation, the Assessment Panel Co-Chairs, and several of the "at large" members form an Executive Committee of he Board. The Board Co-Chairs, Assessment Panel Co-Chairs, Executive Director, as well as the institutions housing the "distributed" Secretariat, have been or will be selected by the Board.

47 The full names of the working groups are: Current Ecosystem Extent, Trends, Conditions and Value WG; Ecosystem Scenarios WG; Response Options WG; Sub-Global Assessment WG.

International Centre for Living Aquatic Resource Management (ICLARM) in Malaysia. The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) will support Working Group No.2 (Condition) and the ICSU Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) will support Working Group No.3 (Scenarios). Developing country institutions will be selected to support Working Group No.1 (Sub-Global) and No.4 (Response Options). The World Resources Institute, in partnership with the Meridian Institute, will support the outreach activities. Collectively, the staff assigned to the MA at these various institutions will form the "distributed" Secretariat of MA.

The core budget for the MA is $ 5.25 million per year for the four-year process. One third of this budget will support the sub-global assessments. Most of the time of experts involved in the assessment will be covered by their home institutions.

The main sponsors of MA are: GEF, United Nations Foundation, Packard Foundation, World Bank, CGIAR, FAO, Government of Norway, Rockefeller Foundation, UNDP, UNEP and NASA.

3.9 United Nations Atlas of the Oceans

The Atlas is an information system designed for use by policy makers who need to become familiar with ocean-related issues and by scientists, students and resource managers who need access to data bases. It also intends to provide the ocean industry and other stakeholders with accessible and pertinent information on matters relevant for sustainable development of the oceans.

The Atlas is under development, since late 1999, in support of the implementation of UNCED's Agenda 21. It is developed jointly by the United Nations and national agencies responsible for matters relevant to the sustainable development of the oceans and the advancement of ocean sciences[48], under the aegis of the ACC Sub-Committee on Oceans and Coastal Areas, under the leading responsibility of FAO, and under the guidance and coordination of a Steering Committee and a Technical Committee. The development phase of the project will be completed by the end of 2001.

The information contained in the Atlas is organised in four main areas of interest:

- about the oceans – from how they were formed to their physiology, biology and climatology;
- uses of the oceans – from food to shipping, mining, energy, etc.;
- trans-sectoral issues – such as sustainability, food security, global change and pollution; and
- geography – information is accessible by referencing to geographical areas.

The preparation of the Atlas is funded by the United Nation Foundation (UNF), with considerable financial contributions from the agencies and organisations participating in its development.

---

[48] Partners in the development of the Atlas include: United Nations, UNEP, FAO, IOC, WMO, IMO, IAEA, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, NOAA and HDNO.

3.10 IPCC

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established, in 1988, by the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and UNEP to assess the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change. The Panel is jointly sponsored by UNEP and WMO and is open to all member countries of these organisations.

The Panel does not carry out new research nor does it monitor climate-related data. It bases its assessment mainly on published and peer reviewed scientific and technical literature.

The work of the Panel is organised through the plenary sessions of the Panel (about once a year) and the activities of its three working groups and a task force[49]:

- Working Group I assesses the scientific aspects of the climate system and climate change;
- Working Group II addresses the vulnerability of socio-economic and natural systems to climate change, the possible and probable negative and positive consequences of climate change, and options for adapting to the expected changes;
- Working Group III assesses the options for limiting greenhouse gas emissions and otherwise mitigate climate changes; and
- The Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories oversees the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.

The plenary sessions of the Panel accept or approve the IPCC reports[50], decide on the mandate and workplans of the working groups, the structure and outlines of the reports, the principles and procedures governing the work of the Panel and its subsidiary bodies, and the Panel's budget. The Chairman and the Bureau of the Panel are elected by the plenary sessions of the Panel.[51]

Three assessment reports[52] have been issued by the Panel:

---

49 Procedures adopted for the work of IPCC stipulate that "experts from WMO/UNEP member countries or international, intergovernmental or non-governmental organisations may be invited in their own right to contribute to the work of the working group and task forces. Governments should be informed in advance of invitations extended to experts from their countries and they may nominate additional experts."

50 The reports of the Panel and its working groups are expected to be approved or adopted by consensus. If a consensus can not be reached, procedural issues are decided according to he General Regulations of the WMO and differing substantive views are explained and, upon request, recorded. Conclusions drawn by the working groups or task forces are not official IPCC views until they have been accepted by the Panel in a plenary meeting. Reports and documents prepared for consideration of the Panel and its working groups are made available, "to the extent possible", in all official UN languages.

51 The plenary sessions of the Panel elect the Chair and five Vice-Chairs of the Panel. Each Working Group has two Co-Chairs (one from a less-developed and one from an industrialised country) and 6 Vice-Chairs.

52 The Principles adopted by the Panel require that the "IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy, although they may need to deal objectively with scientific, technical and socio-economic factors relevant to the application of particular policies" and that "the review of the IPCC documents should involve both peer review by experts and review by governments".

- The First Assessment Report (1990) played an important role in establishing the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) by the General Assembly.[53]

- The Second Assessment Report (1995) provided key input to negotiations which led to the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC in 1997.

- The Third Assessment Report (2001) provides a comprehensive and up-to-date assessment of he policy-relevant scientific, technical and socio-economic dimensions of climate change. It concentrates on new findings since 1995, and pays greater attention to the regional (in addition to the global) scale.

The small Secretariat of IPCC (2 professionals + 3 supporting staff) is hosted by WMO, jointly supported by WMO and UNEP, and managed by WMO.

The average annual budget of IPCC is about $ 2.5 million. The main financial support for the work of the Panel is provided by the joint WMO/UNEP IPCC Trust Fund that is jointly administered by WMO and UNEP.[54] Additional support is provided through in-kind contributions towards the work of the Panel.[55]

4. OPTIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A "REGULAR PROCESS" FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE OF THE GLOBAL MARINE ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Background against which the options should be evaluated

Decision 21/13 specifies that the "process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment" should be:

- regular;

- established with active involvement by governments and regional agreements; and

- building on ongoing assessment programmes.

However, decision 21/13 does not mention a number of equally important issues that are of critical importance for defining the substantive and organisational framework for the assessment process and for a meaningful consideration of the available options that would satisfy the requirements of the decision. The issues of particular relevance are analysed in the ensuing paragraphs.

---

[53] The UNFCCC was adopted in 1992 and entered into force in 1994. It provides the overall policy framework for addressing the climate change issue.

[54] The Trust Fund is alimented by: (i) annual contributions from governments on the basis of a scale adopted by the Panel; (ii) cash contributions from UNEP and WHO; (iii) other voluntary cash contributions.

[55] WMO contributes the cost of the Panel's Secretary and the cost of housing the Secretariat; UNEP the cost of a programme officer in the Secretariat; governments the costs of selected meetings, workshops, document translation and publication.

The definition of the intended ***users and use of the assessment*** will have a decisive influence on the nature and scope of the assessment because the content, presentation, style and language of the assessment reports (and other products that may be available through the assessment process) would have to be tailored to the specific needs of the users. Therefore, before considering the other parameters, a decision would have to be taken about the potential use and users of the products resulting from the assessment process, i.e. about the ***central goal or purpose for establishing the assessment process***. Some of the alternative definitions of this goal may include:

- to provide, on a continuous basis, scientific assessment of the state of the marine environment; or

- to provide, on a continuous basis, science-based and policy-oriented assessment of the state of the marine environment.[56]

The primary users of the first alternative would be the scientific communities, while the second alternative would orient the assessment process more towards the needs of policy-makers and higher-level managers. A feasible "compromise solution", based on the second alternative, would be to prepare the assessment reports in two parts: one written as a scientific/technical report mainly addressing the interest of the scientific communities and the other covering the same ground but written in language and style adapted to the needs of policy-makers.

The products of the assessment process could be also tailored to the needs of general public by, for instance, turning the scientific/technical and policy-oriented parts of the assessment reports into more popular forms.

In considering the ***scope of the assessment*** the following questions would have to be clarified:

- Is the assessment envisaged as a static identification of the state of the marine environment or a more complex assessment, including the assessment of the trends, with forecasts (scenarios) for the changes that may be expected in the state of the marine environment, the implications of these changes and their acceptability from a social and economic point of view?

- Should the assessment be limited to the global marine environment, or should it be wider and include also the assessment of the state of the coastal environment and associated freshwaters?[57]

- Should it provide only a global perspective or should it address also regional and sub-regional situations and concerns?

- Should the assessment include the analysis of: the social and economic factors influencing or being influenced by the state of the marine environment; the value of

---

[56] The policy-relevant questions expected to be treated by the assessment should be clearly defined at the outset as they will have an important bearing on the scope and extent of the science-based analysis.

[57] Since UNCED it is generally accepted that the problems of the oceans can not be considered in isolation from natural and socio-economic processes taking place in the coastal areas.

ecosystem goods and services; the impact of land-based activities (including tourism) and fisheries[58] on the quality and uses of the marine environment and its ecosystems; issues related to resource management (e.g., the status and exploitation of fishery resources and minerals); the risks to human health associated with the quality of the marine environment; other human uses of the oceans (e.g., those related to shipping); etc?

- What should be used as the "legitimate" sources of information and data for the assessment of the state of the marine environment: peer reviewed scientific an technical literature; information and data available through ongoing assessment programmes; information and data from "grey literature", including media; information and data provided by governments through national and regional assessment reports?

- Should the assessment process be a science-oriented or policy-oriented process, i.e. should it also recommend policy or management measures that may mitigate, avoid or solve the eventual negative consequences of human-induced environmental changes?

It could be assumed that the ***nature of the regular process for the assessment*** will be an open-ended (permanent), well planned, structured and closely coordinated process resulting in periodic assessment reports and probably other products. An early decision would have to be taken on the periodicity of the assessment reports as it will have considerable implications for the mechanism selected for the preparation of such reports[59] and for the financial resources needed to support the preparation of the reports. The "other products" of the assessment process may include special reports on some particular issue; advice, information or data provided on request; etc.

The desired ***level and modalities of government involvement*** in the assessment process remained unresolved in decision 21/13. Two main intrinsically linked issues should be considered: (a) governments as the vital source of data and information required for the assessment process; and (b) governments as active participants (partners) in carrying out the assessments, i.e. in evaluating and interpreting the available information, in synthesising the "raw" information and in formulating the policy-relevant recommendations.

The commitment of governments to provide a regular flow of reliable data and information needed for the assessment process is among the basic prerequisite for their active

---

[58] The consideration of the "impact of fisheries" and the "status and exploitation of fishery resources" are legitimate issues to be addressed by the assessment process. The arguments for the inclusion of these issues in the assessment are simple: a meaningful strategy for the protection of the marine environment cannot be developed without following an ecosystem-based approach and without taking into account what is happening to one of the most valuable marine resource which happens to be a critical component of the marine ecosystem. No assessment of the state of the marine environment could be considered comprehensive if it fails to consider one of the major problems of the marine ecosystem. Even GESAMP has recognised that it has to address the status of fishery resources. OSPAR has finally done the same in its latest Quality Status Report (QSR 2000) by emphasising that "it is generally recognised that fisheries management and environmental policies must be further integrated, within the framework of the ecosystem approach".

[59] Should the report be linked with the annual review and evaluation carried out through the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea (UNICPOLOS) or should it rather follow a different approach? GESAMP practised the system of decadal reports; GEO reports are prepared with 2-3 intervals. A compromise solution that may be considered would be the preparation of short, annual reports for UNICPOLOS (and for other meetings of the sponsoring agencies) focusing on the main new developments and current issues, and comprehensive decadal reviews of the state of the marine environment.

participation in the process. Only a universal, globally balanced data- and information-base can lead to a truly global assessment of environmental problems and ensure full transparency of the process.[60]

Taking into account the past experience with various approaches and models for involvement of governments in environmental assessment processes, the range of options seems to be limited to three basic possibilities. The assessment could be carried out by:

- government-nominated or government-endorsed experts[61];
- experts selected (by an organisation or mechanism yet to be defined) in their individual capacity from a pool of experts proposed by governments[62]; or
- experts selected (by an organisation or mechanism yet to be defined) in their individual capacity, with reports cleared (endorsed) by governments[63].

Each of the three options has its advantages and drawbacks. Assessment reports prepared by government-nominated experts, and particularly the policy-oriented recommendations of such reports, are accepted easier and used more readily by the governments. However, these assessments are frequently considered as too partial to positions of some governments and therefore their objectivity and scientific credibility is often questioned. On the other hand, while the assessments prepared by experts selected in their individual capacity from a pool of experts proposed by governments may have higher degree of credibility in scientific circles, the governments do not easily "identify" with them. Consequently the impact of such reports, particularly of the recommendations contained therein, usually are not followed-up by governments. Therefore, the combination of the second and the third option may be the best way to secure the scientific accuracy, impartiality and integrity of the assessment process and the reports resulting from this process, an active dialogue between the scientific community and policy-makers and, at the same time, ensure that the reports and their recommendations are acceptable to the governments.

---

60 Environmental data and information are usually more abundant from countries and regions with well established scientific traditions and developed institutional infrastructure supporting scientific research. This unintentionally but inevitably leads to a biased consideration and presentation of environmental problems and to policy-relevant recommendations addressed to (and easier acceptable by) countries for which data and information are available.

61 Procedure used in the preparation of the assessment reports in the framework of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

62 Procedure used for the preparation of GESAMP reports by some of the agencies sponsoring GESAMP. The recent evaluation of GESAMP recommended that the future selection of members of GESAMP and its working groups should be based on a periodically updated pool of experts covering a broad spectrum of fields of expertise, including natural and social scientists, economists and specialists in management of marine ecosystems, public health and law should be developed. Nomination of individuals to this pool should come from sponsoring agencies, current members of GESAMP, governments, scientific bodies such as SCOR, SCOPE, IABO, and NGOs..

63 Procedure used for the preparation of assessment reports in the framework of a number of regional seas conventions. Usually the final drafts of the assessment reports are circulated for comments to the relevant governments and the clearance/endorsement is obtained either by correspondence or at the meetings of the conventions' governing bodies or their subsidiary organs.

In principle, the ***involvement of regional agreements*** does not pose a technical problem as it was successfully demonstrated through the collaboration between GESAMP, the regional seas agreements and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA/LBA)[64]. However, the coordinated input from regional agreements into the global assessment process would have to be standardised and it should be considered as an integral part of the global process.

The advantages of ***building the assessment process on ongoing assessment programmes*** is obvious as it would avoid duplication of efforts and considerably reduce the costs of the process. The regional and national assessments, particularly those carried out in the framework of the regional seas programmes, will be among the most important sources of information and data on which the global assessment process will have to rely.[65] Experience showed that the quality of the regional and national reports is very uneven and their contents and style are not "standardized", i.e they do not contain easily comparable information and data. Therefore, the mechanism underlying the regular global assessment would have to develop guidelines for the preparation of regional and national assessment reports that could easily feed into the global assessment. Moreover, financial and substantive assistance may have to be provided to certain regions and countries in order to ensure that their reports are up to the standards needed for the global assessment.

Although decision 21/13 does not specify any **involvement of scientific communities or the non-governmental organisations** in the envisaged assessment process, their involvement in the process would seem highly desirable.[66] These communities and organisations are a major source of data and information on the state of the marine environment and their exclusion from the assessment process would seem unjustified and would be to the detriment of the process.

No attempt has been made in the present document to guess the ***costs of the assessment process*** as they will depend on the option selected for the scope of the assessment and the mechanism chosen to carry out the assessment process. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that a "regular assessment process" would require a stable (i.e., predictable) financial support. Any other solution may be considered as jeopardising the regularity of the process. Funding of the process could be provided:

- by a trust fund established by the governments in support of the assessment process;
- by including funds needed for the support of the process in the government-approved budgets of the agencies that may support the process; or

---

64 The recently completed two reports of GESAMP on the state of the global marine environment and on the impact of land-based activities on this environment, were based on regional reports prepared in the framework of regional seas agreements, most of them with the help and active involvement of GPA/LBA.

65 It is reasonable to expect that the regional and national assessments will be prepared by government-nominated experts and endorsed by the relevant governments or group of governments, thus ensuring a high-level involvement of governments in the inputs that will be used for the preparation of global assessments.

66 The involvement of scientific communities and the non-governmental organisations could be envisaged at several levels: they could be asked to propose experts for the pool of experts on whose expertise the assessment process could draw; they could be involved in drafting certain sections of the assessment reports; they could be engaged in the peer review of the assessment reports; etc.

- by creating innovative new financing mechanisms.

Last but not least, the **technical constraints** associated with the preparation of global assessments should be also considered. Among the most important are:

- inaccessibility to some type of data;
- general shortage of reliable and globally comparable data and information: and
- lack of long-term data-sets essential for the identification and analysis of temporal trends.

4.2 The options

Three basic options seem to be available for satisfying the requirements of a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment, as envisaged by decision 21/13. The choice is between:

(a) adaptation of an existing assessment mechanism and programme to satisfy the requirements laid down in decision 21/13;

(b) establishment of a mechanism to co-ordinate the work and outputs of existing assessment mechanisms and programmes; and

(c) creation of a new assessment mechanism and programme that would build on ongoing assessment programmes and mechanisms.

It would be difficult to determine the **suitability of an existing assessment mechanism or programme** that could be adapted to satisfy the requirements of decision 21/13 without clarification of the framework of the assessment process, i.e. the substantive, procedural and policy issues reviewed in section 4.1 of the document. Nevertheless, some of the options that could be considered are:

(i) to "nest" the assessment within the GEO project/process;

(ii) to use an adequately reformed GESAMP;

(iii) to use GOOS, with a broadened mandate, as the general framework for the assessment; or

(iv) to set up the process as follow-up to GIWA.

The advantages from launching the assessment process envisaged by decision 21/13 through an existing assessment mechanism and programme are considerable:

- it would be more cost-effective than setting up a new mechanism;
- it would build on existing experience and benefit from the "prestige" already acquired by an existing programme;
- it would be based on existing organisational and supporting arrangements; and
- it could be launched with minimal delay.

The **establishment of a coordinating mechanism** for the assessment process to coordinate the work and outputs of ongoing assessment programmes is required regardless of the approach, and may seem attractive as a relatively cost-effective option. However, the drawback of this option is that it would require extensive negotiations with existing programmes in order to secure their effective collaboration and coordinated input into the assessment process.

The **creation of a new assessment programme and mechanism,** building on ongoing assessment programmes and organised along the lines similar to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)[67] or the GEO process, seems an attractive option. It would ensure the maximum involvement and control of governments over the assessment process, the reflection of issues and formulation of policy-relevant recommendations as perceived by the governments, and thus easier acceptance of these recommendations by governments. However, caution must be taken that this is not achieved at some detriment to the integrity and scientific credibility of the assessment. On the organisational and financial side, the setting-up a GEO- or IPCC-type of assessment process would require the establishment of a mechanism (secretariat) for the coordination of the process and considerable funds to support the process.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The planning, organisation, overall coordination and implementation of the assessment process that would address the concerns expressed or implied in decision 21/13 is a **highly demanding but feasible task**, as illustrated with examples given in Chapter 3 of the present document.

Decision 21/13 was, obviously, prompted by the opinion of the UNEP Governing Council that the existing systems for the assessment of the marine environment are unsatisfactory. By identifying that the process of the assessment should be "regular", "established with active involvement by governments and regional agreements" and "building on ongoing assessment programmes", the decision implicitly indicates the main reasons why the present systems were considered unsatisfactory. The inadequacy of the quality, scope, relevance or reliability of the ongoing assessment processes and their assessments were not questioned by the decision and, therefore, it could be assumed that they were considered as satisfactory.

Taking into account that the three main concerns listed in the decision are, to a certain degree, addressed by some of the assessment processes reviewed in section 3 of the present document, or could be easily addressed with relatively minor adjustments in the present assessment systems, it seems that the call for the establishment of a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment may have had two main motives:

---

[67] Analogies with IPCC should be considered very cautiously. Namely, data and information on marine environment are far more divers, and the system for measuring, accessing, transferring and modelling such data are far less developed than in meteorology and climatology. A long history of government support ensures that these disciplines, when compared with marine sciences, benefit from more generous and regular funding and a well established institutional infrastructure that provides the global network needed to support IPCC deliberations. GOOS, in time, could perhaps be the basis of a similar system for the marine environment but only if it can be developed to cover the many different features and determinants required for the assessment of the state of the marine environment.

- dissatisfaction with the present institutional arrangements underlying the ongoing assessment systems[68]; and

- concern about the independent nature of presently the only specialised interagency mechanism that was producing, on a regular basis, cross-sectoral scientifically-based high-quality assessments of the state of the marine environment and advice on measures that may contribute to the protection of that environment (i.e. GESAMP).

Taking into account the review and analysis contained in Chapters 3 and 4 of the present document, the most rational approach to the examination of the feasibility for the establishment of a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment would seem to be through a stepwise procedure:

- **Firstly**, to examine and define the general framework in which the assessment process would have to be organised (i.e. the issues reviewed in section 4.1 of the document);

- **Secondly**, to examine which of the existing assessment systems and mechanisms (those reviewed in section 4.2 or any additional) could be used or adapted to implement the assessment process according to the agreed general framework.

- **Thirdly**, and only if the examination recommended above concludes negatively, to consider the establishment of a new assessment process.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE REYKJAVIK MEETING

On the basis of recommendations presented in UNEP's background document prepared for the Reykjavik meeting, the meeting adopted the following as the goal of the assessment:

To provide on a regular and timely basis, scientific assessments of the state and trends of all aspects of marine ecosystems for use by policy makers. These assessments shall include consideration of socio-economic implications and identify scenarios so as to assist policy makers in addressing marine-related issues. The assessments should take the form of technical scientific reports, supplemented by summaries for policy makers.

The mechanism and process to create such assessments must be transparent and independent. The assessments will be done by experts identified by governments, relevant UN bodies and regional organisations inter alia, who will provide their contributions on the basis of their individual expertise and with, where appropriate, advice from qualified experts and non-governmental organisations.[69]

---

[68] The decision seeks to improve the assessment process through institutional changes. However, the core problem is the failure to generate and synthesise sufficient statistical information needed to assess the state of the marine environment at a global scale. If the latter is not solved (and this will take time, and governments' money and commitment) no tinkering with institutional arrangements will have any effect whatsoever.

[69] During the discussions leading to the adoption of the above recommendations, the following main suggestions and remarks were made by the participants of the meeting:

- There is a need to clarify the definition of marine ecosystems, so as not to understate the importance of physical and chemical systems.

In considering the requirements of the assessment process, the Reykjavik meeting rejected the option envisaging the creation of a new assessment mechanism and programme that would build on ongoing assessment programmes and mechanisms. The meeting agreed *on the*

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.2.2

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Proceedings of the First Feasibility Study for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The first informal consultative meeting on the "Feasibility Study for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment" was held at Hotel Loftleidir, Reykjavik from 12-14 September 2001, and was attended by 37 persons representing international bodies, regional organisations, national governments, and other concerned organisations.

2. The process of investigating the potential development of a regular global assessment for the marine environment, to provide accurate information to decision-makers on the threats to this environment, had been instigated by national governments under the leadership of Iceland. The Icelandic proposal had led to the adoption by the UNEP Governing Council (GC), of a decision on "Global assessment of the state of the marine environment" (GC 21/13.). This Decision requested the Executive Director, in co-operation with IOC/UNESCO and other UN agencies, the CBD Secretariat, and the regional seas programmes to explore the feasibility of establishing a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment.

3. The Reykjavik meeting was the first stage in exploring the feasibility of an assessment process. The meeting objectives were to establish whether an assessment process was needed; whether a process would be feasible; what resources were available; who should be the principal users, and what did they require from the process; what should be the scope of the assessment; what the central goals of the assessment would be, and whether options were available to satisfy these goals; which main criteria were needed for a mechanism to undertake the assessment; and what should be the next steps taken in the development of the process.

4. Following the opening presentations participants strongly agreed that a global assessment of the marine environment was both desirable and urgently needed, and further welcomed the opportunity to examine the feasibility of developing this process.

5. To provide a general overview of the resources available for a global process, organisations currently engaged in marine assessment activities were invited to provide presentations on their work. Following the presentations participants noted that there was some duplication in efforts. It was suggested that a basic comparative exercise for organisations undertaking marine assessments could be completed during the meeting to identify and document overlap in effort, possible data gaps, and potential areas for further collaboration. The results of this exercise are recorded as part of this report (Annex XXV)

6. In view of the broad range of detailed material presented, participants agreed that sufficient baseline information was available to allow the construction of a regular, comprehensive, assessment of the marine environment at the global level.

7. It was strongly agreed that the principal target audience of the assessment should be policy-makers, mostly at the national level, and as such outputs and analysis from the process should be aimed towards this group. Country representatives were

invited to outline their needs and specifications for the process. It was suggested that the assessment should provide an examination of current and future changes in the state of the global marine environment; should determine the global impacts of changes in the marine environment; and should provide advice on actions required to mitigate the impacts of environmental change.

8. Guiding recommendations from country representatives were that the assessment should have a comprehensive, broad marine ecosystem approach, based on the best available scientific information. The process must demonstrate full transparency, and follow an inclusive, broad stakeholder approach.

9. It was strongly recommended that the assessment should build upon an existing assessment framework. Country representatives insisted that any proposals for a new mechanism would not receive support from their governments. It was suggested that a reformed GESAMP, provided with adequate funding, might be the best option, largely because of its strong scientific expertise. The meeting further recommended that the process should demonstrate sustainability so as to provide regular future assessments.

10. Participants strongly recommended with a suggestion presented in the UNEP background document that reports from the assessment are produced in a 'two-tier' format: one report (first-tier) should be written as a scientific/technical report to address the needs of the scientific community; with a second report (second-tier) covering the same information but written in a language and style adapted to the needs of policy makers.

11. Within the context of government involvement in the assessment process it was anticipated that governments would provide nominated experts to participate in scientific assessment procedures, and that there would be a role for governments in question formulation and in reviewing scientific input.

12. The geographical area in which the assessment should operate was defined as 'marine and coastal ecosystems and associated estuaries'. It was agreed that the assessment should adopt an ecosystem approach, and would provide an analysis of the impacts of environmental changes in the marine system on ecosystem resources and services. It was recommended that assessment should be based on standardised regional and sub-regional ecosystem assessments, contributed by regional and sub-regional organisations and agreements, and grouped at the global level. While the assessment should be built on existing assessment programmes, participants did not consider it reasonable to expect assessments to be prepared by government-nominated experts and then endorsed by the governments who had nominated the experts.

13. It was strongly recommended that the assessment should not be a static process, but should include the development of ongoing trends and scenarios to demonstrate the implications for biological and socio-economic systems of changes in the global marine environment. It was agreed that the assessment would analyse the social and economic aspects being influenced by changes, but would not examine those aspects influencing changes. Additionally the assessment should identify, but not analyse, risks to human health; moreover the assessment should analyse other human uses of the environment (eg. those related to shipping).

14. The goals of the assessment were established as follows: *To provide on a regular and timely basis, scientific assessments of the state and trends of all aspects of marine ecosystems for use by policy makers. These assessments shall include consideration of socio-economic implications and identify scenarios so as to assist policy makers in addressing marine-related issues. The assessments should take the form of technical scientific reports, supplemented by summaries for policy makers'.*

'*The mechanism and process to create such assessments must be transparent and independent. The assessments will be done by experts identified by governments, relevant UN bodies and regional organizations* inter alia, *who will provide their contributions on the basis of their individual expertise and with, where appropriate, advice from qualified experts and non-governmental organizations'.*

15. To meet these goals the following option was adopted: '*A regular assessment of marine ecosystems would require the adaptation of an existing mechanism, which would work in co-ordination and co-operation with other mechanisms, building upon their work and recognizing that they may also require adaptation'*

16. Participants recommended that the mechanism selected to co-ordinate a regular global marine assessment process should demonstrate the following four main criteria: cost effectiveness; credibility; sustainability; and ability to address policy issues.

17. It was agreed that the next steps in the assessment process should be: the completion, and circulation for comment to a broad-range of interested parties, of the Reykjavik meeting report; a three-day technical workshop to outline a technical blueprint for the development assessment process (probably during the second quarter of 2002 after the GESAMP meeting scheduled in May 2002); an awareness meeting to follow, or take place during the CSD Preparatory Committee meeting in New York, between the 28th and 8th of February 2002.

II. INTRODUCTION

18. The first informal consultative meeting on the "Feasibility Study for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment" was held at Hotel Loftleidir, Reykjavik from 12-14 September 2001.

19. The objective of the meeting was to provide an initial exploration of the feasibility of establishing a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment through the active involvement of national governments, UN agencies, and other organizations.

III. OPENING

20. The meeting was opened by the Hon. Mrs. Siv Fridleifsdottir the Minister for the Environment, Iceland. The Minister began by expressing the sympathy of the Icelandic people for the previous days tragic events in the USA. She stated that the Icelandic nation had been shocked by the news and had expressed their sentiments by flying the national flag at half-mast. The Minister stated that she was honoured that

Iceland had been selected to host the meeting, especially with regard to the country's dependence on the sea and its resources.

21. While she acknowledged the progress made in marine conservation over the last decade, the Minister emphasized that the deterioration of the marine environment was both continuing, and getting worse. She observed that the degradation of the marine environment was impacting not only fisheries but also the Earth's ecological and chemical cycles, and was subsequently impacting human development and progress.

22. The Minister drew attention to the commitment of Iceland to the protection of the marine environment, especially with regards to the country's assistance in the initiation of the feasibility study. She demonstrated concern over the detrimental impact of persistent organic pollutants (POP's) in the marine environment and welcomed the progress of the recent convention related to this issue (the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants). The Minister stressed the importance of a thorough scientific understanding of the marine environment for sound decision-making. In conclusion, she welcomed the delegates and hoped for a fruitful meeting providing a positive outcome for the whole world.

23. Tim Foresman (UNEP-DEWA), Chairman of the meeting, thanked the Minister for her kind remarks and for the warm welcome the delegates had received. He stated that the desire of Iceland to host the meeting had been greatly appreciated, and that the meeting was sorely needed. The Chairman continued by thanking delegates for their participation in the meeting. He stated that it had been difficult to focus on the topic of the meeting, given the previous days terrible events in the USA.

24. The Chairman recognized that international co-operation was never easy, and used the example of the 'tragedy of the commons' to illustrate the difficulties of balancing human affairs with ecological services. Within the context of the marine environment he drew attention to the lack of both scientific co-ordination and conveyance of suitable information to policy makers and citizens.

25. He stated that UNEP was honoured to chair the meeting; that UNEP had developed no set plan of action for the meeting; and that UNEP's role in the assessment process would be decided by the participants. The Chairman emphasized that the Governing Council Decision 21/13 (GC 21/13) had been instigated by co-operating national governments, under the leadership of Iceland, and had not been initiated by UNEP staff. The Chairman reminded participants that the meeting could be instrumental in formulating a plan to conserve the marine environment and the ecological services it provides to society.

IV AGENDA

26. The proposed agenda (Annex III) was presented and adopted without change. However as the meeting progressed, it followed a different scheme as determined by the dynamics of the meeting.

V. ATTENDANCE

27. UN representatives attended the meeting from UNEP DEWA, UNEP-GIWA, UNEP-WCMC, UNEP-East Asia, Black Sea and South Asia Regional Seas, IOC\UNESCO, ACC-SOCA. Governmental agencies were represented from Iceland, Sweden, Kuwait, Germany, Japan, USA, UK, and the Netherlands. Other organisations included the Marine Census Institute, GESAMP, IMO, PAME, Reef Check Europe, ICES, FAO, AMAP, CSD, IOI, and IPCC. In all 37 persons attended the three-day meeting. The complete list of participants is appended to the present report as Annex II.

VI. INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS

(a) Global assessment of the state of the marine environment

28. Magnus Johannesson (Ministry of Environment, Iceland) introduced document 3/12 (Annex IV) outlining the need for a global assessment of the marine environment. He opened by stating that the condition of the marine environment, especially with regards to marine pollution, was a high priority issue for Iceland given the nation's dependence on marine resources. He informed participants that factors such as increased population growth, urbanization, industrial and agricultural development had substantially increased the significance of land-based sources of marine pollution over the last 30 years. He suggested that around 80% of marine pollution was derived from land-based sources. Mr Johannesson considered that public opinion was a key issue in preventing further pollution of the marine environment, and suggested that both the public and media incorrectly perceive events such as oil pollution incidents as most damaging to marine systems.

29. Mr Johannesson informed delegates that the need to provide accurate information to decision-makers on the threats to the marine environment had been the motivation behind the Icelandic proposal. While scientific assessments over the previous 20 years had shown the continuing deterioration of marine systems, these studies had had little impact on decision-maker s policy.

30. He emphasized the need for a clear signal to decision-makers that would build upon the disparate information available, and have relevance to policy development. Mr Johannesson suggested the development of scenarios to illustrate the future impacts and/or repercussions of marine policy measures for socio-economic systems. While he agreed that there was no fixed methodology for creating scenarios, he directed delegates to examine the work undertaken by IPCC as a successful example of scenario development.

31. Mr Johannesson concluded by stating that existing marine programmes must take account of the proposed overview, and that Iceland hoped that UN agencies would act to guide national governments.

(b) Presentation of UNEP Governing Council Decision 21/13

32. The Chairman introduced document 2/12, the UNEP Governing Council Decision 21/13 (Annex V); and provided a summary of document 4/12 the UNEP background document for the meeting (Annex VI).

33. Participants were informed of the suggestion by Iceland for the development of an Intergovernmental Panel on Marine Pollution made at the 7th session of the CSD and the 21st session of UNEP's Governing Council (GC), leading to the adoption by the GC of a decision on "Global assessment of the state of the marine environment" (GC 21/13.). It was explained that this Decision requested the Executive Director, in co-operation with IOC/UNESCO and other UN agencies, the CBD Secretariat, and the regional seas programmes to explore the feasibility of establishing a regular process for the assessment of the state of the marine environment. Therefore UNEP's position was to: "*accept and implement the GC directive*"; and to "*assume the role of objective agency in conducting the feasibility study*".

34. The Chairman explained that the meeting needed to address the following:

i. Ongoing assessment activities - examples include: GESAMP; GEO; GIWA; GOOS; GPA; Regional Seas Programmes; ICRAN; MEA; UN Atlas of the Oceans; IPCC.
ii. The organizational structure of a global marine assessment process
iii. The central goal of this assessment
iv. The scope of the assessment
v. Possible sources of information
vi. Technical constraints
vii. Government involvement
viii. Costs of the assessment process
ix. The options available for developing a programme mechanism
x. And the next steps for undertaking a global assessment

The Chairman's full presentation outlining these issues is included as Annex VII.

35. The Chairman continued by provided a brief history on the progress towards developing a global marine assessment to date, and concluded by stating that UNEP's role was to: listen to the inputs discussed; facilitate the consultative meeting process; and communicate the progress of he assessment, largely by publishing material on the internet at the following site: http://www.unep.org/marineassessment

(c) Discussion on the presentations

36. Following the two presentations above, there were some discussion by the participants on general aspects of the proposed marine assessment process. The need for care in developing the first major cultural and disciplinary crosscutting global environmental initiative for a long-time was recognized. Participants were reminded that there was a need to incorporate all major organizational inputs, and that there should be no gaps in a comprehensive review of the global marine system. It was stated that for the assessment to be successful it was important to build upon, and co-ordinate, the goodwill of participatory bodies, including the provision of

assistance in 'breaking down' cultural and institutional barriers to allow people from different disciples (hydrologists, oceanographers etc.) to work closely together. It was recognized that international co-operation could be a very difficult process, and that co-operation between agencies within a country could also be difficult.

37. It was noted that the meeting should reflect the need to strengthen regional involvement, and to consider the role of national governments in the assessment process. Participants were reminded that GC Decision 21/13 specifies the active involvement of governments in developing the assessment process, that the Reykjavik meeting presented a good opportunity to both gain government opinions and to seek guidance on gaining governmental commitments to participate in a global marine assessment process. The need for a high level of transparency, in both the process and its goals, was emphasized; this was considered to be of particular value for encouraging governmental involvement.

38. Experiences from ongoing programmes indicated the need to clarify both the objectives and a definitive goal for the process before assessment efforts could commence. In response, the representative of UNEP reminded participants that no attempt had been made to formulate a goal prior to the meeting, and that the goal of the assessment would be defined during the course of the meeting.

39. Participants recognized that suitable interpretation of the information gathered by the assessment would only be feasible after a substantial period (several years) of data collection. The development of a long-term assessment process required consideration of sustainability issues by the meeting.

VII. PRESENTATIONS BY REPRESENTED ORGANISATIONS

40. The following representatives provided presentations to the meeting on their organizational activities relating to the marine environment:

Lars-Otto Reiersen	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat (AMAP)
Heiner Naeve	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Patricio Bernal	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC)
Ed Green	World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)
Vladimir Ryabinin	International Ocean Institute (IOI)
Pentti Mälkki	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)
Dag Daler	Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)
Georg Heiss	Reef Check Europe
Cynthia Decker	Marine Census Institute
Anne Rogers	Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)
Hugh Kirkman	East Asia Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (EAS/RCU)

Umit Unluata	ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas (SOCA)
Robert Duce	GESAMP

The presentations and available background documents are included as Annexes VIII to XX.

VIII. PRESENTATION OF THE OUTCOME OF GESAMP EVALUATION AND RELEVANCE TO GC DECISION 21/13

41. René Coenen (GESAMP) informed the meeting about the recently completed independent and in-depth evaluation of GESAMP, which had been commissioned by its sponsoring agencies. The evaluators had recommended that GESAMP should be continued, provided major changes were made to GESAMP's structure, operational procedures and products, a conclusion the sponsoring organizations were willing to endorse in their initial response to the evaluation report.

42. The meeting noted that the sponsoring agencies were planning to formulate their conclusions about the evaluation and the future set-up of GESAMP at their meeting planned for February 2002. Government representatives recommended that they be involved in the final decision in this regard and that there be consultation between the two processes. A presentation outlining this process is provided as Annex XXI.

IX. DEVELOPMENT OF WORKING GROUPS

43. The Chairman requested that participants should divide into three working groups to discuss, and report back during the meeting on the following issues:

- Working Group 1: A comparison of current assessment activities
- Working Group 2: A review of the suggested scoping questions presented in chapter 4 of the UNEP background document (4/12)
- Working Group 3: Guidance on the contents and structure of the meeting report, and possible future development of the Feasibility Study.

The list of issues investigated by each Working Group and the accompanying reports are provided as Annexes XXII to XXIV of this document.

X. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

44. The Chairman of Working Group 1 presented a revised version of a matrix structure, developed during the meeting, for completion by participants, to provide a preliminary documentation of organisational assessment activities. Participants had requested edits to an initial matrix format presented at an earlier stage of the meeting to include the following aspects: further clarification of the term biodiversity; the inclusion of physical and geophysical data sources; the inclusion of water quality data sources; improved emphasis on the methodologies used.

45. The information provided by participants was compiled into two matrixes allowing an initial comparison of the assessment activities of individual organisations. The results of this comparative exercise, including the two matrixes (presented as table 1 and table 2) are provided as Annex XXV of this document.

XI. NEEDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR AN ASSESSMENT PROCESS

46. The Chairman invited meeting representatives from government agencies and intergovernmental organizations to outline their needs and requirements in the formation of an assessment process for the global marine environment.

There was common agreement that a global assessment process was desirable, that policy makers should be the principal target audience, and in respect of this the assessment should address the following issues:

1. Examination of current and future changes in the state of the global marine environment: evaluate the scientific material already available and the ability of this information to determine the current state of the marine environment

2. Determine the global impacts of changes in the marine environment: Provide an indication as to why policy makers should be concerned about changes in the state of the marine environment, especially with regards to impacts on socio-economic systems (especially human health).

3. Provide advice on actions required to mitigate the impacts of environmental change: Including suggestions for policy recommendations that could be developed to lessen impacts; possible remedial action; indication of opportunities for co-coordinated policy response at the international, regional and national levels.

Representatives identified the following main specifications for a global assessment process:

47. **The assessment should be focussed upon a comprehensive, broad marine ecosystem approach**. Equal consideration should be made for living marine organisms, their physical surroundings, and the natural cycles that sustain them. The assessment will establish methodologies that demonstrate this integration, and will recognise that humans are an integral part of the global marine ecosystem. It is important that the global assessment should not solely concentrate on fisheries and/or biological resources, but should also include an evaluation of changes in the geophysical and chemical features of the oceans, and indicate the impact these changes would have on the Earth's ecosystems and functions

48. **The assessment will have a policy driven focus**. The principal target audience will be governmental policy makers, and as such, emphasis will be placed on providing high quality scientific advice on the state of the marine environment in formats that are both easily accessible and can be readily utilised by this group. The assessment will recognise that issues such as POPs can only be addressed through co-coordinated policy action at the international level; therefore any outputs of the assessment should be available to the global community. It was recommended that

policy directed documents derived from the assessment should be authored by government writers, in collaboration with contributing scientists, so as to maintain full credibility for the actions of policy-makers.

49. **The assessment will be based on the best available scientific information.** While many of the UN agencies and other organisations represented at the meeting were recognised as world leaders in marine scientific expertise, it was agreed that any global assessment should encourage the use of the considerable scientific knowledge available within related intergovernmental organisations, relevant government departments, marine focussed NGO's, and recognised independent experts. To regulate the quality of scientific input into the assessment from this broad collection of sources it will be necessary to develop 'screening' process for contributors to ensure that scientific integrity is maintained. The nature of this screening process is to be formulised at subsequent meetings. The management of fishery resources was considered to already be sufficiently monitored by organizations such as the FAO and ICES, and it was recommended that they would be best placed to assess the status and trends of marine fisheries.

50. **The assessment should demonstrate full transparency throughout the process.** Transparency will promote confidence building and engender compliance; it will provide reassurance to both partner organisations and national governments. Full transparency should be encouraged in demonstrating the scientific approach and input used; in the construction and management of the mechanism used to co-ordinate the assessment (including funding issues); in the contributions to the assessment by UN agencies and collaborating organisations; and in any policy recommendations generated by the assessment process. Contributing organisations should advise partners in the assessment of any consultations made; organisations with an interest in the development of the process should be given the opportunity to make their views known; the outcome of all consultations/meetings should be reported back to all participants for their consideration; and wherever possible attempts should be made to identify gaps in transparency coverage.

51. **The assessment should demonstrate an effective, inclusive, broad stakeholder approach.** Participants recognised that in the past there had been an unwillingness to co-operate between UN agencies and other organizations. It was recognized that collaboration between and within organisations was often difficult, and that any attempt to increase coordination and coherence among different institutes by the assessment process would be appreciated; the representative of AMAP presented an example of these difficulties.

52. The presentations of current assessment programmes that had indicated a substantial overlap in evaluation efforts. It was strongly emphasised that duplication of efforts, unhealthy competition, and information gaps should be identified and resolved as part of the assessment process to allow guidance towards the best utilisation of the limited funding resources available, and for future funding strategies. It was recommended that as part of the broad stakeholder approach the assessment process should encourage participation of other agencies, for example ECOSOC, when examining aspects such as the impact of increasing global population on the marine environment.

53. Participants recognised that an inclusive approach to the assessment was especially relevant to mostly enclosed marine areas such as the Baltic and Black Seas; that collaboration with all stakeholders in these areas was especially important to direct effective remedial action from limited resources.

54. **The assessment should build upon an existing framework**. During the meeting it was suggested that the assessment process might require the initiation of a new international agreement on the marine environment. There was strong agreement amongst participants that a new mechanism should not be initiated, that improved co-ordination within the UN system and other organisations was required, and that the assessment process should be built around an existing programme. Country representatives expressed that any proposals for new a mechanism would not receive support by their governments. There was support by a number of participants for the mechanism to be based upon a development of the activities of GESAMP

55. **The assessment should be sustainable**. Participants were reminded of the need to consider the assessment process as a sustained activity, especially with regard to developing specifications and infrastructure for the scientific community. It was emphasised that commitment by governments should already be sought during the design stage of an assessment. Participants were reminded that, in general, government ministries had fixed budgets available and as such would have difficulties in committing funding towards a long-term assessment process. The meeting also recognised the potential difficulties in locating funding resources for contributing university-based scientists.

XII. SCOPE OF A GLOBAL ASSESSMENT ON THE STATE OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT

56. The Chairman of Working Group 2 presented summary findings in response to the suggested scoping questions for the development of a global marine assessment process, as presented in chapter 4 of the UNEP background document (4/12). The full results of the Working Group are presented in Annex XXIII.

57. There was a strong agreement that **the target audience for the assessment should primarily be public sector policy makers**. To reach this audience most effectively participants also strongly agreed with the suggestion presented in the UNEP background document of producing reports from the assessment in a 'two-tier' format: one report (first-tier) should be written as a scientific/technical report to address the needs of the scientific community; the second report (second-tier) should cover the same information but written in a language and style adapted to the needs of policy makers. The use of the assessment is discussed below under 'the goal of the global assessment on the state of the marine environment'.

58. It was agreed that **the assessment should not be a static process**, but should include the development of ongoing trend and scenario methods to demonstrate the implications for socio-economic systems of changes in the global marine environment. The assessment will not discuss the "acceptability" of these changes to socio-economic systems.

59. **The assessment should work within a geographical area defined as 'marine and coastal ecosystems and associated estuaries'**. The assessment will examine inputs to this defined area, noting that impacts will also come from without the area (eg. watersheds and atmospheric deposition of pollutants).

60. **The assessment should be based on regional and sub-regional ecosystem assessments, grouped at the global level**. Collation of material at the global level may: provide guidance to increase opportunities for the production of comparable reports; identify and address shared and common problems; consider common methodologies; facilitate some regional and sub-regional assessments and provide for comparison of similar ecosystems (eg. upwelling).

61. **The assessment should analyse social and economic aspects being influenced by changes in the marine environment, but should not examine those aspects influencing changes**. While there was not full agreement on this issue by participants, a detailed review of socio-economic factors influencing changes in the marine environment was largely considered to be beyond the scope of the assessment process.

62. It was agreed that **the assessment should provide an analysis of the impacts of changes in the marine environment on ecosystem goods and services**. The assessment will analyse the impact of land based activities (including tourism) and fisheries on the quality and uses of the marine environment and its ecosystems.

63. **The assessment should adopt an ecosystem approach to the analysis of marine resources such as fisheries and minerals**. It should not duplicate analytical work undertaken by recognised bodies, such as the FAO, and will identify and resolve potential overlaps in effort during its development.

64. Where possible **the assessment should identify, but not analyse, risks to human health**; moreover **the assessment should analyse other human uses of the environment** (eg. those related to shipping).

65. It was agreed that to identify appropriate material from all available data sources **the assessment process should develop a formalised data quality control component**.

66. Whilst the assessments primary audience has been identified as policy-makers (as detailed above), it must be recognised that **the assessment should be both a science-orientated and policy-orientated process**.

67. In relation to the issue of periodicity of assessments it was agreed that further experience was needed in this matter to before a recommendation could be made. The issue of periodicity should therefore be revisited at a later stage in the development of the process.

68. Within the context of **governmental involvement in the assessment process** it is anticipated that governments will provide nominated experts to participate in scientific assessment procedures. Participants agreed on the need to include experts from intergovernmental organisations, such UN bodies, and to initiate a

supplementary process to ensure that all areas of expertise are included. It was further agreed that the assessment process should include a role for governments in question formulation and in reviewing scientific input.

69. It was agreed that, where possible, **regional and sub-regional organisations and agreements** should contribute to the global assessment process by providing appraisals, standardised through guidelines, of all aspects of the marine environment within their specified area of operation.

70. While the assessment would benefit from being built on an **existing assessment programmes**, it was not considered reasonable to expect that the regional and national assessments will be prepared by government-nominated experts and endorsed by the relevant governments or group of governments.

71. The involvement of scientific communities or non-governmental organisations is discussed below under the goal of the global assessment on the state of the marine environment. At this early stage of assessing the feasibility of developing an assessment process it was difficult to provide any suggestions as to the potential costs of the assessment process and any technical constraints.

XIII. THE GOAL OF THE GLOBAL ASSESSMENT ON THE STATE OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT.

72. Mr Thomas Laughlin (NOAA) outlined a draft goal developed by a small contact group. He explained that the draft goal had been based on (and expanded upon), an initial combination of the two formulations presented on page 21 of the UNEP background document (Annex VI). Key elements in the formulation of the draft included:

a) adoption of the phrase '*regular and timely*' assessments, instead of '*continuous*' assessments.
b) use of the word '*ecosystems*' rather than '*environment*' to better reflect inter-relatedness.
c) inclusion of '*all aspects*' of the marine ecosystems.
d) that the assessment should assist policy makers.
e) that the assessment should address socio-economic implications, through the use of trends/scenarios.
f) publication of the assessment in both scientific and 'policy friendly' formats.
g) the inclusion, but not repetition/duplication of, regional organization assessments.
h) the inclusion of non-governmental organizations in the process

73 The draft did not elaborate on means of public participation, the scope of the study, and assessment methodologies. All of which were to be discussed at a later stage of the meeting.

Discussion

74 Participants were invited to comment on the draft goal and suggest possible edits. Many of the comments received relate directly to the needs and requirements of

the assessment set out above under the needs and specifications for an assessment process.

75. Participants agreed that the goal must indicate policy-makers, such as governments and international conventions, as these would be the main target audience for the assessment. It was strongly reiterated that any assessments should be produced in two formats: technical scientific reports, and summary documents for policy makers. It was recommended that the goal should demonstrate the need for transparency in all aspects of the assessment process.

76. A need to clarify the definition of marine ecosystems was identified; so as not to understate the importance of physical and chemical systems. It was suggested that a footnote giving a clear definition of marine ecosystems could be included in subsequent reports. Participants stated that the goal should illustrate that the process would examine both the state, and importantly, trends of all aspects of the marine environment. The potential of the assessment to relate these trends to socio-economic systems was also indicated.

77. While it was recognized that the selection mechanism for experts engaged in the assessment should be indicated, it was recommended that the selection process should not be so restrictive as to exclude the best available experts outside of governmental organizations.

78. The meeting also considered it important to demonstrate that the assessment would be based on the best available science to make it of greater value to the scientific community. The meeting concluded that the assessment must be made widely available to all users, especially with regard to institutions that have a significant impact on marine systems.

79. **The following draft goal was adopted**:

'To provide on a regular and timely basis, scientific assessments of the state and trends of all aspects of marine ecosystems for use by policy makers. These assessments shall include consideration of socio-economic implications and identify scenarios so as to assist policy makers in addressing marine-related issues. The assessments should take the form of technical scientific reports, supplemented by summaries for policy makers'.

'The mechanism and process to create such assessments must be transparent and independent. The assessments will be done by experts identified by governments, relevant UN bodies and regional organizations inter alia, *who will provide their contributions on the basis of their individual expertise and with, where appropriate, advice from qualified experts and non-governmental organizations'.*

XIV. OPTIONS TO SATISY REQUIREMENTS FOR A REGULAR PROCESS

80. The following three basic options were presented in the UNEP background document for satisfying the requirements for a regular process for the assessment of the marine environment.

(a) adaptation of an existing assessment mechanism and programme to satisfy the requirements laid down in decision 21/13;
(b) establishment of a mechanism to co-ordinate the work and outputs of existing assessment mechanisms and programmes;
(c) creation of a new assessment mechanism and programme that would build on ongoing assessment programmes and mechanisms

Discussion

81. Delegates rejected option (c.) with regard to the earlier debate (on needs and specifications of governments) concluding that a new assessment mechanism should not be developed. A combination of elements from options (a) and (b), drafted earlier by the small contact group on the assessment goal was presented.

82. It was requested that the option should emphasize the need for co-operative co-ordination between organizations.

83. Participants agreed on the need for an adaptation of a single existing mechanism, rather than the use of several mechanisms, should be indicated in the option. This singular assessment mechanism should provide guidance on the possible adaptation of contributing mechanisms.

84. **The following draft option was adopted** to meet the goal of the assessment:

'*A regular assessment of marine ecosystems would require the adaptation of an existing mechanism, which would work in co-ordination and co-operation with other mechanisms, building upon their work and recognizing that they may also require adaptation'*

XV. CRITERIA TO DETERMINE THE SUITABILITY OF AN EXISTING ASSESSMENT MECHANISM OR PROGRAMME

85. Delegates were requested to identify suitable criteria needed in an existing assessment mechanism to satisfy the requirements of decision 21/13. The following programme options presented in the UNEP background paper were introduced:

(i) to "nest" the assessment within the GEO project/process;
(ii) to use an adequately reformed GESAMP;
(iii) to use GOOS, with a broadened mandate, as the general framework for the assessment; or
(iv) to set up the process as follow-up to GIWA.

86. Participants initially began by listing all of the issues of building upon an existing programme. There was concern that the exercise provided a repetition of much of the input of Working Group 2. Participants therefore identified the following four criteria as being key elements of the mechanism to be built on:

a) Cost effectiveness
b) Credibility
c) Sustainability

d) Ability to address policy issues

A full list of attributes for each of these criteria is provided as Annex XXVI of this document.

Discussion on the identified criteria

87. Participants were invited to generally discuss the mechanism o co-ordinate a global marine environment assessment. Concern was raised about the important aspect of sustaining the assessment process to allow long-term reporting on status and trends in the marine environment. It was suggested the mechanism would be vulnerable to varying commitments of individuals and organizations.

88. Participants considered it dangerous to limit the number of options available (i to iv) at the initial meeting. There was further concern that initiatives such as the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment had not been included among the suggested mechanisms. Participants were informed that the choice of mechanism to use was not limited to the options presented, that these were just initial suggestions as to possible mechanisms for co-ordinating the assessment process. It was recognized that none of the suggested, or other active, mechanisms would fit all criteria for the marine assessment process. And it was agreed that the mechanism selected might need to adapt its activities to undertake effective coordination of the marine assessment. Participants recommended that the mechanism should not be 'nested' within the GEO process, as it was believed that GEO had too broad a coverage to accommodate a specifically marine orientated global assessment. A number of the participants supported the use of a reformed GESAMP, provided with adequate funding, as best mechanism option available, largely because of its strong scientific expertise.

89. There was concern that without identifying a suitable mechanism the meeting would be unable to progress towards examining the next steps. In reply it was suggested that it was possibly premature at this stage of determining the feasibility of establishing an assessment process to examine and identify mechanisms with the necessary criteria.

90. It was suggested that an Internet forum could be established to further discuss mechanism options. However participants believed that a set (face-to-face) meeting would be more effective in resolving these issues. The participants agreed that further meetings and/or workshops were required to comprehensively identify organizations to undertake the next steps.

XVI. OBSERVED SILENCE

91. Participants observed three minutes silence as a mark of respect for the victims of the terrorism acts committed in New York, Washington DC and Pennsylvania on the 11th of September 2001.

XVII. AGREEMENT ON NEXT STEPS

92. Participants reviewed the findings of Working Group 3 into the possible future development of the Feasibility Study. Agreement was reached that the following steps should be undertaken to advance the assessment process.

Step 1. Production process of the Report on the Feasibility for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment.

a) UNEP to produce a draft report detailing the needs and recommendations for a global marine assessment process identified during the Reykjavik meeting. The current report is intended to satisfy this point.

b) The report should include the collated organizational comparative exercise initiated by Working Group 1 at the Reykjavik meeting. Organizations will receive a set deadline from UNEP to contribute to this exercise (this deadline was subsequently set at the 12th of October). The current report is intended to satisfy this point with the comparative matrix published on the Internet.

c) A draft letter for the UNEP Executive Director (Klaus Töpfer) is to be drafted inviting participation by organizations in the process.

d) A list of agencies invited to review the report will be drafted by UNEP (An initial list is attached as Annex XXVII). The list of invitees should not be restricted to UN agencies. Participants at the Reykjavik meeting will be invited to suggest other relevant organisations.

e) The final meeting report will be sent to identified organizations for comment and review.

f) Appropriate revisions and edits will be undertaken.

g) The report will be adapted and translated by the 1st of December, in time for the Ministerial Forum in December 2002.

Step 2. Potential meetings for further discussion of the Feasibility for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment.

Participants agreed that subsequent meetings were required to provide further guidance on the development of a global assessment process. The following prerequisites and actions were recommended

Meeting prerequisites:

a) Country financing must be established. UN Executive Director is to send a letter seeking willingness of countries to support the process.

b) Appropriate participants are to be identified.

c) Funding to be gained for the attendance of participants from developing countries.

d) Attending organizations should contribute their own costs.

93. Technical Workshop

A three-day technical workshop (probably during the second quarter of 2002 after the GESAMP meeting scheduled in May 2002, and depending of the availability of funds) will be planned to outline a technical blueprint for the development of the global marine assessment process.

94. Awareness/Linkage Meeting

The awareness meeting should follow, or take place during the CSD Preparatory Committee meeting in New York, between the 28th and 8th of February 2002. Objective is to raise awareness and determine linkages between the global marine assessment process and other initiatives.

XVIII. CLOSE OF MEETING

95. Magnus Johannesson conveyed his regards to participants and hoped that they had enjoyed their stay in Iceland. He felt that the meeting had made excellent progress in the development of a global marine assessment process. He congratulated participants for both their assistance in developing the goals for the process, and helping to determine the way forward.

96. Mr Johannesson asked participants to build on the organizational comparative exercise, and hoped that all attending agencies would be able to contribute to this before the meeting in Paris. He reiterated that there was a need to consider the work required before institutionalization of the process could take place. He congratulated UNEP on their handling of the meeting, which he believed had increased goodwill and understanding between agencies towards a comprehensive assessment of the state of the marine environment.

97. Tim Foresman, thanked Mr Johannesson for his kind comments, and congratulated participants on an open and constructive meeting. He continued by reminding the meeting that it was a difficult time with many challenges, and that it was time to be concerned with the whole world rather than individual agendas. He concluded that given Iceland's dependence on marine resources it had been a very appropriate venue for this initial meeting. He thanked the Icelandic government for their hospitality, and closed the meeting.

ANNEX I LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex I	List of Annexes
Annex II	Participant list
Annex III	Agenda
Annex IV*	Iceland Discussion Paper (document 3/12)
Annex V*	UNEP GC Decision 21/13 (document 2/12)
Annex VI*	UNEP Background Paper (document 4/12)
Annex VII*	Presentation by UNEP
Annex VIII*	Presentation by the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme Secretariat (AMAP)
Annex IX*	Presentation by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Annex X*	Presentation by the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) (document 6/8)
Annex XI*	Presentation by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP WCMC)
Annex XII*	Presentation by the International Ocean Institute (IOI)
Annex XIII*	Presentation by the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES)
Annex XIV*	Presentation by the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)
Annex XV*	Presentation by Reef Check Europe
Annex XVI*	Presentation by the Marine Census Institute
Annex XVII*	Presentation by the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)
Annex XVIII*	Presentation by the East Asia Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (EAS/RCU)
Annex XIX*	Presentation by the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas (SOCA)
Annex XX*	Presentation by GESAMP
Annex XXI*	Outcome of the GESAMP Evaluation and Relevance to GC Decision 21/13
Annex XXII	Report of Working Group 1
Annex XXIII	Report of Working Group 2
Annex XXIV	Report of Working Group 3
Annex XXV	Comparative analysis
Annex XXVI	Criteria to determine the suitability of an existing assessment mechanism or programme
Annex XXVII	A Draft List of Agencies Invited to Review the Report on the Feasibility Study for Establishing a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment
Annex XXVIII	List of acronyms

An asterisk (*) indicates that the annex is not supplied with this document, but is available at the following UNEP Internet site: Http://www.unep.org/marineassessment

ANNEX II. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1.	Mr. Stefan **ASMUNDSSON** Legal Adviser in International Affairs Ministry of Fisheries Skulagata 4 150 Reykjavik Iceland Tel: 354-5609670 Fax: 354-5621853 Email: stefan.asmundsson@sjr.stjr.is	ICELAND
2.	Patricio A. **BERNAL** Executive Secretary/Assistant Director-General IOC/UNESCO 1 Rue Miollis 75732 Paris Cedex 15 FRANCE Tel: 33-145-683983 Fax: 33-145-685810 Email: p.bernal@unesco.org	UNESCO
3.	Anders **BERNTELL** Director Ministry of the Environment S-10333 Stockholm Sweden Tel: 46-8-4052058 Fax: 46-8-219170 Email: anders.berntell@environment.ministry.se	SWEDEN
4.	Renate **CHRIST** Deputy Secretary of the IPCC UNEP/IPCC Ave. de la Paix 7 bis CH-1211 Geneva Switzerland Tel: 41-22-7308574 Fax: 41-22-7308025 Email: christ_r@gateway.wmo.ch	IPCC

5.	René Cornelis **COENEN** IMO Technical Secretary of GESAMP IMO 4 Albert Embankment London SE1 7SR Tel: 44-207-7357611 Fax: 44-207-5873210 Email: rcoenen@imo.org	GESAMP IMO
6.	Mr. Neil **COX** 16a Magrath Avenue Cambridge, CB4 3AH, UK Tel: 44-1223-510703 Email: neil.cox2@ntlworld.com	RAPPORTEUR (UNEP-WCMC)
7.	Dag **DALER** Acting Scientific Director UNEP/GIWA University of Kalmar S-39182 Kalmar, Sweden Tel: 46-480-447351 Fax: 46-480-447355 Email: dag.daler@giwa.net	UNEP
8.	Cynthia J. **DECKER** Director, Census of Marine Life Secretariat Census of Marine Life, Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education 1755 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036 USA Tel: 1-202-3320063 Ext: 265 Fax: 1-202-3329751 Email: cdecker@COREocean.org	CENSUS OF MARINE LIFE SECRETARIAT
9.	Els **de WIT** Senior Policy Advisor Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management P. O. Box 20906 2500 Ex The Hague, The Netherlands Tel: 31-70-3510505 Fax: 31-70-3519078 Email:e.m.dwit@hkw.rws.minvenw.nl	THE NETHERLANDS
10.	Prasantha Nimal Abeyegunawardene **DIAS** Deputy Director (Programmes) South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP) 10, Anderson Road Colombo 5 Sri Lanka Tel: 94-1-596442 Fax: 94-1-589369	SACEP

	Email: pd_sacep@eureka.lk	
11.	Robert Arthur **DUCE** Professor Depts. Of Oceanography and Atmospheric Sciences Texas A & M University College Station, Texas 77843 USA Tel: 1-979-8455756 Fax: 1-979-8628978 Email: rduce@ocean.tamu.edu	GESAMP
12.	Hon. Mrs. Siv **FRIDLEIFSDOTTIR** Minister for the Environment Vonarstraeti 4 150 Reykjavik, Iceland Tel: 354-5609600 Fax: 354-5624566 Email: siv.fridleifsdottir@umh.stjr.is	ICELAND
13.	Dr. Timothy **FORESMAN** Director Division of Early Warning and Assessment United Nations Environment Programme P. O. Box 30552, Nairobi Kenya Tel: 254-2-623231/4028 Fax: 254-2-623943 Email: Timothy.Foresman@UNEP.org	UNEP
14.	Ottar Freyr **GISHLASON** Advisor The Ministry for the Environment Vonarstraeti 4 101 Reykjavik, Iceland Tel: 354-5609600/9622 Fax: 354-5624566 Email: ottor.freyr.gislason@umh.stjr.is	ICELAND
15.	Edmund Peter **GREEN** Head of Marine and Coastal Programme UNEP-WCMC 219 Huntingdon Road Cambridge, CB3 0DL U.K. Tel: 44-1223-277314 Fax: 44-1223-277136 Email: ed.green@unep-wcmc.org	UNEP-WCMC
16.	Ms. Soffia **GUDMUNDSDOTTIR** Executive Secretary, PAME Hafnarstraeti 97 600 Akureyri, Iceland Tel: 354-4611355 Fax: 354-4623390 Email: pame@ni.is	PAME, ICELAND

17.	Dr. Sherry **HEILEMAN** Division of Early Warning and Assessment United Nations Environment Programme P. O. Box 30552, Nairobi Kenya Tel: 254-2-624311/4575 Fax: 254-2-623495 Email: Sherry.Heileman@UNEP.org	ICELAND
18.	Dr. Georg **HEISS** Co-ordinator Foundation Reef Check Foundation Wachmannstr. 23 28209 Bremen Germany Tel: 49-421-3467032; Mob: 49-175-208634 Fax: 49-421-3467033 Email: georg.heiss@reefcheck.de	REEF CHECK FOUNDATION
19.	Mr. Thorir **IBSEN** Minister-Councellor Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs Raudararstigur 25 150 Reykjavik, Iceland Tel: 354-5609900 Fax: 354-5622373 Email: thorir.ibsen@utn.stjr.is	ICELAND
20.	Helgi **JENSSON** Director of Office of Environment Protection Environmental and Food Agency of Iceland Armulila P. O. Box 8080 15-128 Reykjavik, Iceland Tel: 354-5851000 Fax: 354-585101 Email: helgi@hollver.is	ICELAND
21.	Dorothea **JOHANNESDOTTIR** Economist Ministry of Fisheries, Skulagata 4 150 Reykjavik, Iceland Tel:354-5609670 Emal: dora@hafro.is	ICELAND
22.	Magnus **JOHANNESSON** Secretary-General Ministry of the Environment Vonarstraeti 4 150 Reykjavik, Iceland Tel: 354-5609600 Fax: 354-5624566	ICELAND

	Email: Magnus.johannesson@umh.stjr.is	
23.	Hamza Abbas **KARAM** Head of Marine Pollution Section Environment Public Authority, Kuwait – EPA P. O. Box 24395, SAFAT – 13104 KUWAIT Tel: 965-5611741 Fax: 965-5653328 Hakaram@epa.org.kw	KUWAIT
24.	Hartmut **KEUNE** Director Federal Ministry for Education and Research BMBF, 425 Heinemann – Str. 2-10, D-53175 Bonn Germany Tel: 49-228-573043 Fax: 49-228-5783043 Email: Hartmut.keune@BMBF.BUND.de	GERMANY
25.	Dr. Hugh **KIRKMAN** Co-ordinator UNEP East Asian Seas Regional Coordinating Unit 9th Floor ESCAP Building, UNESCAP Rajdamnern Ave. Bangkok 12002, Thailand Tel: 66-2-2881860 Fax: 66-2-2812428 Email: kirkman.unescap@un.org	UNEP EAST ASIA
26.	Kunio **KOHATA** Leader of Coastal Environment Research Team National Institute for Enhvironmental Studies 16-2 Onogawa, Tsukaba Ibaraki 305-8506, Japan Tel: 81-298-502438 Fax: 81-298-502576 Email: Kohata@nies.go.jp	JAPAN
27.	Thomas L. **LAUGHLIN** Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary NOAA Rm. 5220 DOC, 14th Constitution NW Washing DC. 20230, U.S.A. Tel: 1-202-4825118 Fax: 1-202-4824307 Email: Tom.Laughlin@hdq.noaa.gov	USA
28.	Prof. Pentti **MÄLKKI** President International Council for Exploration of the Sea Finnish Institute of Marine Research P. O. Box 33, FIN-00931 Helsinki, Finland Tel: 358-9-61394400 Fax: 358-9-61394494	ICES

	Email: pentti.malkki@fimr.fi	
29.	Dr. Heiner **NAEVE** Senior Fishery Resources Officer Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 Rome, Italy Tel: 39-65-7056442, Fax: 39-65-7053020 Email: heiner.naeve@fao.org	FAO
30.	Øystein **NESFE** Adviser Ministry of Environment P. O. Box 8013 DEP., N-0030 Oslo, NORWAY Tel: 47-22-245812 Fax: 47-22-249560 Email: nes@md.dep.no	NORWAY
31.	Lars-Otto **REIERSEN** Executive Secretary, AMAP P.B 8100 Dep., 0032 Oslo, NORWAY Tel: 47-2-3241632 Fax: 47-2-3241631 Email: lars-otto.reiersen@amap.no	AMAP
32.	Anne H. **ROGERS** Chief, Oceans and Land Unit, Water, Natural Resources & Small Islands Branch, Division for Sustainable Development United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) Room DC 2-2016, UN – New York 10017 USA **Tel: 1-212-9632476** Fax: 1-212-9631795 Email: rogersa@un.org; Web; www.un.org/esa/sustdev/	CSD
33.	Vladimir **RYABININ** Executive Director International Ocean Institute P. O. Box 3- Gzira, GZR, MALTA Tel: 356-346528 Fax: 356-346502 Email: ioimal@kemmunet.net.mt	IOI
34.	Oksana Grygorivna **TARASOVA** Permanent Secretary Convention on Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution, Bucharest Conventions Pollution Assessment and Maintenance Office Polmabahee Sarayi 11 Hareket Kosku 80680 Besiktas, Istanbul, TURKEY Tel: 90-212-2279927-9 Fax: 90-212-2279933	Black Sea RCU

	Email: otarasova@blacksea-environment.org	
35.	Halldor **THORGEIRSSON** Director The Ministry for the Environment Vonarstraeti 4 101 Reykjavik Iceland Tel: 354-5609600/9622 Fax: 354-5624566 Email: halldor.thorgeirsson@umh.stjr.is	ICELAND
36.	Mr. Chris **TOMPKINS** Ministry of Environment, Department for Environment Marscham Street, London SW1 (3EB U.K Tel: 44-207-9445306 Fax: 44-207-2768861 Email: Chris.Tompkins@defra.gsi.gov.uk	U.K.
37.	Umit **UNLUATA** Head, Ocean Sciences IOC/UNESCO 1 Rue Miollis 75732 Paris Cedex 15 FRANCE Tel: 33-145-684008 Fax: 33-145-685812 Email: u.uluata@unesco.org	IOC/UNESCO, GOOS, SOCA

ANNEX III DRAFT ANNOTATED AGENDA

12 September 2001

11:00 – 11:15 Welcome and Opening. The Honourable Minister Mrs. Siv Fridleifsdottir, Iceland Ministry for the Environment, will welcome participants and open the meeting.

11:15 – 11:30 Opening remarks. Dr. Tim Foresman, UNEP, will make opening remarks and inform participants of the objectives and expectations of the meeting.

11:30 – 11:45 Adoption of agenda – Dr. Timothy Foresman, UNEP, Chairperson, will invite the Meeting to adopt the agenda for this meeting, as annotated below. The Chairperson will introduce some housekeeping issues pertaining to the conduct of this meeting.

11:45 – 12:10 Presentation of Iceland discussion paper – Dr. Magnus Johannessen, Secretary General, Min. for the Environment, Iceland. An overview of Iceland discussion paper on which GC decision 21/13 is based, will be presented. Copies of the paper will be distributed at this meeting.

12:10 – 12:40 Presentation of GC decision 21/13 – Dr. Timothy Foresman. GC decision 21/13 on the feasibility of establishing a regular process for assessment of the state of the marine environment, will be presented. Copies of the text of this decision will be distributed at this meeting as well as the background paper that has been prepared by UNEP.

12:40 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 16:00 Presentations by Organisations. Each organisation will give a 10-minute presentation on its activities related to assessment of the marine environment (AMAP, CSD, FAO, GESAMP, IMO, IOI, IPCC, IOC/UNESCO/SOCA, NOAA, Ocean Initiative, Regional Seas?, Country Reps?).

16:00 – 16:30 Outcome of GESAMP evaluation and relevance to GC decision 21/13 – Dr. Rene Coenen, IMO Technical Secretary of GESAMP. The Meeting will be informed of major recommendations coming out of the recently-conducted GESAMP evaluation.

16:30 – 17:30 Open discussion on existing programmes. Participants will be invited to engage in discussion of the work of existing marine assessment programmes with a view to identifying and quantifying needs, and identifying gaps and concerns. The discussion will focus on a comparative analysis of existing programmes.

17:30 Reception

13 September 2001

9:00 – 9:30 Continuation of previous item

9:30 – 11:00 Prioritisation of needs and specifications. Identified needs will be prioritised based on previous discussions. This will allow the scope of the new programme to be determined in this session.

11:00 – 11:15 Coffee break

11:15 – 12:30 Feasibility and mechanisms of addressing needs. The Meeting will explore various options for mechanisms for addressing identified needs, and determine if another process, other than those already existing, is required. Possible scenarios for the establishment of a regular programme for assessment of the state of the marine environment, including institutional framework, financial mechanism, etc., will be explored.

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 Consensus on the need for a regular programme to assess the marine environment. At this time the Meeting will be invited to consider whether there is a need for a regular programme for assessment of the state of the marine environment, and to propose options for conduct of the feasibility exercise.

15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break

15:45 – 17:00 Continuation of previous item

<u>14 September 2001</u>

9:00 – 11:00 Recommendations for feasibility study The Meeting will be invited to make recommendations for the feasibility exercise. Approval will be sought from the Meeting on the needs, organisations and their respective roles in the feasibility study.

11:00 – 11:15 Coffee break

11:15 – 12:30 Continuation of previous item

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 Agreement on next steps. Meeting will be invited to confirm their agreement on the next steps to be taken, as well as the role of each organisation in follow-up activities.

15:30 – 16:00 Concluding remarks and closing of the meeting - Dr. Timothy Foresman

ANNEX XXII REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 1. A COMPARISON OF CURRENT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: BASE MATRIX

USERS		OUTPUTS OF ASSESSMENTS	
Governments		Scientific reports	
Science		Scientific summary	
Independent		Policy report	
Commercial-corporate		Education material	
Public information		Public awareness	
Educational			
Governance			
Intergovernmental orgs.			
DATA PROVIDERS-SOURCE		DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE	
Gov't agencies		Peer-review	
Academia		Non-peer review	
Commercial (Incl. industries)		Long term	
NGOs		Short term	
Individuals		Standard	
Intergovernmental Orgs.		Non-standard	
		Others	
DATA TYPES			
Socio-economic		FUNDING	
Living marine resources		Source	
Pollution		Short term	
Habitat		Long term	
Pathogens			
Biodiversity		PARTNERSHIPS (6 MOST RELEVANT)	
Geographical data			
Carbon cycles			
Alien species			
Human health			
Physical data			
Ecosystem structure			
Physical-geographical			
Non-living resources			

Nutrients		GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE	
Water quality		National	
		Global	
METHODS		Regional	
Ecosystem approach		Ecosystem	
Future state scenarios		Site specific	
Biogeographical approach			
Pressure-state-response			
Indicators use			
Causal chain analysis			

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 1. A COMPARISON OF CURRENT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: GUIDELINES

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT	In your agency Reply **yes** or **no**		
USERS		**OUTPUTS OF ASSESSMENTS**	
Governments		Scientific reports	Priority 1
Science		Scientific summary	
Independent	Individuals who need these data	Policy report	Priority 1
Commercial-corporate	Includes consultants and industry	Education material	
Public information		Public awareness	
Educational			
Governance	To assist with the governance of the nation		
Intergovernment orgs.	Includes UN agencies		
DATA PROVIDERS-SOURCE		**DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE**	This section is covered by adequate metadata
Gov't agencies		Peer-review	
Academia		Non-peer review	
Commercial (Incl. industries)	Consultants, fishing industry etc	Long term	Periodicity
NGOs		Short term	Periodicity
Individuals		Standards	Were standard methods used? Which standards?
Intergovernmental Orgs.	Includes UN agencies	Non-standard	
		Others	Other metadata descriptions
DATA TYPES			
Socio-economic		**FUNDING**	
Living marine resources	Fisheries, seaweed,	Source	What is the source of your funding?
Pollution	POPs, sediment, heavy metals, hydrocarbons	Short term	Is it short or
Habitat	Ecosystems,	Long term	Long-term?
Pathogens	Bacteria, viruses that effect humans or marine animals or plants		

Biodiversity		**PARTNERSHIPS (6 most relevant)**	
Geographical data	Topography, geological		
Carbon cycles	Refers to CO_2 and climate change		
Alien species	Introduction in eg ballast water		
Human health	Toxic algal blooms, hazadardous chemicals		
Physical data	Salinity, temp, depth,		
Ecosystem structure	Composition by species diversity and abundance		
Non-living resources	Hydrocarbons, mined minerals		
Nutrients	Causing eutrophication and coming from agriculture or wastewater sources	**GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE**	
Water quality	Clarity, phytoplankton, chemicals, salinity,	National	
		Global	
METHODS	Many of these are involved with modelling	Regional	
Ecosystem approach		Ecosystem	Are the data collected on an ecosystem wide basis?
Future state scenarios	Predictive models	Site specific	Are the data site specific?
Biogeographical approach	Area divided into bioregions		
Pressure-state-response	Often used in State of Environment reporting		
Indicators use	Biological or physical measures of change revealed by a single or a few indicator		
Causal chain analysis	Cause of change may not be obvious cause		

ANNEX XXIII REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2. A SUMMARY REVIEW OF THE SUGGESTED SCOPING QUESTIONS PRESENTED IN CHAPTER 4 OF THE UNEP BACKGROUND DOCUMENT (4/12).

Introductory comment

This document provides guidelines for the scope of a Regular Process for the Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment. Please refer to section 4.1 of the UNEP background document (4/12) for details of the issues upon which this document is based.

Users and use of the assessment and central goal or purpose for establishing the assessment process

- Users: Primarily public sector policy makers at the appropriate level and also constructed to be useful to the private sector.
- Use: See discussion of goals.

Scope of the assessment

- Not static, should include trends and scenarios; should provide and assessment of implications but not "acceptability" (So, the report would only mention implications, not acceptability, as the report will not be in the form of amending the UNEP document.)
- Should be a bounded geographical area defined as marine and coastal ecosystems and associated estuaries. We should be looking at inputs to this defined area, noting that though the impacted area is so defined, impacts will come from without – e.g. watersheds and atmospheric deposition of pollutants.
- Assessment should be based on regional and subregional ecosystem assessments, grouped at the global level. Global level could: provide guidance to increase opportunities for comparable reports; identify and address shared and common problems; consider common methodologies; facilitate some regional and subregional assessments and provide for comparison of similar (e.g. upwelling) ecosystems.
- The assessment will: analyze social and economic aspects being influenced but not those influencing; analyze impacts on ecosystem goods and services (reformulation); take language on land based activities and fish as in existing text; resource management, examined by the ecosystem approach; will not duplicate work undertaken by the FAO; will identify possible overlap in efforts as an item to watch as process moves forward.
- Identify risks to human health (it will not analyze these risks)
- Analyze other human uses to end, as in text.
- Within the context of the UNEP background document there is a need to remove the term '"legitimate" sources of information', and include a general point that the assessment process much have a data quality control component.
- The assessment should be both a science-orientated and policy-orientated process

Nature of the regular process for the assessment

- Disagreement with the need to identify periodicity now. Need further experience on this matter to proceed.

Level of modalities of government involvement

- Government nominations of experts to undertake scientific assessment. Also a need to include experts from UN organizations and initiate a supplementary process to assure all expertise included.
- There is a need to include a role for Governments in question formulation and reviewing scientific input.

Involvement of regional agreements

- Regional and Sub-regional organizations and agreements should, where possible, undertake their ecosystem assessments (see points on Scope above).
- Agreement that guidelines could be produced for regional assessments.

Building the assessment process on ongoing assessment programmes

- Disagreement with footnote 61. Especially with regard to the term '*endorsed*'.

Involvement of scientific communities or the non-governmental organizations

- This will be included as part of the overall goal for the assessment.

Costs of the assessment process

- No comment

Technical constraints

- No comment

ANNEX XXIV REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 3: GUIDANCE ON THE CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE OF THE MEETING REPORT, AND POSSIBLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY.

Summarisation

I We wish to prepare a report from this meeting to reflect broad perspective and agreement that:

- Regular assessment is necessary
- An 'assessment process' is feasible… but more work necessary to define specifics of the feasibility.
- We need to define how to develop on "assessment process"
- We draft a report.

II Process required to proceed

A. Submit the report to Klaus Töpfer

B. Recommend that Klaus Töpfer send a letter to appropriate Agencies:
- Inviting their participation in the feasibility study
- Inviting the hosting of meetings and other support

C. Convene "agreeing" partners to meeting series

REPORT OUTLINE - GC 21/13

I. Preambles
- Set the principles, what is driving the report?
- Comprehensive, broad marine ecosystem approach
- Policy driven focus
- Scientifically based
- Transparency
- Inclusiveness, broad stake holder approach
- Building on existing framework

II. Current Conditions and Comparative Analysis
- Existing known resources (Group 1)
- Identification of barriers and weaknesses
- Highlighting gaps

III. Scoping the response
- Reference to Group 2

IV. Options: The way forward

V. Next steps

SIGNIFICANT DATES AND EVENTS.

2001

- Regional Seas meeting – November 23-24th
- GPA Review – November 2001 (26-30th)
- IOC – December 3rd

2002

- GFEM – February 2002
- GESAMP – May 2002
- World Summit on Sustainable Development – September 2nd

2003

- UNEP GC 22 – February 2003

ANNEX XXV COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The following exercise collates the individual matrixes received from participants, and provides a preliminary overview of the activities of the organisations represented at the meeting. The summary generally intends to provide a brief description of the information provided by participants; suggest areas where duplication of efforts may be occurring; attempt to identify gaps in the use of information resources or monitoring activities; and suggest potential for further collaboration between participants and other organisations in the context of developing a global marine environment assessment process.

The collated matrixes are presented below as tables 1 and 2.

II. USER GROUPS

2. A broad range of user groups was identified by each individual organisation, with almost all participants identifying intergovernmental, governmental, and scientific organisations as the principal users of their data. This was largely unsurprising as many of the organisations represented were scientifically orientated agencies, or regional agreements whose general objectives include assisting decision-making activities by intergovernmental and governmental organisations.

3. There is undoubtedly some overlap in the targeting of these user groups by the represented organisations. While some collaboration does occur, there are almost certainly still considerable opportunities for improved cooperation between organisations to avoid unnecessary competition for limited funding resources, and to deliver important interdisciplinary assessments (emphasising the common ecosystem approach) on marine resources. Collaboration and cooperation should be encouraged wherever possible.

4. Several of the organisations represented produce material for public information and educational purposes. Although much of this material may be specifically targeted at local or regional user groups, there is potential for organisations to collaborate in the development of a common 'resource pool', that would allow comparison between regions and with global trends. The 'resource pool' could take the form of a general website with hypertext links to participating organisations and relevant resources.

5. Fewer organisations identified commercial-corporate companies and independent agencies/individuals as significant user groups. There is scope to investigate potential sources of sponsorship from these bodies.

III. DATA PROVIDERS-SOURCES

6. The main data providers identified by participants were intergovernmental organisations, government agencies, and scientific academia.

7. Although individual experts and NGO's hold an enormous body of pertinent data these resources are less frequently used. Further investigation is required into the opportunities for using this material and for involving its holders in sustained collaboration with organisations participating in the regular process for the global assessment of the marine environment.

8. Relatively few participants appear to use commercial data sources. This is somewhat surprising as commercial sources, and their associated industrial bodies, can provide substantial comparative data on a wide range of marine related topics such as coastal tourism growth, and the coral reef fish trade. Further consideration should be given to using these resources where appropriate.

IV. DATA TYPES

a) living resources

9. The majority of organisations represented at the meeting collect data on living marine resources (fisheries, coral etc.); socio-economic data; and/or geographical data. There is significant coordinated collaboration between national, regional, and global bodies (eg. FAO and ICES) in the collection and dissemination of information on commercial marine fisheries (such as landings and stock status). The ordered monitoring of these resources provides a valuable base for the inclusion of this information within a global marine environment assessment.

10. Whilst not as well structured as for marine fisheries, there is already considerable collaboration between organisations working with other living marine resources (such as coral reef fishes), particularly through the development of partnerships such as the International Coral Reef Initiative. However there is a need to further strengthen these relationships so as prevent duplication of efforts, and to add value to any outputs produced. It seems probable that the development of a common mechanism, such as the global marine assessment process, will further enhance coordination between these organisations.

b) socio-economic

11. Many of the organisations represented are concerned to some degree with producing data related to socio-economic issues. While there is quite a broad coverage of subjects relevant to the marine environment, most focus around the use of marine resources by coastal communities, the socio-economic aspects of commercial fisheries, and the impact of land-based activities on marine systems. Further, detailed, analyses of the socio-economic issues covered by represented organisations, beyond the scope of this present document, are required. There are significant opportunities to form collaborative links with relevant global organisations such as UNDP.

c) geographic

12. The majority of participating organisations produce geographical marine information; this information is commonly presented as spatial data in map format. The information available suggests that a broad range of subjects, including biodiversity hotspots, habitat distribution, topography, and geology are reasonably

well recorded at both regional and global level. There may be some overlap in efforts to collect material, and participants should be encouraged to collaborate wherever possible to prevent duplication occurring. A comprehensive review of the geographic datasets available from potential contributors to the global marine assessment would be of value. The review should provide detailed information on the datasets held by participants, the quality of these data, and the global coverage of the datasets.

d) habitats

13. The majority of organisations represented indicate that they gather information on marine habitats. However from the information received it is unclear as to which particular habitats are monitored and at what magnitude this monitoring is undertaken. There is a need for a further, more detailed, review of the information held and/or collected by organisations to fully identify duplication of efforts and information gaps. The review should address standardisation in the definition of habitat types; agreement on the current extent of specific habitats; reported changes in habitat area (where area can be adequately defined); and standardisation of methods by which changes in the apparent quality or integrity of habitats may be recorded.

e) pollution

14. Pollution of the marine environment is monitored by many of the participating organisations. The level of importance attached to collecting information on pollutants varies greatly between represented organisations. The Global Investigation of Pollution in the Marine Environment (GIPME) Programme co-sponsored by the IOC, UNEP, and the IMO provides a firm baseline from which to examine the impacts of pollution on the marine environment at the global scale. In addition, a number of regional organisations such as AMAP collect and publish a considerable array of information on a number of pollutants, such as POPs, heavy metals, and hydrocarbons. For other organisations, such as UNEP-WCMC, pollutants are not a priority issue; however data relating to specific pollution incidents such as oil spills are often maintained.

15. There is a general need to involve a much broader range of organisations focussed on pollution issues within a global assessment programme. These may include experts from national marine institutes, representatives from intergovernmental bodies such as the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, and representatives from commercial/industrial sources.

f) pathogens and alien species

16. Information on pathogens and alien species is gathered by a number of the organisations. Pathogens are generally represented by regional level data, although material for some specific pathogens is available at the global level (for instance as UNEP-WCMC's coral disease datasets). It appears that more comprehensive, global, information is required on the impact of pathogens, most especially those affecting human health and commercial fish stocks. FAO and UNEP-WCMC provide records of introductions of marine species at a global scale. There appears to be potential for increased coordination between regional and global bodies to fully document

introductions. There is also scope for collaboration with commercial organisations which may contribute to accidental introductions, for instance in ballast water, and with those bodies specifically concerned with alien species, such as The IUCN\SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group.

g) ecosystem structure

17. Data on ecosystem structure, (species composition, and abundance) are generally collected by organisations concerned with marine biodiversity at either a global (eg. UNEP-WCMC) or regional level (eg. EAS/RCU). While the structure of some ecosystems such as tropical coral reefs is reasonably well-documented by these organisations, a broad review of the available knowledge on the structure of less-well known ecosystems, such as deep-sea coral reefs, would be of value in the development of a global assessment process.

h) non-living resources

18. Several of the represented organisations collect data on non-living resources such as hydrocarbons and mined minerals. Within the current study it is difficult to gauge the adequacy of the global coverage for comprehensively monitoring these aspects of the marine environment. A more detailed review is required to both identify information gaps, and to investigate the very high potential for beneficial collaboration with commercial sources.

i) carbon cycles

19. Information on carbon cycles within the marine environment is collected by a number of regional (eg. AMAP) and global organisations (eg. IOC, especially through GOOS). It would be useful for a global marine assessment process to build on this information base, in order to provide comparisons of regional carbon variations and to illustrate global trends in marine carbon cycles. Full collaboration with organisations concerned with global climate change (such as the IPCC) should be encouraged.

j) physical

20. There is a generally good global coverage for monitoring physical marine systems. Information on aspects such as salinity, temperature, and depth are widely collected at both the regional and global level. It may be of value to a global assessment to identify organisations monitoring these characteristics within each geographical area.

k) human health; physical-geographical; nutrients; water quality

21. Few organisations represented are concerned with producing data on human health issues, physical-geographical data, nutrients, and water quality. Human health issues are generally focussed at a regional scale (eg. AMAP, EAS/RCU); consequently there is need for the development of a greater coverage to provide a comprehensive global view. Significant potential exists for obtaining contributions from relevant organisations such as WHO. Information on physical data, such as nutrients and water quality are well represented globally by IOC and GESAMP, and

more regionally by bodies such as AMAP and EAS/RCU. Again there is a need for a co-ordinated review to determine any information gaps within this coverage or areas requiring improved monitoring procedures.

V. METHODS

a) ecosystem approach

22. With the exception of GESAMP and IOI, all of the participating organisations use data collection and analysis methods within an ecosystem approach framework. It is probable that the development of a global assessment of the marine environment would also follow this methodology to best reflect the interconnections between biological, chemical, and physical aspects of the marine environment.

b) indicators

23. Indicators are used by most organisations to measure a range of changes in biological, physical, and chemical components of marine systems. In general, organisations often independently develop indicator methodologies to meet their own needs. There is a need to develop a system by which these various indicators can be compared and/or combined; this may provide a useful description of the previous, current and future state of the global marine environment. Full transparency in the development of indicators, and for the data behind them, will add to their credibility. Where regional bodies have developed specific indicators for their areas, it would be of value towards developing a global overview for them to collaborate and share details of these indicators with related organisations from other regions.

c) biogeographical approach

24. Most of the organisations represented operate a biogeographical approach, by which the area under investigation, global or regional, is divided into specific bioregions. There are some variations in the delimitation of biogeographic areas by assessment organisations; this is generally related to the individual organisations, or their members, particular needs. It would be of value in the development of a global assessment process to investigate the use of standardised biogeographic regions, which are acceptable to participating organisations, particularly within the context of current assessment activities. Additionally there is a need to review the biogeographical methods used by organisations, particularly regionally based, not represented at the Reykjavik meeting.

d) future state scenarios

25. The use of future state scenarios was identified as a method frequently used by participants. The information provided suggests a reasonably wide usage, from global to regional level, and between scientific disciplines. This generally reflects the more widespread use of scenario methods in environmental assessment activities over recent years. Scenario methodology commonly requires a holistic approach, considering all available environmental and socio-economic parameters, to provide accurate estimates of future events. It would appear that this methodology might be beneficial in the development of a collaborative global marine assessment process;

this method is already in use by similar assessment processes such as GEO. One of the benefits of scenario development is that a narrative may be constructed which outlines predicted changes and is readily available to a wide audience, including policy-makers.

e) causal-chain analysis; pressure, state, response

26. Few organisations represented in Reykjavik operate either causal chain analysis or pressure-state-response methods. There is a need to investigate the wider application of these methods by participating organisations. For instance, an increased use of causal chain analysis methods may assist a global assessment by linking and identifying specific socio-economic factors to the health of the marine environment. The use of pressure-state-response methods would assist a global assessment in suggesting remedial actions for implementation by policy-makers.

VI. OUTPUTS OF ASSESSMENTS

27. The majority of organisations produce a broad range of outputs from their assessment activities. Nearly all produce both scientific reports and summaries and it seems probable that a number of these reports will be targeted at the same, or at a very similar, audience. While a number of organisations already collaborate closely in their work (eg AMAP and ICES), there is a general need to build more open and constructive relationships between institutions. With improved collaborative links in place there is a considerable potential to prevent duplication of efforts, and to increase the value of scientific outputs for governments and other target audiences.

28. The matrix indicates that many of the participating organisations produce educative or public awareness material. This information is generally focussed at user groups in the scale in which the organisation operates, regional or global. As mentioned, above under the heading 'User Groups', there is some potential for co-ordinating, and comparing, this information in a single resource base.

VII. DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE

29. Most of the organisations represented have a long term, peer-review process in position for data-quality assurance. In general, standardised internal methods are used to review data. Several of the organisations operate a non-peer review process though which data are examined by an independent scientific source. There is a need to establish a formalised data review course as part of a global marine assessment process.

VIII. FUNDING

30. A general guide to funding sources for represented organisations is presented in table 2.The majority of organisations receive long-term funding from member states/parties, governments and international agencies (such as UNEP). While strategic funding mechanisms have been developed by donor agencies, it seems probable that there will be some competition between organisations for these funding resources. Increased cooperation and collaboration between organisations would allow better use of limited funds.

31. Several organisations depend partly on private sources for their income. The general uncertainty of long-term support from these resources suggests that methods to ensure their sustained contribution to a global assessment process, possibly through a specific funding mechanism, should be investigated.

IX. PARTNERSHIPS

32. A broad range of partnerships has been developed by represented organisations. Key partners are presented in table 2. With the inclusion of further regional bodies in the global assessment process, such as all UNEP Regional Sea Units, a more globally representative collection of potential partners is expected to develop.

X. GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

33. The matrix indicates that geographic coverage depends largely on the scale at which the represented organisations operate. Many of the organisations attending the Reykjavik meeting provide a global coverage within their assessment activities; examples include FAO, IOC and UNEP-WCMC. Others produce information more specifically focussed at the regional level (eg. ICES, AMAP, EAS/RCU). In general the geographic coverage demonstrated may provide a firm base for developing a global marine assessment process. There is a need to encourage the involvement of additional expert regional bodies, for those areas not represented at the Reykjavik meeting, within a global marine assessment process. This may be developed through the UNEP Regional Seas Programme. It seems likely that there is some overlap in assessment activities between global and regional bodies. Where possible, globally orientated organisations should be encouraged to work closely with the relevant regional bodies.

XI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

34. The above review represents an initial documentation and comparison of the assessment activities for a number of organisations concerned with the marine environment. The material provided by participants largely followed the useful guidelines developed by Working Group 1 during the Reykjavik meeting. However these guidelines did not indicate a need for participants to prioritise organisational activities when completing the matrix, and without this qualitative material, the analysis made of the available data coverage for developing a global assessment process is relatively subjective.

35. From the material submitted it appears that both overlap in efforts and unnecessary competition occurs in the areas of data collection and user groups' targeted. There is a general need for improved collaboration between organisations to effectively use the limited funding resources available. It is anticipated that the further development of a highly participatory global assessment process will contribute to strengthening collaborative links between organisations.

36. With regards to the data sources currently used by participants, few appear to make substantial use of the large quantity of pertinent available from commercial

organisations and NGO's. While there is an evident need for caution when using these data, it would be useful for a participatory global process to investigate the suitability of incorporating material from reliable commercial bodies NGO's.

37. From the information received it is difficult to gauge the true global data coverage for the marine environment. There is a need to further develop the comparative exercise during the initial stages of the assessment process to include information from national, regional, and international bodies and organisations, which may provide a better indication of data gaps. Also, as mentioned above, there is a need to distinguish the priority activities for organisations.

Table 1. Comparative matrix of activities for organisations represented at the Reykjavik meeting

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
USERS													
Governments	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y
Science	Y	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y
Independent	Y		N	Y/N	Y		?	Y (2)	Y	Y (2)	Y		Y
Commercial-corporate	Y		Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y (2)		Y (2)	Y		
Public information	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y (2)	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y	Y
Educational	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y (1)	Y (2)	Y	Y (3)	Y		Y
Governance	?	Y (2)	Y	Y				Y (2)	Y	?	Y	Y	Y

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
Intergovernmental orgs.	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y	Y
DATA PROVIDERS-SOURCE													
Gov't agencies	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y/N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y	Y
Academia	Y		Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y
Commercial (Incl. industries)	Y		N	Y/N	Y	Y		Y		Y (2)	Y		
NGOs	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y (3)	Y	Y	Y
Individuals	Y		N	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Intergovernmental Orgs.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y	Y

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
DATA TYPES													
Socio-economic	Y (ACIA)	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Living marine resources	Y	Y (1)	Y (coral)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Pollution	Y		Y (basin)	Y	Y (Oil)	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Habitat	Y		N	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pathogens	Y		N	Y	Y			N	Y	Y	Y		Y
Biodiversity	Y		Y (limited)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Geographical data	Y		Y (bathymetry)	Y/N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
Carbon cycles	Y (ACIA)		Y	N				N	Y	Y	Y		Y
Alien species	Y (ACIA)	Y	Y	Y/N	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Human health	Y		Y	Y				N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Physical data	Y		Y	N				N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ecosystem structure	Y		N	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Physical-geographical	Y				Y			N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Non-living resources	Y		N	Y				N	Y	Y	Y		Y
Nutrients	N		Y	N				N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
Water quality	Y		N	Y		Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
METHODS													
Ecosystem approach	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Future state scenarios	Y	Y (2)	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y		Y	Y
Biogeographical approach	Y		Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Pressure-state-response	Y		Y	N				N	Y	Y			Y
Indicators use	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Maybe	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Causal chain analysis	Y		Y	Y				N	Y	Y		Y	Y
OUTPUTS OF ASSESSMENTS													

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
Scientific reports	Y (1)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Scientific summary	Y (1)		Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Policy report	Y (1)	Y	Y	Y/N		Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Education material	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Public awareness	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Partly	Y	Y	Y
DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE													
Peer-review	Y	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Non-peer review	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
Long term	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Short term	Y		Y	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Standard	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
Non-standard	Y			Y						?			
Others			Meta-data				Internal						
GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE													
National	Y			Y					Y			Y	Y
Global	N	Y		Y/N	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
Regional	Y (All area north of 60 N)			Y		Y (Atlantic North of 35°N)			Y	Y		Y	Y
Ecosystem	Y			N			Y		Y	Y	Some	Y	Y
Site specific	Y			Y					Y		As examples		Y

Key: Y = Yes (number in parenthesis indicates degree of importance, 1 being most important); N = No. [1] Matrix in final format not received for ICES, information presented for this organisation is largely based on material submitted during the Reykjavik meeting.

Table 2. Funding sources and major partnerships for organisations represented at the Reykjavik meeting

	AMAP & ACIA	FAO	IOC[1]	IOI	UNEP-WCMC	ICES[1]	Reef Check	Marine Census Institute	EAS/RCU	IPCC	GESAMP	GIWA	South Asian Seas
FUNDING													
Source	Governments, institutions, NGO's.	Governments	Governments, trust fund	Fund, grants	Contribution from UNEP of 10% of costs. Remainder from individual project funds	80% from member countries	Private, project based, members donations	Wide variety of sources. Private, public, intergovernmental, national to local depending on nature of project.	GEF, donor countries, funding agencies	Core support from UNEP and WMO and technical support from WG chairmen, governments, other funding voluntary contributions	Interagency	50% GEF, other from government departments.	UNEP, Donor Countries, Funding Agencies
Short term	Yes, mostly		Biannual, mid-term	N/Y	Yes for specific projects	Y	Y	10 year funding lifetime for the census.	GEF, donor countries, funding agencies			Y (GIWA is a four year programme)	UNEP, Donor Countries, Funding Agencies
Long term	Yes, some	Y		Y	Y	Y		Ocean Biogeographical Information System	UNEP Environment Fund, East Asian Seas Trust Fund	Y			South Asian Seas Trust Fund
PARTNERSHIPS (6 MOST RELEVANT)													
	UNEP	Regional fishery bodies and agreements	IGOS	Host universities	UNEP	FAO	ICRI	Broad mix of institutions and scientists (academic, government, industry/commercial, private foundations)	Network of Aquaculture Centres Asia and Pacific (NACA)	UNFCCC	ACOPS	UNEP	UNEP
	UN-ECE		JCOMM	OSRF Foundation	WCPA Marine	IOC	GCRMN		Wetlands International	UNEP	Regional Seas	GEF	Global Plan of Action for Land based activities

	IAEA		All UN Agencies	Local communities	Marine Aquarium Council, and commercial businesses	AMAP	UNEP		START of Southeast Asia	WMO		NOAA	IMO
	ICES		WCRP	Gvt of Malta	Oil companies, and IPIECA	OSPAR	Regional Seas		South East Asia Policy and Law (SEAPOL)			The Finnish Dept. for Int. Development Co-operation.	NORAD
	WMO		IGBP	UN Seabed Authority	ICRAN	GEF			Reg. Office Asia and Pacific UNEP			Sida (Sweden)	CORDIO
	OSPARCOM		IHDP	TRAINSEA Coast	NASA	GIWA			Global Plan of Action for land-based activities			World Bank Group	ICRI/DFID

ANNEX XXVI CRITERIA TO DETERMINE THE SUITABILITY OF AN EXISTING ASSESSMENT MECHANISM OR PROGRAMME

Outline of key criteria:

Cost effectiveness

- The mechanism should demonstrate value for money provided by governments
- There should be minimum redundancy of effort.
- The mechanism processes should be fully budgeted, including, where possible, an assessment of resources used outside of the conventional budgeting structures.
- The mechanism should be financially feasible.
- A return on financial investment should be indicated.
- The mechanism should show financial reality, be affordable.

Credibility

- The mechanism must show complete transparency.
- The ability to undertake a comprehensive assessment must be shown.
- It is highly important that the mechanism is scientifically sound, especially in regard to defining uncertainties and long-term trends.
- The mechanism must be objective, and not captive of a single school of thought or agency.
- It should demonstrate inclusiveness for all credible scientific data.
- The mechanism should be inter-disciplinary.

Sustainability

- The mechanism must receive long-term support, gaining institutional commitment by the use of Memorandums of Understanding.
- Multi-institutional support by governments, NGO's etc should be encouraged to increase the potential for long-term commitment.
- The mechanism must receive broad support.
- A sound financial basis should be developed for the mechanism. This could build on the experiences of similar programmes.

Ability to address policy issues

- The mechanism should demonstrate flexibility for delivery.
- It must show responsiveness to current issues.
- Production of information by the mechanism should be timely.
- The mechanism processes should be transparent to policy-makers
- Government involvement in the mechanism and its process should be encouraged.
- A participatory approach must be adopted (multi-stakeholder).
- It is important that the mechanism is multidisciplinary. This approach has been of great value to the IPCC in addressing policy issues.
- The ability to address policy issues should be integrated with other criteria.

ANNEX XXVII A DRAFT LIST OF AGENCIES INVITED TO REVIEW THE REPORT ON THE FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR ESTABLISHING A REGULAR PROCESS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT.

*United Nations System

- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO
- International Maritime Organization (IMO)
- United Nations Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea (UN/DOALOS)
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), including all Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
- World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
- World Health Organization (WHO)
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
- United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)
- International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)
- International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- World Trade Organization (WTO)
- World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)

*Intergovernmental and non-governmental Organizations

- International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU)
- Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP)
- International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)
- World Conservation Union (IUCN)
- The programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)
- World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)
- International Whaling commission (IWC)
- International Ocean Institute (IOI)
- Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS)
- European Commission (EC)
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
- International Hydrographic Organization (IHO)
- Hellenic Marine Environment Protection Association (HELMEPA)
- Census of Marine Life Secretariat
- Reef Check Foundation

*Interactions and Coordination

- Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP)

- Inter-Secretariat Committee on Scientific Programmes Relating to Oceanography (ICSPRO)
- Planning and Coordinating Committee on the Marine Mammal Action Plan Agenda 21
- Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD)
- Inter-Agency Committee for Sustainable Development (IACSD)
- ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas (ACC-SOCA)

Others

- UNCLOS
- Appropriate Environmental Conventions
- International environmental observing and assessment programmes (GOOS, GIWA, WWAP, MA, IPCC, including GPA)
- New Initiative on "Worldwide marine census" – Sydney Feb. 2001
- Appropriate NGOs
- Specialized thematic centres (e.g. NOAA)
- Appropriate regional collaborating centres

Source: Review of International Programmes Relevant to the Work of the Independent World Commission on the Oceans (prepared for the Independent World Commission on the Oceans). Stjepan Keckes. 1997.

ANNEX XXVIII LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACC-SOCA	ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas
ACIA	Arctic Climate Impact Assessment
AMAP	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CSD	Commission for Sustainable Development
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEO	Global Environment Outlook
GESAMP	Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection
GIPME	Global Investigation of Pollution in the Marine Environment Programme
GOOS	Global Ocean Observing System
GPA	Global Plan of Action
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
ICRAN	International Coral Reef Action Network
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO
IOI	International Ocean Institute
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN\SSC	World Conservation Union Species Survival Commission
MEA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
NGOs	Non Governmental Organisations
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PAME	The programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
SACEP	South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

UNEP-DEWA	UNEP- Division of Early Warning and Assessment
UNEP-GIWA	UNEP-Global International Waters Assessment
UNEP-WCMC	UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WHO	World Health Organization
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.3.1

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Regional Seas and the Private Sector: The case of the Mediterranean region
Introductory note for a discussion

Regional Seas and the Private Sector: The case of the Mediterranean region

Introductory note for a discussion

by
L. Chabason, Coordinator UNEP/MAP

Background

The Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) was created in 1975 at the initiative of UNEP by the Mediterranean coastal States and the European Community as an intergovernmental initiative for regional cooperation for protecting the marine environment. The Barcelona Convention, adopted in 1976, provides its legal framework. The Convention is supported by protocols, such as those concerning dumping, cooperation in combating pollution in cases of emergency and the protection from pollution from land-based sources; this legal system concerns and may affect economic activities.

This has led to the gradual participation of economic actors in MAP at two levels: at the national level, by evaluating measures proposed by MAP and influencing national governments and at the regional level through participation in MAP meetings as lobbies seeking to make known the point of view of industry and possibly influence decisions in this forum in order to make them acceptable to industry. This was the specific case for the chemical industry when precise measures were being adopted for application of the protocols and reduction of land-based pollution from heavy metals and persistent and bio-accumulative substances.

It was gradually recognized that industry cannot be perceived solely as an economic interest that seeks to dilute as much as possible protection measures that may have a high economic cost. Industry can be a positive partner and is, in any event, an interest that cannot be overlooked when implementing effective measures for reduction of pollutants, development of alternative technologies and financing clean up.

Such perception, well known and explored by the UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, was also tested within MAP, where industry contributing to marine pollution is also a potential partner in combating such pollution. However, the direct MAP-industry dialogue has for a long time remained virtual because of the strictly intergovernmental character of MAP. This situation has recently evolved because of the expansion of MAP's mandate at the Barcelona Conference, which approved MAP II and revised the Convention and increased participation of the private economic sector and civil society in the activities of MAP, especially through the establishment of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD).

Legal developments and the private sector

The private sector is directly affected by legal and substantive developments within MAP. Under the framework of the new protocol on protection against pollution from land-based sources and activities (Land-based Protocol, signed as amended at Syracuse, Italy, in 1996), industrial activities concerned by the protocol are listed in the annex to that protocol. In order to prepare the strategic action plan (SAP) aimed at reducing land-based pollution, MAP, together with the UNEP Division for Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE), brought together interested industrial sectors and experts in Marseille in 1997 for the first time. The strategic action plan (SAP) was adopted at the 1997 meeting of the Contracting Parties. It contains objectives for

reducing pollution affecting the Mediterranean Sea. A Global Environment Fund project for US$ 12 million was approved in 2000 to support implementation of the SAP. It includes an economic dimension that will allow MAP to cooperate with related socio-economic interests and financial institutions.

A similar evolution can be noted in the maritime economic activities in relation with the adoption of a new Mediterranean protocol, which deals with the prevention of accidental and operational pollution related to maritime transportation, and the new protocol on offshore activities that will soon enter into force. The economic sectors involved with maritime transportation, including port activities and recreational navigation, as well as the sectors concerned with the transportation of materials and substances will necessarily become involved in the new MAP legal framework.

Integrating environment with economic developments

Beyond the legal questions, the approach of sustainable development leads MAP, above all within the framework of MCSD, towards cooperation with the private sector and, more broadly, with the economic sector, because it must be taken into account that in many Mediterranean countries, industry, especially heavy industry, is often controlled by the government. It must be remembered that MCSD includes five representatives of this economic sector (out of 36 members) on an equal footing with member States, representatives of local governments and non-governmental environmental organizations. MCSD has dealt with questions of sustainable development related to economic activities. A working group on sustainable tourism has been established, bringing together national representatives and non-governmental environmental organizations along with tour operators and other parties active in tourism. As a result of this, an important workshop was held at Antalya in 1997, which led to recommendations adopted by MCSD. Similarly, MCSD working groups on Industry and on Free Trade have been excellent opportunity to cooperate with the private sector, mainly through Chambers of Commerce and Industry.

The expansion of MAP to meet socio-economic challenges and the promotion of a direct relationship with the private sector continue. For implementation of these activities, in accordance with Agenda 21 and the strategy of sustainable development, MAP has found it advisable to request the expertise of the United Nations specialized agencies and other organizations that can provide the experience that an environmental institution such as MAP does not have. FAO, UNIDO, the UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, the World Bank, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe have been involved in the work of MAP, especially through MCSD. Cooperation among related United Nations agencies is a prerequisite for successfully taking into account economic questions through an environmental structure.

A more specific question is that of the financing of sustainable policies at the local, national and regional levels, questions of growing relevance in the Mediterranean region. In order to deal with this question within the framework of a policy aimed at reducing land-based pollution (the strategic action plan) and, more generally, in a context of sustainable development, MAP will seek to develop economic and financial expertise along with existing expertise in the field of marine pollution, biodiversity, management of coastal areas and environmental law. Ongoing revision of the mandates of the Plan Bleu and PAP/RAC, two important MAP regional activity centres, will be an opportunity to introduce this new capacity into MAP institutions.
In conclusion, the following key issues could be discussed:

Identification and involvement of partners

First of all, there is a difficulty in identifying partners organized in geographical areas for many economic sectors. In the Mediterranean for example, there is an association of Mediterranean chambers of commerce but nothing similar exists for the chemical or the petroleum industries or the maritime navigation. There are instead organizations covering Europe or the Arab countries. In addition, the economic organizations in developed countries are better structured and have consequently better chance for cooperation.

As a result of the above, although the creation of bodies linked to the process of achieving sustainable development, such as the successful case of the MCSD for the Mediterranean region, do allow for a better "penetration" in the economic sectors and for partnership also at the local level, difficulties still remain in the identification of ways and accepted procedures for recognizing and approaching pertinent partners adequately representing the regional socio-economic interests and associating them to the Convention project and activity.

Expected outputs

In the case of the "polluting" industrial sectors, the results expected to come out from possible partnerships are very high and obtainable on the long-term. Concerning the chemical industry for example, the combination and balance between the so-called command-and-control approach based on legal rules and voluntary initiatives such as covenants, voluntary agreements are still to be found. The same applies to other sectors such as tourism industry..

Capacity building and cooperation

An obligated passage for all Action Plans and regional Conventions for the identification of proper means of cooperation with, and follow up to, the economic sectors, is surely to develop and introduce new and adequate expertise within the RCUs themselves. In addition, attempting to involve competent UN Agencies and regional bodies related to the socio-economic sectors – often already cooperating with the private sector unlike the RCUs- should be always taken into consideration at the onset of the activities to ensure the necessary synergism and, ultimately, the establishment of the needed contacts with the private sector.

Direct support and sponsorships from private enterprises

Another case of cooperation which may occur, with positive but also problematic aspects, is the direct support and sponsorships of Conventions' activities and projects by individual private enterprises. The obvious positive aspect of such cooperation is the possibility to obtain extra funds and increase the potential range of intervention. However, prudence should be used when considering such offers since they may contain hidden risks for the independence of the programme and be ethically controversial. Considering however the possible positive aspects of such offers, it would be advisable not to reject a priori the idea and to discuss the opportunity to set common criteria for the selection of the offers.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/IGM/2/4
4 July 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

OPEN-ENDED INTERGOVERNMENTAL
GROUP OF MINISTERS OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES
ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE
Second meeting
Bonn, Germany, 17 July 2001

IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE AMONG MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS: NEGOTIABLE TERMS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

A POLICY PAPER

A. Introduction

1. The most important theme in the ongoing dialogue on international environmental governance is the need for greater policy and programme coherence through enhanced coordination/collaboration among the various intergovernmental organizations and multilateral environmental agreements.

2. Collaboration/coordination constitutes the process by which organizations achieve integrated patterns of group and individual effort. To coordinate is to develop unity of action for common purposes. Unity of effort means that organizations and managers have so arranged the nature and timing of activities that individual efforts blend into a harmonious stream of productive action. Unity of effort requires that participating organizations understand the goal towards which they are working as a group and that there be no costly overlap of their methods and activities.

3. In this context, the rationale for enhanced collaboration among multilateral environmental agreements is apparent: efficient use of collective resources - information, financial and expertise; reduction of duplication and overlaps; emphasis on programme and policy coherence; and averting fragmented sectoral initiatives. At the national level, which is the focus of the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, the concerns relate to reducing the burden on Governments of reporting under different agreements; assisting Governments in establishing priorities and allocating resources in an era of shrinking budgets; and supporting Governments in coordinating preparations for, and monitoring of, decisions taken under various agreements and intergovernmental processes. The case for enhanced coordination is also strengthened by the requirements for coherent global and regional environmental management in the face of an expanding global trade regime. The broadened scope and stronger dispute settlement mechanism of the World Trade Organization (WTO) implies that WTO and the rules that it administers have greater influence on the negotiation and implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, and on international

K0135338 110701

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

environmental governance more generally. Unless global economic governance and global environmental governance are more closely aligned and developed more synergistically, sustainable development will be difficult to achieve. The discussions on international environmental governance should hence take into account the relationship between multilateral environmental agreements and WTO.

4. It must also be noted that globalization is changing the policy context in which national Governments operate. The globalization of financial markets and the need to bring coherence to environmental policies and programmes is just one aspect of this changed environment. The challenge to policy makers is made more acute by a host of other "internationalizations" under way, in areas such as environmental crime, communications, and product and service markets. Even so-called domestic issues are increasingly affected by international actors and events. The note by the secretariat entitled "International environmental governance: Multilateral environmental agreements" (UNEP/IGM/1/INF/3) delineates the problems faced by the agreements from different angles (para. 22) and elaborates on them in a chapter entitled "Strengths and weaknesses".

5. Clearly, the structures of international environmental governance need to be examined and improved in order for Governments to function effectively in setting and implementing global environmental policy. There is also a need for coordination efforts among multilateral environmental agreements to take into consideration international law governing relations between treaties in general. The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties requires cooperation and coordination among treaties.

6. There is now consensus among major stakeholders, including multilateral environmental agreements, regarding this position, deriving from the increasing number of agreements and the lessons learned from experience. The convergence of various developments, including the adoption of chapter 38 of Agenda 21, decisions taken by UNEP's Governing Council (17/25, 18/9, 19/9 C, 20/18 B and 21/21), the recommendations of the United Nations Task Force on Environment and Human Settlements, the Secretary-General's report to the Millennium Assembly, the Nairobi and Malmö Declarations, the meetings on coordination of environmental conventions convened under the aegis of UNEP, and the current debate on international environmental governance, has driven the calls for enhanced coordination among multilateral environmental agreements and intergovernmental organizations to improve the impact of their actions.

7. The primary objective of this paper is to propose a translation of the dialogue at the general level into a policy paper and a strategy with a set of concrete actions. The paper thus aims to further develop a strategic approach to coordination/collaboration and to move from vision to action. The paper proposes the elements for systematic cooperation that encompasses United Nations inter-agency cooperation, scientific and technical assessment linkages and, most importantly, implementation at the national level.

8. The paper takes into account the consensus that has emerged from the three consultative meetings on international environmental governance with the convention secretariats that coordination cannot take place at the cost of diversity, and that coordination itself has costs. Thought will have to be given to how those costs will be covered. It is also understood that the most significant coordination efforts will emerge from a bottom-up rather than top-down approach, decentralized rather than imposed from the centre.

B. Defining international environmental governance

9. The participants at the first meeting of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or Their Representatives on International Environmental Governance (New York, 18 April 2001) felt that there was a need for a better definition of international environmental governance. The second meeting of secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements held at the same venue on 18 April agreed, and decided to tackle this issue with a view to facilitating the ongoing discussions on how to improve governance, particularly within the context of multilateral environmental agreements.

10. "Governance" and "government" are both defined as "the act or manner of governing". While simple in its definition, the word governance is broad in scope, encompassing both the decision-making and policy-making process and the institutional structure for implementing decisions and policies.

11. With this in mind, the participants at the 18 April consultative meeting of secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements on international environmental governance agreed that the structure of international environmental governance has four layers. The top layer is the international decision-making process. Efforts to improve international environmental governance involve improving coordination of the decision-making process, so that there are no contradictions between what each multilateral environmental agreement is trying to achieve. The second layer is the international institutional architecture. When policy decisions are taken, they must be implemented through an institutional structure. Actual implementation at the international level is the third layer: management or operationalization of the policies and decisions. Finally, there is a fourth layer: coordination of the implementation of international environmental governance decisions at the national level.

12. At the third consultative meeting of secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements on international environmental governance, held on 4 July 2001, the secretariats pointed out that at the national level, internal governmental tensions have often militated against policy coherence. Governments are subject to divergent policy views often epitomized in conflicting sectoral interests of the line ministries. In this context, it was repeatedly emphasized by the participants that coordination of activities at the national level was the bedrock on which international environmental governance must evolve, given the fact that Governments form the governing bodies of international processes, including those relating to multilateral environmental agreements. Coherence in decision-making at the international level hence depends largely on how well coordination occurs at the national level. Therefore, there is a clear link between the first layer and the fourth layer of international environmental governance defined above. At the same time, coordination at the national level needs to be encouraged through international processes. The two approaches to environmental governance - national and international - need to be harmonized.

13. Clearly, at this point, the proposals for improving international environmental governance as regards multilateral environmental agreements are not yet fully articulated, and are presented as preliminary proposals, focusing on the first, third and fourth layers described above.

C. Concrete short-term actions for enhancing coordination among multilateral environmental agreements

14. The key to signalling the resolve to move forward will be the adoption of a series of concrete actions that can be taken in the short term. Small incremental steps through concrete actions could be taken to enhance coordination/collaboration as part of the overall effort to improve international environmental governance. On the basis of discussions among the agreements and UNEP, actions proposed for implementation are presented below. The proposals in sections 1 to 3 correspond to the international decision-making layer, with those in sections 4 and 5 corresponding to the management and national implementation layers respectively.

1. Coordination at the policy-making level through regular meetings of the bureaux of the Conferences of Parties

15. When decision-making is not integrated, the risks of duplication and conflict are greater, which would increase the need for formal coordination. Often commitments in one multilateral environmental agreement appear to conflict with commitments in others. Coordination either before or after the conclusion of such agreements can reduce these conflicts and lead to a more integrated and effective system of international environmental governance.

16. It is recommended that the bureaux of the Conferences of Parties meet regularly, preferably once a year, to consider in an integrated manner the priorities of their programmes of work and linkages with other multilateral environmental agreements and intergovernmental organizations.

17. The agenda for these meetings could encompass objectives such as:

(a) Promotion of cooperation and complementarity at the policy level;

(b) Joint efforts in responding to basic human needs such as poverty alleviation, food security, access to clean water and energy;

(c) Building synergies at the programmatic, scientific and technical levels;

(d) Avoiding potential inconsistencies among decisions adopted by various Conferences of Parties;

(e) Monitoring of the implementation of decisions.

18. At the third consultative meeting of secretariats, some multilateral environmental agreements expressed strong support for such regular consultations. One – the Ozone Secretariat – was ready to forward this suggestion to the Bureau of the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. In organizing such meetings of the bureaux, the different governing structures of the different agreements and the financial implications in individual cases would need to be considered. For example, the Ramsar Convention has a Standing Committee which is equivalent to a bureau. Since the Standing Committee is much larger than a typical bureau, the financial implications of developing country members participating in its meetings would be considerably higher.

19. As appropriate, these joint meetings could be organized at the global level or at the cluster level (for example, the biodiversity-related conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions). UNEP could be asked to convene these meetings and provide secretariat services for them. The recommendations of these meetings would subsequently be presented to the respective Conferences of Parties by the Chair of each.

20. At the second consultative meeting of secretariats, there was strong support for clustering of the agreements not only at the programmatic sectoral level but also at the functional level. For example, it was pointed out that there are close similarities in approach between the Rotterdam Convention's prior informed consent procedure and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety's advance informed agreement procedure. There was also support at this meeting for clustering at the regional level encompassing issues such as the pooling of resources, capacity-building, compliance and enforcement and complementary national legislation.

21. At the third consultative meeting, it was suggested that the meetings of the bureaux could be systematized to be held either at the cluster level or around specific policy issues. Some of these meetings could be dovetailed with meetings of UNEP's Global Ministerial Environment Forum.

22. A programme of work could be prepared for these meetings and presented to the Global Ministerial Environment Forum to make this idea a reality.

2. Regular meetings of the scientific and technical subsidiary bodies of multilateral environmental agreements and collaboration among assessment bodies

23. Scientific and technical assessments are vital to the effective implementation of multilateral environmental agreements. So far these assessments have been organized to support particular agreements and negotiations. A more coordinated approach involving not only assessments organized under multilateral environmental agreements but also others such as the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment could lead to a more effective system of assessments, particularly because scientific linkages exist among all environmental problems and issues addressed by such

agreements. It must be noted that scientific and technical assessments are most useful when they are driven by policy-relevant questions. Certainly there is information that is common across assessments, which would suggest the need for coordination amongst the agreements to exploit particular linkages.

24. Annual or periodic joint meetings of the scientific and technical bodies, including the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), could go a long way in aiding this process of coordination. As UNEP, the World Bank and the United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration indicated in Protecting Our Planet: Securing Our Future - Linkages among Global Environmental Issues and Human Needs (1998),

> "The importance of global environmental issues - such as climate change, loss of biological diversity, stratospheric ozone depletion, deforestation, and water degradation - to poverty alleviation and development is now becoming more fully recognized. However, these global environmental issues are, to a large extent, normally thought of as isolated issues by both the scientific and policy communities. As a result, they often fail to adequately recognize that there are strong scientific and policy interlinkages among the global environmental issues, between global environmental issues and local and regional environmental issues, and between environmental issues and basic human needs - adequate food, clean water, energy services, and a healthy environment. If these global environmental issues are to be addressed within a more holistic and synergistic policy framework, it is essential to gain an improved understanding of the scientific and policy interlinkages among them and how they influence our ability to meet basic human needs."

25. In this context, the participants in the first meeting of subsidiary scientific and technical bodies of multilateral environmental agreements, held in Bonn on 26 and 27 October 1999, the meeting to assess the need for a second interlinkages report, held in Bonn on 27 October 1999, and the Ninth Meeting on Coordination of the Secretariats of Environmental Conventions, convened by UNEP in Nairobi on 11 and 12 February 2001, noted the value of holding periodic meetings of the Chairs of assessment panels of different conventions and protocols to maximize the benefits of limited human and financial resources. Another suggestion made was that a comprehensive biennial report could be prepared providing a synopsis of the reports of the panels of related agreements, which could also help promote linkages and synergies at the scientific and technical level.

26. One suggestion emanating from the third consultative meeting of secretariats was that these meetings should be dovetailed with the meetings of the bureaux of the Conferences of Parties.

3. Establishment of a mechanism for monitoring the decisions of multilateral environmental agreements with a view to identifying inconsistencies

27. The issue of inconsistencies and even contradictions among the decisions of different agreements has gained salience over the years. Perhaps the best example was the decision of the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol to phase out the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances in favour of substitutes such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) that have a high global warming potential. Many such inconsistencies seem to exist.

28. At the second consultative meeting of secretariats concern was expressed that some species could be addressed by four or five agreements, with inconsistent mechanisms of implementation which do not favour efficiency on the ground. A mechanism for monitoring the decisions taken under such agreements would help to identify inconsistencies, decisions that are out of sync, as well as opportunities for synergy.

29. UNEP is well placed to play this role. Upon identifying inconsistencies and potential conflicts, as well as opportunities for cooperation and synergy, UNEP would bring these to the attention of the appropriate Conferences of Parties and their secretariats.

4. Support provided by United Nations bodies in the implementation of environmental conventions and agreements

30. The expansion of multilateral environmental agreements has important implications for coordination/collaboration among United Nations agencies. As indicated in the note by the secretariat on "International environmental governance: Multilateral environmental agreements" (UNEP/IGM/1/INF/3), six principal United Nations organizations - UNEP, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Secretariat - are involved with the implementation of programmes and policies that support or influence major global and regional environmental agreements and conventions of relevance to the environment.

31. The coordination meetings of the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements organized under the aegis of UNEP since 1994 have been instrumental in discussing joint programmatic policies and activities, discussing emerging issues of common concern and coming up with common positions. But there is a need to go further and bring more coherence and cooperation among the 140 major conventions relevant to the environment, including regional agreements of global relevance such as the 17 regional seas conventions and action plans and the 30 regional fisheries agreements.

32. There is a need to sharpen the profile of the present consultative mechanisms by considering the establishment of a forum to permit better coordination of the support provided by United Nations bodies in implementing multilateral environmental agreements. In order to avoid establishing a new institutional structure that only adds another layer to the existing coordinating institutions and mechanisms, inter-agency coordination could be carried out as a subset of an existing arrangement, for example by expanding the secretariat coordination meetings to include the relevant United Nations bodies to as a part of the Environmental Management Group. The forum should also involve internationally recognized lawyers to bring with them experience in the field of international environmental law.

33. The benefits of inter-agency coordination are numerous. They include:

(a) Avoiding duplication of effort;

(b) Identifying gaps in research;

(c) Identifying opportunities for collaboration;

(d) Developing mechanisms for collaboration;

(e) Promoting synergy through combined resources;

(f) Sharing information and activities and research findings in order to build a more systematic and cohesive effort;

(g) Providing an identifiable entity that can disseminate information to policy makers about United Nations system-wide activities.

34. The inter-agency coordination effort should :

(a) Assess the actual situation of international environmental law at the global and regional level in some critical fields and issue reports on and proposals for the further development of international environmental law, keeping in mind the need for rationalization, synergy and efficiency;

(b) Upon request, assess initiatives or proposals for the development of international instruments;

(c) Promote a framework and mechanisms for coordination among multilateral environmental agreements, for example in harmonizing reporting and definitions and in compliance and enforcement.

5. Coordination at the national level through the establishment of national coordination committees

35. At the third consultative meeting of secretariats, there was a strong consensus in favour of treating activities under multilateral environmental agreements at the national level as the foundation for coordination among the agreements. It was also felt that coordination amongst the agreements at the international level would act as a catalyst for enhanced coordination at the national level, and vice versa. Clearly, an integrated national perspective will provide a sound basis for coordination among the agreements. A national discussion allows countries to consider the need for common approaches and how different conventions may help realize them.

36. The conventions place a significant burden on countries in terms of planning, implementation and reporting. These requirements amount to a formidable burden, particularly for developing countries that are already suffering from human and institutional capacity constraints. Unless they are fully integrated in existing national planning processes, the conventions may simply generate just another set of plans. To date, indications are that the conventions are not yet mainstreamed as part of national planning processes and that the national focal points responsible for them are isolated from mainstream policy-making and sectoral planning processes and from each other.

37. The benefit of establishing national coordination mechanisms such as coordination committees or a secretariat for implementation of multilateral environmental agreements is that they will be a policy-making structure which deals with the strategic planning, implementation and legislative requirements for successful implementation of the instruments and related activities. Consultative mechanisms have also been established by many Parties to the Basel Convention that involve all stakeholders including relevant ministries, industry, academia, local communities and grass-roots groups. Countries may consider setting up such mechanisms.

38. Regional mechanisms such as the frameworks for implementation of the regional seas conventions and action plans are also important in supporting the implementation of global environmental agreements. Another example of a regional mechanism is furnished by the Basel Convention's regional centres as the main vehicles for the implementation of global and regional hazardous wastes and chemicals conventions. The centres function as forums for joint activities with other agreements and their secretariats and international organizations. One suggestion made at the third consultative meeting was for the establishment of a multi-stakeholder forum at the regional level to coordinate activities under multilateral environmental agreements. The benefits of such a forum will include engaging a wider group of experts, policy makers and stakeholders, including the private sector and civil society, than would be possible at the global level and identifying where joint initiatives would be beneficial and cost-effective, for example in information resources management or capacity-building.

39. UNEP, in collaboration with the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements, could be given the role of facilitating, perhaps in coordination with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), FAO and the World Bank, the establishment of such national coordination mechanisms for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, as well as providing advice on issues to be addressed. The United Nations agencies that support the implementation of conventions and agreements of environmental relevance could be enlisted to support this process. This bottom-up approach would contribute greatly to the harmonization of the decision-making process and the integrated implementation of multilateral environmental agreements at the global level.

6. Financing the work of the multilateral environmental agreements

40. Enhanced coordination and efficiency in the work of the multilateral environmental agreements in the context of international environmental governance cannot be considered in isolation from adequate financing of their activities. Some multilateral environmental agreements suffer from a chronic lack of funds. Inadequate funding hampers the effective implementation of the agreements, including the required support

needed by developing countries and countries with economies in transition, some of which find difficult or impossible to gain access to support from GEF. Particularly affected by inadequate funding are the development of synergies and collaborative activities among conventions. It is also a fact that a large part of the funds for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements has been derived from international funding mechanisms such as GEF. Consistency in policy and programme priority-setting between the financial mechanisms and multilateral environmental agreements needs to be improved.

41. Although the priorities of multilateral environmental agreements differ, strengthening the capacity of Parties or member States to meet their obligations and commitments through financial assistance ranks as a high priority for all agreements. This aspect was brought out strongly at the third consultative meeting.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/IGM/2/5
4 July 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

OPEN-ENDED INTERGOVERNMENTAL
GROUP OF MINISTERS OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES
ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE
Second meeting
Bonn, Germany, 17 July 2001

PROPOSAL FOR A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO COORDINATION OF MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

A. Introduction

1. The United Nations, its specialized agencies and the secretariats of numerous multilateral environmental agreements are already engaged in various initiatives to enhance their coordination in a number of areas. These range from joint meetings of convention secretariats under the aegis of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to efforts to harmonize national reporting and the implementation of joint work programmes under memoranda of understanding signed between convention secretariats.

2. Yet the implementation of these initiatives has been piecemeal rather than the result of a deliberate, overarching strategic choice. A strategic vision for collaboration and coordination amongst multilateral environmental agreements not only has to take into account lessons learned but must also marshal limited resources - human and financial - to leverage change. The problems faced by the multilateral environmental agreements in enhancing coordination have been delineated in the report entitled "International environmental governance: multilateral environmental agreements" (UNEP/IGM/2/INF/3) (para. 22), and elaborated on further in chapter 2 of that report.

3. The policy paper entitled "Improving international environmental governance among multilateral environmental agreements: Negotiable terms for further discussion" (UNEP/IGM/2/4) delineates a number of institutional mechanisms to take the process forward. It endeavours to establish a structure for system-wide cooperation encompassing United Nations agencies and multilateral environmental agreements, as well as promoting coordination and cooperation at the national level.

4. In order to actualize these interlocking goals, new supporting policies, processes and procedures will need to be put into place. This paper on a systematic approach to coordination builds on the above-mentioned paper for improving international environmental governance and proposes strategies and

K0135344 110701

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

actions to enhance coordination among multilateral environmental agreements, setting out objectives and expected outcomes.

5. The proposal presented here constitutes a follow-up to the dialogue conducted during three consultative meetings with convention secretariats on international environmental governance (Nairobi, 11 and 12 February 2001; and New York, 18 April 2001; and teleconference, 4 July 2001), and is largely an extension of the exchange of ideas which led to the production of the paper entitled "International environmental governance: multilateral environmental agreements" (UNEP/IGM/2/INF/3), which was presented to the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or Their Representatives on International Environmental Governance at its first meeting (New York, 18 April 2001). The participants in the second consultative meeting agreed that a systematic approach for promoting collaboration and coordination among conventions was desirable. Since the representatives of convention secretariats were unable to consult their Parties on the substance of this paper, given time restraints, their inputs and views were provided in their capacity as individual experts, rather than as representatives of multilateral environmental agreements.

B. The vision

6. The vision of coordination hinges on a partnership approach among the multilateral environmental conventions, UNEP and other intergovernmental organizations in the implementation and operationalization of "four Cs" - coordination, coherence, compliance and capacity-building.

7. Under this vision, coordination is a process rather than a one-time event. The process calls for continuous dialogue between the partners – United Nations agencies, the bureaux of Conferences of Parties, subsidiary bodies, assessment and technology panels and Governments. The vision calls for bringing together all the major actors to discuss and agree on the components that will support the harmonized and coordinated implementation of the conventions at the national level. The centrepiece of the coordination process will be the implementation of the conventions at the national level.

8. The outputs of the dialogue will be coordinated strategies for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements. The coordination process proposed will help to generate and update complementary strategies as necessary and contribute to improving international environmental governance.

C. Mechanisms for issue prioritization and coordination

9. With the proliferation of multilateral environmental agreements at the global and regional level, there is an increasing need for a strategic approach. To better coordinate the work of these agreements, what is required first is to develop mechanisms for prioritizing issues that require coordination and leveraging synergies. The policy paper on improving international environmental governance lists a number of institutional mechanisms that could be established for this purpose.

10. The proposed regular joint meetings of the bureaux of the Conferences of Parties and subsidiary scientific and technical bodies, and the establishment of a forum to ensure coordination in support being provided by United Nations bodies in implementing environmental conventions, could offer opportunities for identifying priorities and synergies.

11. As a first step, the multilateral environmental agreements should take stock of ongoing initiatives by undertaking an in-depth transparent study on existing bottlenecks and prospects for true synergies involving all stakeholders. Such an overview would not only help to provide a comprehensive perspective on activities under the agreements, but would also be likely to detect potential room for synergies and better coordination among agreements and intergovernmental organizations. In addition, this survey should identify current institutional hurdles and bottlenecks and ask what concrete steps can be taken to facilitate and enhance coordination and collaboration among agreements. The overview should also arrive at a preliminary cost-benefit analysis of individual initiatives and the ultimate impact of leveraging synergies and how it can be

improved. This will require inputs from countries addressing the operational impact and measurable impact of coordination among the agreements.

12. At the second consultative meeting it was decided that collaboration and coordination could be promoted at three levels of clustering: sectoral (for example, among biodiversity-related conventions in the management of ecosystems and species); functional (for example on trade-related issues); and at the regional level (capacity-building, compliance and enforcement, pooling of resources, and complementary legislation). The implementation of clustering at all three levels calls for consultations with the conventions and specific proposals from them.

13. There is also a need to follow up the suggestion made at the Ninth Meeting on Coordination of the Secretariats of Environmental Conventions that the state of cooperation and collaboration among biodiversity-related conventions and regional seas conventions should be analysed. This will enable UNEP and related conventions to approach collaboration in a more systematic and cohesive manner.

14. A further need is for an up-to-date inventory of memoranda of understanding concluded between multilateral environmental agreements and intergovernmental organizations, as well as related decisions of Conferences of Parties.

15. The policy paper on international environmental governance has suggested the establishment of a mechanism for monitoring the decisions of multilateral environmental agreements with a view to identifying inconsistencies and opportunities for synergy. This mechanism, which could be set up under the aegis of UNEP, should continuously track developments in each convention on a routine basis to alert other conventions to duplications and capture synergies.

D. Scientific and technical cooperation

16. The growing importance of science within policy-making and the recognition of the co-dependence of ecosystems have raised the question of whether more integrated scientific mechanisms or processes between multilateral environmental agreements would be more conducive to identifying synergistic policies and exploiting the biogeophysical relationships between the agreements.

17. The policy paper on improving international environmental governance indicates the need for regular joint meetings of the scientific and technical subsidiary bodies of the agreements. An annual meeting of the Chairs of the scientific and technical bodies of the agreements, including the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), could enhance coordination in this field. Noteworthy in this context is the suggestion made at the Ninth Meeting on Coordination of Conventions that periodic meetings of the Chairs of the assessment panels of different conventions and protocols should be held to maximize the benefits of limited human and financial resources available for their operation.

18. Another suggestion made at the same meeting and worthy of implementation relates to the preparation of a comprehensive biennial report providing a synopsis of the reports of the panels of related agreements, which could help promote linkages and synergies.

19. At the third consultative meeting of secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements it was suggested that the meetings of scientific and technical subsidiary bodies of the agreements and meetings of the Chairs of the assessment panels should be dovetailed with meetings of the bureaux of Conferences of Parties.

20. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has carried out periodic assessments on the state of knowledge of causes of climate change, its potential impacts and options for response strategies. Over the years, IPCC assessments have provided the scientific basis for negotiations and decision-making on climate change. It has also prepared special reports and technical papers on specific issues that require independent scientific information and advice, several of which were requested by the Subsidiary Body on

Scientific and Technical Advice of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). As the IPCC Third Assessment Report nears completion, IPCC is considering its future work programme. One of the issues being discussed is its potential to carry out assessments that will also serve the needs of other multilateral environmental agreements, particularly on matters that relate to climate change. Recently, IPCC received a request from the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to carry out an assessment on the linkages between climate change and biological diversity. It will take a decision on this request in the near future. Such an endeavour would contribute to the enhancement of scientific collaboration among multilateral environmental agreements by streamlining the means of conducting assessments required under those agreements.

21. At the Ninth Meeting on Coordination of the Secretariats of Environmental Conventions it was suggested that environmental indicators should be put into the spotlight as an instrument for measuring the performance and achievements of the agreements, taking into account the need to better link scientific assessments to policy.

E. Harmonization of information systems, information exchanges and access to information

22. An oft-discussed issue in various meetings of the multilateral environmental agreements is the creation of a common entry point via the World Wide Web for all agreements. This can enable improved access to information in national reports; improved feedback to Parties on implementation; scope for users to conduct electronic searches while tailoring information retrieval to their needs; and opportunities to archive documents and retain easy access.

23. This common entry point could be linked to the establishment of a "lessons learned network" to encourage the sharing of experience from case studies. This network should endeavour to select lessons learned from existing documents, develop Web site prototypes and establish links to other lessons-learned facilities and convention clearing houses.

24. A target date for making real advances in information support to environmental assessment and planning should be established.

Harmonizing national reporting

25. The benefits of harmonization of reporting will accrue to all stakeholders, including national Governments, convention secretariats and governance bodies. At the national level, Governments will be encouraged to identify a consolidated list of obligations in a cross-sectoral manner, identify national priorities in relation to the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements in a holistic manner, improve awareness of national obligations under and compliance with such agreements within Governments at all levels, identify gaps in national legislation and policies and improve the ability to implement country-driven actions in support of treaty commitments.

26. The harmonization of reporting will also benefit convention secretariats. It will enable them to encourage and support Governments in: (a) the implementation of their own national priorities; (b) the preparation of global, regional and thematic analyses to help Conferences of Parties to assess progress towards treaty objectives and set future priorities; (c) improving an integrated analysis capacity and an enhanced ability to coordinate inter-agency programmes of work through the sharing of information and experience; and (d) improved linkages with international environmental monitoring agencies, major data custodians and regional treaties.

27. The harmonization of national reporting can be achieved through short-term and medium-term objectives. The short-term objectives will include reviewing needs and opportunities for a range of potential mechanisms for increased streamlining and harmonization, testing such mechanisms and providing

supporting tools and demonstration actions to assist both Parties and secretariats in the process of streamlining.

28. In the medium term, the objectives will be to study the findings of this review and identify how to implement them in the context of the needs and governance structures of the different agreements, and to identify further actions to be taken at the national and international levels to increase streamlining and harmonization, including capacity-building at the national level.

29. Achieving these objectives will require standing linkages between the agreements in a number of areas, including:

(a) Further harmonization of and linkages between Web sites and other forms of information dissemination;

(b) Consistency in information management practices and technologies;

(c) Coordination of scientific methodology considerations such as indicators;

(d) Development and coordination of a joint capacity-building programme in information management and related Internet technology;

(e) Management of a shared lessons-learned library.

F. Compliance and enforcement

30. There is a need to focus the attention of the multilateral environmental agreements in a coordinated manner on the need to further the application of agreed international norms and policies, as well as to facilitate compliance with environmental principles and international agreements.

31. Only recently have provisions on monitoring and evaluation been included in the agreements. This is a trend bound to continue as new environmental agreements are developed. In recent years, Governments have also focused their attention towards the implementation and enforcement of such agreements.

32. Proposed areas of coordinated action between the agreements include:

(a) Joint promotion and strengthening of the regular exchange of information, training and public awareness programmes to support compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, including at the cluster level;

(b) Joint research initiatives to assess and determine the extent and nature of legal and illegal trade in products regulated by multilateral environmental agreements;

(c) Joint development of guidelines for cooperation at the national, regional and global levels relating to compliance with and enforcement of such agreements;

(d) Coordinated action to help Parties to environmental conventions to develop or strengthen national laws and regulations to enhance enforcement of and compliance with multilateral environmental agreements;

(e) Establishment of enforcement focal points for better coordination at the global, national and regional levels.

G. Capacity-building

33. Capacity-building for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements places an imperative on a coordinated approach which crosses administrative and sectoral boundaries, involving the major stakeholders. One of the important ongoing activities is capacity-building in developing national legislation that encompasses the implementation of some multilateral environmental agreements. In general multilateral environmental agreements are currently placing more emphasis on how to facilitate assistance and general capacity-building, including training, technical, legal and administrative assistance and technology transfer to developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

34. A coordinated approach to capacity-building will involve the following objectives:

(a) To design joint country-driven multi-stakeholder programmes in capacity development;

(b) To encourage greater adaptability to local conditions through delegation and decentralization;

(c) To set longer and more flexible time horizons to accommodate a process approach;

(d) To enhance internal capacity by training and broadening skills in subjects related to capacity development - from mediation to environmental economics;

(e) To devise new indicators for capacity development and develop new tools for building capacities.

H. More cost-effective and rational organization of meetings of the multilateral environmental agreements

35. The proliferation of meetings of Conferences of Parties, inter-sessional consultations and meetings of scientific and technical subsidiary bodies is costly, inefficient and unsustainable. There are considerable savings to be realized by rationalizing and systematizing the various meetings held under the aegis of the multilateral environmental agreements. The prevailing shortage of funds should also provide an impetus for developing a sound strategy for organizing these consultations.

36. One of the possible ways to reduce costs is to host Conferences of Parties of related conventions back to back at the same location. The most obvious costs are for conference facilities, which are usually covered by the host Government. Additionally, considerable costs are borne by the participating delegates, observers and the media to cover air fares and accommodation. Finally, there are costs related to setting up temporary offices and communications infrastructure. Part of these costs may be saved by holding Conferences of Parties back to back. There will almost certainly be cost savings for the secretariats by opting to pool resources when hosting two conferences back to back. Similarly, Governments could gain by maintaining the same communications infrastructure for both conventions. In addition, carefully planned back-to-back events would enhance the scope for cross-cutting negotiations, making it possible to weed out substantive contradictions or "grey area" issues that still exist within the international law regime.

37. The participants at the third consultative meeting of secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements on international environmental governance pointed out that holding meetings of Conferences of Parties back to back might not be feasible. One Conference meets for more than 10 days at each session. Holding two such meetings together could extend the duration to 20 days, which might be too long for some delegates. It was suggested that there was scope for reducing the periodicity of such meetings to once every 18 months or two years; holding meetings of the Conferences of Parties to two multilateral environmental agreements belonging to the same cluster simultaneously; or holding a single Conference of Parties for all the multilateral environmental agreements belonging to the same cluster. Clearly, more attention needs to be paid to this aspect.

38. A related issue is that of the participation of ministers in these consultations. There is growing dissatisfaction among ministers of the environment that they are not being properly utilized at these meetings and that the number of convention meetings is increasingly placing a burden on their time and work. This dilemma could be resolved by determining more specifically where and when the ministers could be involved. At the third consultative meeting, it was suggested that there was no need to hold a ministerial segment at some Conferences of Parties. Ministers should be invited only if the topic to be discussed expressly demanded their presence.

I. Rationalization of coordination meetings among multilateral environmental agreements

39. The above proposal for a systematic approach for promoting collaboration and coordination among multilateral environmental agreements should not become a burden for convention secretariats and representatives by creating a layer of too many meetings on top of their regular meetings. The attached list of meetings scheduled to be held during 2001 (annex II) provides an idea of how heavy the schedule of meetings has become. In 2001 alone at least 40 major meetings organized under multilateral multilateral environmental agreements were planned, without mentioning numerous smaller workshops and meetings.

40. Annex I proposes a rational calendar of meetings for implementing the systematic approach to promoting collaboration and coordination among multilateral environmental agreements proposed in this paper, as well as deadlines for specific outputs. Greater use would be made of teleconferencing for meetings where desirable.

41. An overall calendar of coordination meetings among conventions would need to be updated regularly with a view to maintaining a realistic schedule.

Annex I

Calendar of envisaged activities

	ACTIVITIES	TIMING
1.	Meetings of the bureaux of Conferences of Parties to global agreements	Annual meetings in December to take stock of progress in implementing decisions adopted by the Conferences of Parties and activities during the year and to look at likely decisions for the following year. Bureau meetings could also be held in conjunction with UNEP's Global Ministerial Environment Forum
2.	Global meetings of regional seas conventions and action plans	Annual meetings in November for promoting cooperation, including linkages with global multilateral environmental agreements
3.	Meetings of the subsidiary scientific and technical bodies of multilateral environmental agreements, including assessment panels (involving the Chairs of the bodies)	Annual meetings in connection with one of the Conferences of Parties to multilateral environmental agreements. Dovetailing these meetings with bureau meetings could also be considered
4.	Meetings to coordinate inter-agency support to multilateral environmental agreements	Annual meetings either as a part of coordination meetings of secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements or in connection with meetings of the Environmental Management Group
5.	Meetings on coordination of convention secretariats	Annual meetings early in the year (February/March)
6.	In-depth study on bottlenecks and prospects for synergies	March - May 2001 (planning for the study and its terms of reference at the coordination meeting of multilateral environmental agreements in February/March 2002)
7.	Analysis of the state of cooperation and collaboration among multilateral environmental agreements, including establishment of an inventory of memoranda of understanding	UNEP to conduct the analysis in late 2001 to feed into the in-depth study (item 6 above)
8.	Monitoring of decisions adopted under multilateral environmental agreements	UNEP to put in place the necessary resources during 2002 and monitoring to start that year. The results will eventually feed into the meetings of the bureaux and the convention secretariats
9.	Development of environmental indicators for measuring performance and achievements of multilateral environmental agreements	A project concept to be drawn up by UNEP during 2002
10.	Development of a Web site	A single entry point (home page) to be established for existing Web sites related to multilateral environmental agreements, based on the conventions Web site set up by UNEP's Information Unit on Conventions and including a working Web site for multilateral environmental agreements. UNEP to work on this during 2001

Annex II

Meetings of environmental conventions, including regional seas conventions and action plans, 2001

1. Second Liaison Group Meeting on Agricultural Biodiversity (Rome, 24-26 January)

2. Global Biodiversity Outlook Advisory Group (Geneva, 25 and 26 January)

3. Ninth Meeting on the Coordination of the Secretariats of Environmental Conventions (Nairobi, 11 and 12 February)

4. First meeting of the Interim Scientific, Technical and Advisory Committee under the Protocol on Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities to the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, and meeting of the Regional Working Group of the Global Programme of Action on Municipal Wastewater (Ocho Rios, Jamaica, 19-23 February)

5. African Regional Meeting on the Biosafety Clearing House and the Clearing-house Mechanism (Nairobi, 26-28 February)

6. Sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Montreal, 12-16 March)

7. Second meeting of the Panel of Experts on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit-sharing (Convention on Biological Diversity) (Montreal, 19-22 March)

8. Second session of the Interim Chemical Review Committee (Rotterdam Convention) (Rome, 19-23 March)

9. Second session of the High-level Government-designated Expert Meeting of the Proposed North-East Pacific Regional Seas Programme (Managua, Nicaragua,19-23 March)

10. Third meeting of the Consultative Working Group of Experts on Biodiversity Education and Public Awareness (Convention on Biological Diversity/UNESCO) (Bilbao, Spain, May, tentative)

11. Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Stockholm, 21-23 May)

12. Forty-fifth meeting of the Standing Committee of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (Paris, 19-22 June)

13. Workshop on financial support for the creation and implementation of national biosafety frameworks (Havana, 4 and 5 June)

14. Open-ended expert meeting to further develop proposals on the implementation of capacity-building provisions of the Protocol for consideration by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol at its second meeting (Havana, 6-8 June)

15. Expert Meeting on Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of Living Modified Organisms (Convention on Biological Diversity) (Paris, 13-15 June)

16. International Conference on New Biotechnology Food and Crops: Science, Safety and Society (Bangkok 10-12 July)

17. Open-ended Expert Meeting on Capacity-building for the Implementation of the Biosafety Protocol (Convention on Biological diversity) (Havana, 11-13 July)

18. International Workshop on Financial Support for National Biosafety Frameworks (Havana, 14 July)

19. Financial Resources and Mechanism Workshop on Financing for Biodiversity (Havana, 16 and 17 July)

20. Fourteenth session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Bonn, Germany, starting 16 July)

21. Resumed sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Bonn, Germany, 18-28 July)

22. Third session of the High-level Government-designated Expert Meeting of the Proposed North-East Pacific Regional Seas Programme (Panama City, 6-9 August)

23. Technical Experts Review Meeting on the Pilot Phase of the Biosafety Clearing House (Montreal, September, tentative)

24. Seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (Bonn, 11-15 September)

25. Fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (Bonn, 17-28 September)

26. Seventh meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (Turkey, October)

27. Second meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol (Nairobi, 1-5 October)

28. Eighth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee of the Rotterdam Convention (Rome, 8-12 October)

29. Thirteenth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (Colombo, 15-19 October)

30. Seventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and sixteenth session of the subsidiary bodies (Marrakech, Morocco, 29 October-9 November, to be confirmed)

31. Seventh Intergovernmental Meeting on the North-West Pacific Action Plan (Russian Federation, November)

32. Twelfth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (Monaco, 14-17 November)

33. Seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Montreal, 12-16 November)

34. Open-ended Inter-sessional Meeting on the Strategic Plan, National Reports and Implementation (Convention on Biological Diversity) (Montreal, 19-21 November)

35. Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (Montreal, 21-23 November)

36. First Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (Montreal, 26-30 November)

37. Twenty-sixth meeting of the Standing Committee of the Ramsar Convention (Gland, Switzerland, 3-7 December)

38. Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Emergency Protocol of the Barcelona Convention (end of year, to be decided)

39. Third meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Nairobi Convention (Seychelles, October-November, to be decided)

40. Sixth meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Abidjan Convention (Ghana, October-November, to be decided)

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP/IGM/4

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

The Decision-Making Process of Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Case for Enhanced Coordination

The Decision-Making Process of Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Case for Enhanced Coordination

I. Introduction

1. The objective of this paper is to examine the decision-making process of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) with a view to identifying cases of inconsistencies and contradictions, as well as overlaps and opportunities for collaboration and synergies. This paper will undertake a preliminary analysis of how a number of specific species, ecosystems and issues are treated under decisions made in terms of the five global wildlife and biodiversity-related conventions, hereinafter referred to as the biodiversity-related conventions: the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar); and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC). It will also consider a smaller selection of decisions taken by other MEAs, which have required inter-MEA consultations, specifically between the Montreal Protocol for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and between the Basel Convention for the Control of the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal and the Montreal Protocol. The decisions that will be considered cover both "resolutions" or "recommendations", which are intended to provide long-term guidance, as well as "decisions" which can be task-specific and time-limited. As a general rule, decisions constitute "soft" law and are not necessarily regarded as legally binding, unlike the text of a convention, which is generally considered "hard" law and legally binding.

2. This paper is not meant to be a comprehensive analysis of overlaps, inconsistencies and contradictions among the decisions taken by the Conferences of the Parties (COPs) of different MEAs. There currently does not exist a systematic tracking of all the decisions made by the governing bodies of MEAs that looks for overlaps, inconsistencies or contradictions. In fact, this preliminary analysis revealed that many MEAs do not have easily accessible the collective body of decisions taken by their COPs. In one case, one MEA secretariat did not have records of the decisions of its earliest COPs.

3. Some of the decisions made under the biodiversity-related conventions will be examined to determine how their application might impact upon one another and upon the Parties' ability to carry out their various obligations under the different Conventions. A key concern is whether the decisions complement, overlap with or contradict one another in their treatment of particular species, habitats and issues. It is critical to emphasise that it is beyond the scope of this paper to undertake a detailed analysis of all decisions taken under the biodiversity-related Conventions and their possible interactions. This paper simply serves to raise some initial thoughts on whether there may be a need to monitor systematically all decisions made by the Conferences of the Parties

(COPs) of the different Conventions in order to promote greater collaboration and synergies in the decision-making process. Recommendations will be made in the concluding chapter of this paper, as to how synergies and harmonisation could be achieved between the decisions made under the various Conventions.

II. Brief Overview of Key Global Biodiversity-related Conventions

4. It has to be borne in mind that, while the biodiversity-related Conventions considered here might all have biodiversity conservation as their general goal, the objectives and ambit of each Convention might be quite narrow and specific. CITES deals with trade in endangered or threatened species of both flora and fauna; CMS focuses on migratory wild animal species; while CBD looks at individual species of flora and fauna, its focus is principally on the ecosystem approach; Ramsar focuses on one set of ecosystems, namely wetlands; and WHC confers protection on natural sites that meet its restricted criteria for listing. Thus, in essence, CITES and CMS are species-specific, Ramsar and WHC are site-specific, and CBD sets out general principles regarding the conservation of biodiversity at the genetic, species and ecosystem levels. Another critical point is that each convention is an autonomous legal instrument, bound only by the decisions made by its specific governing body (usually the COP). No Convention is automatically obliged to take into account the decisions made by any other Convention. In order to compare how the different Conventions treat the same species or ecosystem, a brief analysis of the objectives of each Convention follows.

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, 1973 (CITES)

5. The objective of CITES is to subject international trade in specified endangered or vulnerable species of flora and fauna to a licensing system. Appendix I species are those threatened with extinction and trade in these species is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Appendix II species are not necessarily threatened with extinction, but trade is controlled in order to ensure sustainable use. Appendix III species are those, which are, protected in at least one country which has asked the parties for help in controlling the trade. CITES, as a trade instrument, differs from other conventions in that it concerns itself not only with living specimens, but also with dead animals and plants and their parts. CITES resolutions are intended to provide long-standing guidance on the implementation of the Convention, while decisions contain specific instructions, often to be effected by a certain time, and then become obsolete. (Some of the CITES decisions contain long-term guidance which would be more appropriate in the form of resolutions This confusion arose due to an earlier consolidation of all decisions and resolutions into a single document; however, CITES is undertaking to eliminate these inconsistencies.)

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, 1979 (CMS)

6. CMS aims to provide a framework for range States to conserve migratory species of wild animals throughout their range. Appendix I lists migratory species that are endangered and places the following obligations upon Parties regarding Appendix I species:

- To conserve and restore the habitats of listed species;
- To prohibit their taking (hunting, fishing, capturing, harassing and deliberate killing), with few exceptions;
- To remove obstacles and minimise activities that seriously hinder their migration; and

- To control other factors that might endanger them, including control of introduced exotic species.

7. Appendix II lists migratory species that have an unfavourable conservation status as well as those that would benefit significantly from the international co-operation that could be achieved through an intergovernmental agreement. Parties are encouraged to conclude agreements to protect Appendix II species. In this respect, CMS acts as a framework convention, providing for separate, legally binding instruments among the range states of a single migratory species, or groups of species. These include the Agreement on Conservation of Mediterranean, near Atlantic and Black Sea Cetaceans and their habitats (ACCOBAMS); the Agreement on Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA); the Agreement on Conservation of Small Cetaceans on the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS); and the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS). States do not have to be a party to the parent convention in order to join an associated agreement. CMS passes "resolutions" and "recommendations" which can call for "concerted action" or "co-operative action", the former of which carries the greater weight.

Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992 (CBD)

8. The objectives of this Convention are (a) the conservation of biological diversity, (b) the sustainable use of its components and (c) the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources. CBD calls upon Parties to identify and monitor components of biological diversity which require urgent conservation measures and can be used sustainably; promote the protection of ecosystems; rehabilitate and restore degraded ecosystems and promote the recovery of threatened species; establish protected areas to conserve biological diversity while promoting environmentally sound development around those areas. Governments are required to develop national biodiversity strategies and action plans. The ecosystem approach to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is used as a framework for action. Decisions taken under CBD tend to take the form of work programmes and recommendations, rather than direct rules. Specific legislation and programmes are left up to national governments.

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, 1971 (Ramsar)

9. The Ramsar convention focuses on a particular set of ecosystems - wetlands - rather than on species or special issues, although wetlands that are habitats for sizeable populations of waterbirds are of particular importance. The objective of the convention is to promote the conservation of listed wetlands, and as far as possible, the wise use of wetlands in the Party's territory (Article 3). Wetlands are defined as "areas of marsh, fen, peatland or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six metres" (Article 1). Contracting Parties commit themselves to: designate at least one site that meets the Ramsar criteria for inclusion in the List of Wetlands of International Importance (the Ramsar List); include wetland conservation in their national land-use planning; and establish nature reserves on their wetlands. Resolutions and recommendations passed by Ramsar COPs give guidelines to Parties on their national policies and programmes.

Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972 (World Heritage Convention - WHC)

10. The objective of the WHC is to protect natural or cultural or mixed sites, which meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List. Thus the concepts of nature conservation and the preservation of cultural sites are linked in one Convention. One criterion for natural sites is that the site must contain the most important and significant natural habitats for *in-situ* conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value form the point of view of science or conservation. Countries that apply to have natural sites inscribed on the World Heritage List must include a management plan for the site and describe how that site is already protected under national legislation. Decisions made by the World Heritage Committee relate to applications for inclusion on the World Heritage List. If a country does not fulfil its obligations under the Convention, its site may be deleted from the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee also has the power to decide to place listed sites that are endangered on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

III. COP DECISIONS

11. There would seem to be no formal or legal mechanisms requiring a COP to take into account relevant decisions made under other Conventions on the same species, ecosystems or issues. Much would seem to depend upon the *modus operandi* of the particular COP and its secretariat, and its level of formal and informal co-operation with other Conventions (e.g. in the form of MOUs or joint work programmes), as to whether decisions made under other Conventions would be taken into account in their own deliberation process. In the normal course of events, glaring inconsistencies with decisions taken under other Conventions would presumably be ironed out during initial intergovernmental negotiations, but this is not always the case. One exception is CITES, which currently follows the decisions made by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) on the conservation status of whales. However, this relationship to IWC is built into CITES texts and resolutions

12. The outcome of the deliberations of a COP as to how the Convention can best be implemented is often a set of recommendations or resolutions, which usually take the form of long-term guidelines, or a set of decisions, often specific directions, sometimes addressed to a particular body, and with a time-limit for implementation. While the text of a Convention is regarded as "hard" law, decisions and recommendations are regarded as "soft" law - in other words, as guiding principles and not firm and binding principles of law. These recommendations and decisions only become effective if they are translated into national legislation and policies that are then effectively implemented at the national level. Thus the key to the effectiveness of Conventions is their implementation at the national level. But clearly, in order for national implementation to be effective, their needs to be clarity and consistency in decisions taken at the international level. The real issue seems to be that of overlaps amongst the Conventions and determining to what degree these overlaps lead to inefficiencies or duplication of effort.

IV. SELECTED SPECIES, HABITATS AND ISSUES

13. This paper will now list a selected number of species, habitats and issues and outline the way in which the relevant Convention decisions apply to their conservation. As indicated earlier, this paper is not meant to be an exhaustive analysis of COP decisions. The specific decisions examined are listed in Annex 1.

IV.A. African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*)

CITES: African elephant

14. All of the populations of the African elephant are listed in Appendix I, apart from the elephant populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, which are listed in Appendix II. All trade in live elephants and ivory is prohibited for Appendix I populations. Appendix II populations are allowed to do the following: export of hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations (Namibia: for non-commercial purposes only; South Africa: for re-introduction purposes); export of hides and leather goods (South Africa and Zimbabwe); export of ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes (Zimbabwe only); export of ivory tusks from Kruger National Park (South Africa: zero quota). In effect, a compromise position was adopted at COP11 in 2000 whereby ivory trade is prohibited unless relaxed by subsequent COPs and the African elephant populations for Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa remain listed on Appendix II with a zero quota for ivory exports.

15. Relevant decisions made under CITES include Decision 11.65 (directed to the Parties) which states that "[e]ntire geographically separate populations should not be included in the Appendices without prior consideration of negative consequences to conservation and management programmes for national populations or to sustainable development programmes involving such populations." CITES thus applies decisions to geographically separate populations of the same species. Decision 11.3 (regarding ivory) sets out the conditions under which stockpiles of ivory may be sold and the use to which ivory revenues must be put, i.e. towards improved elephant conservation.

CMS: African elephant

16. The African elephant is on Appendix II. This means that the African elephant has an unfavourable conservation status and would benefit significantly from the international co-operation that could be achieved through an intergovernmental agreement. Although no such agreement exists to date, discussions on a possible agreement were held during the last CMS COP in Capetown in 1999.

CBD: African elephant

17. The following Articles might apply to the African elephant: Article 7 (identification and monitoring), Article 8 (in-situ conservation) and Article 10 (sustainable use). CBD leaves most of the actual implementation of the Convention up to national states.

Ramsar: African elephant

18. The Ramsar convention would only apply if a particular African elephant habitat also happened to be a wetland, as the Conventions does not deal specifically with the African elephant species. For instance, the Lake George Ramsar site in Uganda lies within Queen Elizabeth National Park, which hosts several species protected under both CITES and CMS, including the African elephant. Ramsar decisions are focused on ecosystem protection and not individual species. In addition, the African elephant is not regarded as a "wetland species".

WHC: African elephant

19. Some natural sites listed as protected sites under WHC are also African elephant habitats. For instance, the WHC category "East African woodland/savannah natural sites" includes Serengeti National Park and Ngorongoro Conservation Area; and the "East African Highlands" category includes Mt Kenya National Park. All the aforementioned WHC sites host the African elephant. Greater St Lucia Wetland Park in South Africa, which embraces five ecosystem types and is also a Ramsar site, has seen the return of wild elephants recently.

IV.B Whale species (Order: Cetacea)

CITES: Whales

20. CITES recognises and co-operates with the management decisions of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) (see Resolution Conf. 11.4). CITES has placed all whales on Appendix I to support the IWC moratorium on whaling: Bowhead whale (*Balaena mysticetus*), Northern minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*), Southern minke whale (*Balaenoptera bonaerensis*), Sei whale (*B. borealis*), Bryde's whale (*B. edeni*), Blue whale (*B. musculus*), Fin whale (*B. physalus*), Beaked whales (*Berardius* spp.), Pygmy right whale (*Caperea marginata*), Grey whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*), Right whales (*Eubalaena* spp.), Bottle-nosed whales (*Hyperoodon* spp.), Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), and the Sperm whale (*Physeter catodon*).

21. Decisions 11.39-11.42 call for the monitoring of illegal trade in whale parts, using DNA analysis if possible.

CMS: Whales

22. Whales are migratory and covered by Appendix I and II. Certain regional Agreements made under CMS cover cetaceans, e.g. the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS) and the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS).

CBD: Whales

23. The following Articles might apply: Article 7 (identification and monitoring), Article 8 (in-situ conservation) and Article 10 (sustainable use).

Ramsar: Whales

24. Ramsar sites might include coastal areas that are part of the range of certain whale species.

WHC: Whales

25. There are areas of overlap between WHC sites and the individual species protected under other Conventions. One example is the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area, Australia, which includes the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Several threatened species use the Great Barrier Reef as a feeding ground, including the Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and the minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*). Shark Bay, Australia, is another WHC site, which is used as a

migratory staging post by the Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and southern Right whale (*Eubalaena* spp.).

IV.C. Dolphins (Order: Cetacea)

CITES: Dolphins

26. The Ganges and Indus River dolphins (*Plantanista* spp.), Humpbacked dolphins (*Sotalia* spp., *Sousa* spp.) are listed in Appendix I. Appendix II includes the La Plata River dolphin (*Pontoporia blainvillei*).

CMS: Dolphins

27. Recommendation 6.2 lists the South American dolphin populations, cited in Appendix II, as requiring co-operative action.

Ramsar: Dolphins

28. Ramsar sites might also be part of the dolphins' range.

WHC: Dolphins

29. The Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area and Shark Bay, both Australian WHC sites, host dolphins, including the Bottle-nosed dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*).

IV.D. Hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)

CITES: Hawksbill turtle

30. All sea turtles (*Cheloniidae* spp.), including the Hawksbill, are listed in Appendix I

CMS: Hawksbill turtle

31. The Hawksbill turtle is listed on both Appendix I and II. An MOU on the Conservation and management of Marine Turtles and their habitats of the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia exists.

CBD: Hawksbill turtle

32. Decision V/3 on the work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity might apply.

Ramsar: Hawksbill turtle

33. Ramsar sites might also be part of the turtle's range.

WHC: Hawksbill turtle

34. WHC sites might also be part of the turtle's range.

IV.E. Sturgeon species (Order: Acipenseriformes)

CITES: Sturgeon

35. All sturgeon and paddlefish species worldwide are covered by CITES, and appear either on Appendix I or II. Appendix I includes the Short-nosed sturgeon (*A. brevirostrum*), the Baltic sturgeon (*A. sturio*), and Dabry's sturgeon (*A. dabryanus*). The Beluga (*Huso huso*), Russian (*Acipenser gueldenstaedtii*), Stellate (*A. stellatus*), Siberian (*A. baerii*), Ship or Spiny (*A. nudiventris*), and White (*A. transmontanus*) sturgeon species are on Appendix II.

36. Resolution Conf.11.13 urges the Parties to introduce a uniform labelling system for the identification of caviar. Relevant decisions include decision 11.58 (directed to the Parties): Range States are required to declare their annual export and catch quotas for all commercial trade in Acipenseriformes. Failure to inform the Secretariat of the quotas will lead to an automatic zero quota the following year. Decision 11.162 (directed to the Secretariat) states that the Secretariat is to monitor the implementation of the universal labelling system for caviar, as well as explore mechanisms for the effective and secure labelling of caviar that is repackaged and re-exported.

CMS: Sturgeon

37. Sturgeon are migratory and are covered by Appendix II. However, no such agreement exists to date. Recommendation 6.2 calls for co-operative action to be taken by the Parties with regard to sturgeon.

CBD: Sturgeon

38. Article 10, relating to the sustainable use of an exceptionally valuable resource, might apply.

Ramsar: Sturgeon

39. Certain sturgeon habitats might also be Ramsar sites.

IV.F. Sharks (Class: *Chondrichthyes*)

CITES: Sharks

40. The FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks points out the need to pay special attention to vulnerable or threatened species. CITES decision 11.94 calls upon the Chair of the Animals Committee to liaise with FAO on the implementation of the International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks. In a similar fashion, Decision 11.151 urges the Secretariat to liaise with the World Customs Organisation regarding the classification of shark parts in trade.

CMS: Sharks

41. Recommendation 6.2 lists the Whale shark (*Rhincodon typus*), an Appendix II species, as requiring co-operative action.

CBD: Sharks

42. Decision V/3 on the work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity might apply, as well as Decision V/24 on the sustainable use of biodiversity.

Ramsar: Sharks

43. Ramsar sites might also be part of the sharks' range.

WHC: Sharks

44. WHC sites might also be part of the sharks' range.

IV.G. Houbara Bustard (*Chlamydotis undulata*)

CITES: Houbara Bustard

45. The Houbara Bustard is on Appendix I.

CMS: Houbara Bustard

46. CMS has placed the Northwest African populations of the Houbara Bustard on Appendix I and the Asian populations on Appendix II.

IV.H. Coral Reefs (Phylum: *Cnidaria*)

CITES: Corals

47. Many species are listed in Appendix II.

CBD: Corals

48. Decision V/3 on the work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity deals with corals and the issue of coral bleaching in detail. The decision notes the joint work plan for 2000-2001 with the Ramsar Convention and urges co-operation with UNFCCC, Ramsar, CITES, WHC, FAO, IPCC, and ICRAN in dealing with coral bleaching.

Ramsar: Corals

49. Some Ramsar sites also encompass coral reefs, e.g. Moreton Bay, Australia, and the Coral Reefs of Tongaland, South Africa.

WHC: Corals

50. Some WHC sites also encompass coral reefs, e.g. the Great Barrier Reef in Australia.

IV.I. Plants

51. While specific plant species are named and protected under CITES, CMS does not by definition apply to plants. CBD, WHC and Ramsar, while they do not cite individual plant species for protection, would encompass plant species in their protection of ecosystems.

CITES: Plants

52. Decision 11.60 calls upon the Parties to check if plants are in fact artificially propagated and Decision 11.61 urges the monitoring of nurseries exporting CITES-listed plants. Decisions 11.158-11.161 call upon the Secretariat to review the status of cycads, aloe products, etc.

53. Decisions 11.84-11.86 relate to the Timber Working Group and co-operation with the Harmonised System of the World Customs Organisation (WCO). Decision 11.4 establishes a Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group. Pacific coast mahogany (*Swietenia humilis*) and Caribbean mahogany (*Swietenia mahogani*) are both in Appendix II. The Bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*) populations of Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica and Mexico are in Appendix III.)

IV.J. Alien Species

CITES: Alien species

54. Decision 11.64 recognises the threat posed by trade in alien species and calls for synergies with CBD on this issue. Decisions 11.100 and decision 11.115 direct the Animals Committee and the Plants Committee respectively to foster co-operation with the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group.

CMS: Alien species

55. Although no specific mention is made of alien species, certain alien species would "migrate" with protected migratory animals (e.g. alien animal parasites, plant seeds, etc).

CBD: Alien species

56. Decision V/8 recognises that alien species may threaten ecosystems, habitats or species and contains detailed guidelines as to how to approach the issue of alien invasive species.

Ramsar: Alien species

57. Resolution VII.14 covers issues pertaining to invasive species & their potential impact on wetlands.

IMO: Alien species

58. The Marine Environment Protection Committee of IMO is working on the development of draft new regulations for ballast water management to prevent the transfer of harmful aquatic organisms in ballast water. This new convention will be considered for adoption at a diplomatic conference during 2002 or 2003. It is estimated that 10 billion tonnes of ballast water are transferred globally each year, potentially transferring invasive marine species that may prove

ecologically harmful when released into a non-native environment. This new MEA will have a two-tiered approach, with the first establishing requirements applicable to all ships and the second covering special requirements which may apply in certain areas and would include procedures and criteria for the designation of such areas in which additional controls may be applied to the discharge and/or uptake of ballast water.

IV.K. Wetlands

CITES: Wetlands

59. CITES deals with individual species under threat by trade. Some of the individual species protected by CITES may be species associated with wetland ecosystems, e.g. Venus flytrap (*Dionaea muscipula*) - Appendix II; Andean flamingo (*Phoenicopterus andinus*) - Appendix II.

CMS: Wetlands

60. Many of the migratory animal species protected under CMS are dependent upon wetland ecosystems, particularly waterbirds, e.g. White-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*). There is therefore a good deal of co-operation between CMS and Ramsar on wetlands. For example, one of the regional agreements that falls under the CMS framework, AEWA (African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement), covers wetlands specifically as stopping points for migratory waterbirds.

CBD: Wetlands

61. Decision V/2 covers the CBD work programme on biological diversity of inland water systems. The decision recognises the need for co-operation with other Conventions on wetlands and endorses the joint work plan for 2000-2001 with the Ramsar Convention. Decision V/3 refers to the work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity and again notes the joint work plan for 2000-2001 with the Ramsar Convention.

Ramsar: Wetlands

62. Resolution VII.24 is interesting in that it enforces the concept of compensation for lost wetland habitats

WHC: Wetlands

63. Several WHC sites contain wetland habitats, e.g. Greater St Lucia Wetland Park, South Africa.

V. Issues

64. In addition to covering similar species and ecosystems, certain Conventions also deal with similar cross-cutting issues, e.g. sustainable use (CBD, Ramsar, CITES), co-operation (CBD, Ramsar), restoration of habitats (Ramsar, CBD, CMS), the involvement of local communities in conservation (CBD, Ramsar), scientific nomenclature and taxonomy (CITES, CBD), whereas some issues are dealt with almost exclusively by one Convention (e.g. impact of by-catch on seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans – CMS; bushmeat - CITES; agricultural biodiversity - CBD; genetically modified organisms – CBD).

VI. REGIONAL AND GLOBAL OVERLAPS IN DECISIONS

65. Not only are the same species, ecosystems and issues covered by different conventions at the international level, there are also overlaps between international and regional agreements. For

instance, the Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) and the Mediterranean monk seal (*Monachus monachus*) fall under the following international and regional agreements:

VI.A. Harbour porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)

European Economic Community (EEC): Harbour porpoise

66. Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ("Habitat Directive") places the Harbour porpoise on Appendix II: Animal and plant species of community interest whose conservation requires the designation of special areas of conservation; and Appendix IV: Animal and plant species of community interest requiring rigorous protection.

Convention on the Conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats, Berne 1979: Harbour porpoise

67. The Harbour porpoise is listed in Appendix II: Strictly protected animal species.

CMS: Harbour porpoise

68. The species is listed in Appendix II: Migratory species to be the subject of agreements.

CITES: Harbour porpoise

69. The species is listed in Appendix II: Species which although not necessarily now threatened with extinction may become so unless their trade is subject to particularly strict regulation.

Barcelona Convention Protocol concerning specially protected areas and biological diversity in the Mediterranean, Barcelona 1995 ("Barcelona Convention"): Harbour porpoise

70. The Harbour porpoise is in Appendix 2: Endangered or threatened species.

Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area, Monaco 1996 ("ACCOBAMS"): Harbour porpoise

71. The species is included in Annex 1: indicative list of cetaceans to which this agreement applies.

VI.B. Mediterranean monk seal (*Monachus monachus*)

African Regional Convention for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Algiers 1968: Mediterranean monk seal

72. The species appears in Class A: list of protected species.

CITES: Mediterranean monk seal

73. The Mediterranean monk seal is listed in Appendix I: Species threatened with extinction, which are or may be threatened by trade.

Convention on the Conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats, Berne 1979: Mediterranean monk seal

74. The species is listed in Appendix II: Strictly protected animal species.

CMS: Mediterranean monk seal

75. The species appears in Appendix II: Migratory species to be the subject of agreements.

EEC: Mediterranean monk seal

76. Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ("Habitat Directive") places the Mediterranean monk seal on Appendix II: Animal and plant species of community interest whose conservation requires the designation of special areas of conservation; and Appendix IV: Animal and plant species of community interest requiring rigorous protection.

Barcelona Convention Protocol concerning specially protected areas and biological diversity in the Mediterranean, Barcelona 1995

77. The species is listed in Appendix 2: Endangered or threatened species

VII. REGIONAL AND GLOBAL INCONSISTENCIES IN DECISIONS

78. Another potential area of concern is possible inconsistencies and contradictions between global and regional Conventions. One example of an inconsistency between decisions taken by different international and regional Conventions relates to CITES and CMS (both global Conventions) and the regional Protocol to the Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region, namely the Protocol Concerning Protected Areas and Wild Fauna and Flora in the Eastern African Region. Annex III of the Protocol lists marine turtles as "harvestable", which might be interpreted as contradicting the complete protection under CITES (Appendix I), CMS (Appendix I) (as well as their protection under the broader regional Algiers Convention - the African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources). In a similar fashion, Annex III of the Protocol lists the African elephant as "harvestable" - this could also be interpreted as contradicting its CITES status (Eastern African elephant populations are on Appendix I) and CMS status (Appendix II). The inconsistency could be explained by the fact that Parties to the Protocol are not necessarily Parties to CITES and CMS – but it does pose a problem for those States who are Parties to all Conventions. It leaves States uncertain as to which decisions are to be implemented at the national level, and according to what criteria?

79. Another example of a potential area of difficulty between regional and international agreements relates to the Hawksbill turtle. Cuba's proposal at the CITES 2000 meeting to downlist the Hawksbill turtle from Appendix I to Appendix II, if adopted at a future CITES COP, would, by allowing legal trade in the Hawksbill, clash with the strict protection accorded by the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) of the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region. It became

necessary to hold a meeting in Mexico City this year to resolve these differences between CITES and the Cartagena Convention.

VIII. AREAS OF CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE GLOBAL CONVENTIONS

80. There is a strong drive to foster co-operation amongst the various global biodiversity-related Conventions to avoid duplication of effort and achieve their objectives in a cost-effective manner. For instance, Memoranda of Understanding and Co-operation exist between the Ramsar Convention and other environmental Conventions, including CBD, CMS, WHC, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention) and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention). This level of co-operation reduces the possibility of inconsistent decisions and actions occurring in areas of interest covered by more than one Convention. Greater details on MOUs among the biodiversity-related conventions are provided in section I.G. of UNEP/IGM/1/INF/3.

Ramsar Convention and UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (MAB)

81. There are currently 60 sites that are both Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention and Biosphere Reserves under MAB. Common sites include the Danube Delta (Romania), Langebaan (South Africa) and Lake George/Queen Elizabeth National Park (Uganda).

Ramsar Convention and World Heritage Convention

82. There are a number of Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention that are also World Heritage "natural properties" under the UNESCO WHC Convention. Common sites include the Danube Delta (Romania), Donana (Spain) and the Everglades (USA). All three sites are also MAB sites.

IX. Examples of Decisions Involving Non-Biodiversity-Related Conventions Requiring Consultations

<u>HFCs under the Montreal Protocol and the Kyoto Protocol</u>

83. The Montreal and Kyoto Protocols are linked because hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HFCs), which are included in the basket of gases of the Kyoto Protocol, are significant substitutes for some important uses of ozone depleting substances. HFCs have no ozone depleting potential but are greenhouse gases. Substituting chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) with HFCs was recognized as early as 1989 as being part of the solution to phasing-out CFCs, and this continues to be the case. Parties to the Montreal Protocol that have switched to HFCs, or are contemplating a switch, are concerned that they might be confronted at a later date with decisions under the Kyoto Protocol that would compromise the continuing use of HFCs. The uncertainty was especially acute for developing countries, since under the rules of the Multilateral Fund, a project previously funded to switch to HFCs would not be eligible for additional funding.

84. In November 1998, the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change invited the relevant bodies of the Montreal Protocol, and other organizations to provide

information on ways to limit emissions of HFCs as replacements for ozone depleting substances. At the same time, the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol took a decision to have it's Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) undertake an assessment of the implications to the Montreal Protocol of the inclusion of HFCs in the Kyoto Protocol. A joint workshop was also convened, to examine ways and means of limiting HFC emissions.

85. A TEAP Task Force was created to do the assessment. The panel concludes in a November 1999 report that the Kyoto Protocol need not interfere with the Montreal Protocol, and vice versa, if certain regulatory and technological conditions are respected. The Parties appeared generally satisfied with the Panel's conclusion, although some of the 32 major findings in the report remain contentious. The HFC issue could arise again in the future.

The Montreal Protocol and the Basel Convention

86. In December 2000 the Parties to the Montreal Protocol took a decision on disposal of controlled ozone depleting substances. The decision established a TEAP Task Force on destruction technologies, charged with producing a report for the 2002 meeting of the parties on the status of destruction technologies, including on their environmental and economic performance. TEAP itself is to evaluate the technical and economic feasibility for long-term management of contaminated and surplus ozone-depleting substances, including disposal and consider possible linkages to the Basel Convention and other international treaties regarding the issue of disposal.

87. Cooperation with the Montreal Protocol's TEAP was discussed at the Basel Convention Technical Working Group meeting in June 2001. TEAP had suggested meetings and electronic information exchange with Basel Convention experts, and their participation on two TEAP Task Forces, one on disposal and one on management options. The Basel Technical Working Group welcomed the TEAP offer, noting that gases are not covered by the Basel Convention, and agreed to work with the TEAP to better understand the issue and determine how it should be addressed. While not an example of differing positions among MEAs, this is an example of how conventions need to synchronize their efforts in order to avoid potential obstacles and inaction.

IX. Conclusions

88. It appears from the above preliminary analysis that several species, ecosystems and issues are covered by more than one global biodiversity-related Convention. Overlaps in decisions, rather than inconsistencies and contradictions, would seem to be the main issue for biodiversity-related decisions at the global Convention level. It has been noted that overlaps, inconsistencies and contradictions also occur between the international and regional conventions. It is possible that contradictory and inconsistent decisions might be more of an issue across the international/regional conventions interface, rather than amongst the global biodiversity-related Conventions. Contradictory and inconsistent decisions at the international or regional level clearly create problems at the national level when it comes to compliance and implementation.

89. In order to assess the degree to which Convention decisions may overlap with or contradict each other, either at a global or regional level, and to assess what the implications are at a national compliance and implementation level, a more detailed study would be required. The preliminary conclusions of this paper indicate that areas of overlap do occur amongst the decisions taken under the different global biodiversity-related Conventions; inconsistencies and contradictions in decision-making would seem to be less of an issue. It may be worthwhile exploring what further

opportunities for synergy and co-operation these overlaps may offer. Would there be any cost saving and increase in efficiency in harmonising the overlaps? It might be illuminating to carry out a specific case study on the impact of the overlaps in decisions at the national compliance and implementation level. For instance, Lake George and Queen Elizabeth National Park in Uganda are both Ramsar and WHC sites. They also host species protected by other global biodiversity-related Conventions: African elephants (CITES), cycads (CITES), migrant waterbirds (CMS, CITES). Such a practical case study could analyse how the overlaps interact on the ground and how they affect national attempts at compliance and implementation. Do such overlaps hinder or help conservation efforts on the ground? Is there a way of making these overlaps work more effectively?

90. However, it has to be borne in mind that overlaps in decisions do not necessarily lead to problems of national compliance and implementation, as the specific aims of the different Conventions seek to protect different factors affecting the conservation of specific species. It would also seem that the secretariats of the various global biodiversity-related conventions are taking concrete measures to collaborate on areas of mutual interest, as evidenced by the MOUs referred to above and in section I.G. of UNEP/IGM/1/INF/3.

91. The example provided for differing positions in the decision on HFCs between the Montreal Protocol and the Kyoto Protocol illustrates that, while overlaps among decisions tend to dominate, in some cases initial conflicting positions can be adopted between two MEAs.

92. In two specific cases where conflicting positions initially existed (Montreal protocol versus Kyoto Protocol on HFCs, CITES versus the Cartagena Convention on the Hawksbill turtle), the concerned MEAs held meetings to resolve these differences (see paragraphs 79 and 84). Meetings are also being held between the Montreal Protocol and the Basel Convention on the issue of how to address the disposal of gases that are surplus ozone-depleting substances.

X. Recommendations

93. In order to assess whether there are serious overlaps, inconsistencies or contradictions amongst not just the decisions of the global biodiversity-related conventions, but all the MEAs, at both the international and regional level, it is recommended that a detailed study be undertaken of all decisions made under all the agreements, bearing in mind that each COP is an independent legal body and is not necessarily obliged to take into account decisions made under other conventions.

94. Finally, sight should not be lost of the recommendation on this issue contained in UNEP/IGM/2/4, "Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion". This paper, which was presented at IGM-2 in Bonn, proposes the consideration of the establishment of a mechanism for monitoring the decisions taken under MEAs to assist in identifying inconsistencies, decisions that are out of sync, as well as opportunities for synergy. This suggestion is reiterated in UNEP/IGM/2/5, "Proposal for a Systematic Approach to Coordination of Multilateral Environmental Agreements". Through such a mechanism, MEAs would be alerted and informed of overlapping decisions, potential difficulties and opportunities for collaboration.

95. This mechanism for monitoring the decisions of COPs could be developed as a comprehensive information base on all decisions taken by MEA COPs since they entered into force. In such a system, decisions would be indexed and cross-referenced. This information base would serve as a valuable reference for promoting collaboration and co-operation among MEAs.

96. As indicated in paragraph 88, overlaps in decisions, rather than inconsistencies and contradictions, are most frequently the case. This is particularly the case for global biodiversity-related conventions. The cases looked at in section IV of this paper illustrate that a particular species or ecosystem can be addressed in decisions taken by the governing bodies of two or more MEAs. In the case of corals and wetlands, relevant decisions have been taken by four of the five global biodiversity-related conventions. If regional MEAs, such as the regional seas conventions and action plans, are taken into account, the number of MEAs with overlapping decisions on a particular species or ecosystem can be considerably more. For example, decisions regarding the conservation and sustainable use of corals have been taken by the governing bodies of at least seven regional seas conventions and action plans. The clustering approach proposed in the companion paper being considered at the Fourth Meeting of the Open-Ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or Their Representatives on International Environmental Governance offers a framework for promoting co-ordination in the implementation of related decisions. Such an approach would allow, for example, for the Global biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions to work together in preparing a collective programme of work in follow-up to their respective decisions on corals or wetlands. Perhaps the most obvious conclusion and recommendation of this report is that overlapping decisions by MEAs on related thematic issues should be implemented in close co-operation with a view to generating synergies and making better use of limited resources.

ANNEX I

	CITES	CMS	CBD	RAMSAR
African elephant	Decision 11.3 - disposal of ivory stocks/generation of resources for elephant conservation Decision 11.65 - consequences of listing of geographically separate populations	Recommendation 6.5 - Co-operative action for elephant in Western and Central Africa - cooperate with IUCN African Elephant Specialist Groups, possible Agreement. Recommendation 6.2 - Co-operative actions for App II species		
Sturgeon	Resolution Conf. 11.13 - universal labeling system for identification of caviar Decision 11.58 - Range state quotas Decision 11.59 - report implementation measures Decision 11.95 - Animals Committee to review trade in sturgeon and paddlefish Decision 11.162 - Secretariat: Monitor universal labeling system; re-packaging and export of caviar	Recommendation 6.2 - Co-operative actions for App II species		
Sharks	Decision 11.94 - Chair of Animals Committee to liaise with FAO on implementation of International Plan of Action for the Conservation and management of Sharks	Recommendation 6.2 - Co-operative actions for App II species		

	Decision 11.151 - Secretariat: Liaise with WCO re: classification of shark parts in trade			
Dolphins	Decision 11.91 - Animals Committee to review status of Black Sea bottlenose dolphin Decision 11.139 - Secretariat: Request information on Black Sea bottlenose dolphin from range and import States	Recommendation 6.2 - Co-operative actions for App II species		
Whales	Resolution Conf. 11.4 - adherence to ICRW Decisions 11.39-11.42 - monitoring of illegal trade in whale parts (DNA analysis)			
Albatrosses		Resolution 6.3 - Southern hemisphere albatrosses - possible Agreement, implement FAO's International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries		
Houbara Bustard		Resolution 6.1 - Concerted Actions for Appendix I species		
Corals	Decision 11.98 - Animals Committee - trade in hard corals Decision 11.99 - Identification of		Dec V/3 - work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity. Notes joint work plan for 2000-2001 with	

	corals at genus and species level		Ramsar Convention. Issue of coral bleaching - co-operate with UNFCCC, Ramsar, CITES, WHC, FAO, IPCC, ICRAN	
Alien species	Decision 11.64 - threat posed by trade in alien species; synergies with CBD Decisions 11.100 - Animals Committee: Co-operation with IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group Decisions 11.115 - Plants Committee: Co-operation with IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group		Dec V/8 - alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species. Guidelines.	Resolution VII.14 invasive species & wetlands
Wetlands			Dec V/2 - work programme on biological diversity of inland water systems. Recognizes need for co-operation with other Conventions on wetlands; endorses joint work plan for 2000-2001 with Ramsar Convention; alien species Dec V/3 - work programme on marine and coastal biodiversity. Notes joint work plan for 2000-2001 with Ramsar Convention	Resolution VII.24 compensation for lost wetland habitats
Compliance/Enforcement	Decisions 11.15-11.21 - national			

	legislation Decision 11.28 - checking of shipments of CITES specimens Decision 11.137 - Secretariat: submit reports on infractions to COP Decision 11.156 - Secretariat: Investigate non-reporting on timber trade			
Marine Turtles		Resolution 6.1 - Concerted Actions for Appendix I species Resolution 6.6 - Regional co-operation - Indian Ocean and South-East Asia - Marine Turtles (possible agreement, by-catch)		
Freshwater turtles & Tortoises	Resolution Conf. 11.9 - Asian national legislation to protect turtles Decision 11.93 - Animals Committee to review trade in CITES-listed specimens			
Plants	Resolution Conf. 11.11 - artificial propagation Decision 11.60 - check if artificially propagated Decision 11.61 - nurseries exporting CITES-listed plants Decisions 11.158-11.161 - Secretariat: Review status of: Cycads, aloe products, etc			

Timber trade	Decisions 11.84-11.86 - Timber Working Group - Harmonized System of World Customs Organization Decision 11.155 - Secretariat: application of artificial propagation to timber trade		Dec V/4 - work programme on forest biodiversity - conservation and sustainable use of forests. Co-operation with UNFCCC,	
Mahogany	Decision 11.4 - Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group			
Breeding animals	Resolution Conf. 11.14 - App I species for commercial purposes			
Ranched species	Resolution Conf. 11.16			
Bushmeat	Decision 11.166 - Secretariat: Convene Working Group; co-operate with ITTO, CBD, FAO, etc			
Nomenclature	Decisions 11.167-11.168 - Secretariat			
By-catch		Resolution 6.2 - protect seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans against by-catch; co-operate with CBD, FAO, etc; mitigation measure		
CMS Appendix II species		Recommendation 6.2 - Co-operative actions for App II species - i.e. seven species of petrels, whale shark, 18 species of sturgeon; African elephant, all albatrosses, African penguin,		

		South American dolphins		
Sustainable use			Dec V/24	Resolution VII.15 incentive measure to encourage wise use principle
Indigenous peoples			Dec V/16	Resolution VII.8 - guidelines for establishing and strengthening loca communities' & indigenous people' participation in the management of wetlands
Agricultural biodiversity			Dec V/5; includes bees	
Genetically Modified Organisms			Dec V/1	
Co-operation			Dec V/21	Resolution VII.3 - partnerships with international organizations; Resolution VII.19 guidelines for international co-operation under th Ramsar Conventio

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP/IGM/4/

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Implementing the Clustering Strategy for Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Framework

TABLE OF CONTENTS

pages

I. Introduction 1
Planning Contexts and Organizational Needs 1
Basis for Overlaps between MEAs 2
III. Clustering - the objective 2
Clustering and Implementation of Sustainable Development 3
IV. Approaches to Clustering 4
IV.A. Clustering at the thematic level 4
IV.A.1. Objectives and Priorities 6
Cluster 1: biodiversity-related conventions 6
Cluster 2: the atmosphere conventions 6
Cluster 3: the land conventions 6
Cluster 5: Regional seas conventions and related agreements 7
MEA clusters as tools of coherence 7
IV.A.2. Framework for Profiling Thematic Clusters 8
Finance 8
Information 8
Scientific Mechanisms 9
Implementation review 9
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) 9
Development of Common Indicators 9
Ecosystem protection and management 10
Protection of human health 10
Energy 10
Education and awareness raising 10
Participation by the Civil Society 10
IV.B. Clustering at the Functional Level 10
V. Coordination at the National Level 12
Legislative Mandate 13
Financing Mechanism 13
Coordination at the policy-making level through regular meetings of the Bureaux of the Conference of Parties 14
Regular meetings of the subsidiary bodies on scientific and technical aspects (SBSTAs) of the MEAs and collaboration among assessment bodies 14
Taking Stock of On-going initiatives, gaps and overlaps 14
Harmonization of information systems, information exchanges and information access 15
Compliance and enforcement 15
A more cost-effective and rational organization of the meetings of the MEAs 16
Co-location of MEA secretariats including common administrative support 16

This paper will be subject to further revisions following
Consultations with MEA secretariats
Draft of 25 October 2001

Implementing the Clustering Strategy for Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Framework

I. Introduction

1. The paper focuses on "clustering" as a management strategy for enhancing coordination and policy coherence among multilateral environmental agreements. It builds on two papers that were presented to the Open-ended Group of Ministers or Their Representatives on International Environmental Governance and as such form a part of the IEG process: UNEP/IGM/2/INF/3 which gives a comprehensive assessment of the status of the MEAs and their legislative mandates and UNEP/IGM/2/5 entitled "Proposal for a Systematic Approach to Coordination of MEAs".

2. The reflections and suggestions in this paper are not intended as definitive and consistent proposals for change. They should be viewed as contribution to the ongoing discussions on international environmental governance - a resource to be adapted by member countries involved in the debate.

II. Background

Planning Contexts and Organizational Needs

3. Today, the governance of global environmental affairs is mediated by an intricate web of treaties, agreements and organizations. Though treaties and agreements on aspects of environmental management go back almost to the turn of the century, since 1972, over 300 agreements have been negotiated.

4. It must be stated that the growth in the existing system of multilateral environmental agreements has been an incremental affair. The system has grown in response to manifold environmental pressures and events. These agreements - global, regional and sub-regional - respond to broad-based environmental concerns or concerns that are issue specific. It may be argued that though such an individualized ad hoc approach has given strength to each separate instrument, at the same time gaps and overlaps may have been created to the possible detriment of the overall effectiveness of the legislation.

5. Together the multilateral environmental agreements constitute a loose structure of institutions and activities, addressing fundamentally similar, and often related, issues. The human and financial resources devoted to this enterprise are substantial.

6. The deliberations at the three meetings of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Group of Ministers or Their Representatives (IGM) have provided a compelling rationale for a comprehensive effort at rationalizing, streamlining and consolidating the present system of MEAs. The UNEP/IGM/2/4 paper entitled "A Policy Paper for Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion" (presented at the meetings of the IGM in Bonn and Algiers) summarizes these challenges. These are: efficient use of collective resources--information, financial and expertise; reduction of duplication and overlaps; emphasis on programme and policy coherence; and averting fragmented sectoral initiatives. At the national level which is the focus of implementation of MEA activities, the concerns are for reduction of governments' burden of

reporting under different MEAs; assisting governments in establishing priorities and allocating resources in an era of shrinking budgets; and supporting governments in coordinating preparations/monitoring to reinforce decisions taken under various MEAs and intergovernmental processes.

7. The need to promote coherence is also manifested in the disconnects between the environmental and socioeconomic dimensions of the work of the MEAs and the absence of integrated sustainable development policy and programme frameworks at national and regional levels. This aspect has also been articulated in the meetings of the IGM.

8. Any new system for streamlining the work of the MEAs should provide a clear and unifying organizing principle. It should be designed to ensure effective responses to global environmental problems. It should integrate the essential elements necessary in order to:

   a) monitor global environmental conditions
   b) develop appropriate international policies,
   c) promote optimal strategies for collective actions and leverage implementation, and
   d) ensure compliance and timely achievement of effective results.

   It should combine thoughtful rationalization and consolidation of key functions, sharper definition of roles and a clear division of labor, and a comprehensive coordination capability, in a coherent, well-managed whole.

9. It must be stated here that implementing a coherent system such as clustering of MEAs is likely to present demanding organizational and management challenges. Nevertheless, it may emerge as the most appropriate approach to pull together and progressively strengthen the loose framework of entities which form the nascent system of governance of global environmental affairs. Such an approach would emphasize linking already existing organizations more effectively. It would refocus their mandates, add new capabilities to close functional gaps, and reconfigure and strengthen mechanisms for coordination and governance.

Basis for Overlaps between MEAs

10. There are various reasons for the overlap between multilateral environmental agreements. Some overlaps are scientific - resulting from the interlocking nature of the earth's ecosystems. Other overlaps intersect across issue areas dealt by the MEAs. Examples of these overlaps include issues of climate change and other atmospheric or stratospheric phenomena (ozone depletion) linked to regional and local problems of land degradation, desertification and biodiversity loss.

11. Another source of overlaps is policies negotiated in various institutional fora. Some of these overlaps stretch across wide policy domains, linking environmental agreements to other legal regimes or the work programmes of various inter-governmental organizations, such as international trade and investment, food and agriculture or customs control. Overlaps may also be identified at the functional or operational level of the MEAs. The reference here is to the use of common tools and approaches, reporting, capacity building and awareness raising, technology transfer and financing mechanisms.

III. Clustering - the objective

12. Clustering of MEAs may be regarded as a "tool of coherence" which when translated into structures, processes and methods of work shall bring greater policy and programmatic consistency in the work of the MEAs.

13. The objective of "clustering" as a management strategy vis-a-vis the multilateral environmental agreements is to:

a) arrange multilateral environmental agreements around a set of common elements that reflect their primary environmental goals and concerns essential to their realization.

b) enhance potential linkages and synergies within a cluster of issues specific MEAs such as those addressing various dimensions of biological diversity, chemicals etc.

c) ensure that initiatives launched in one MEA do not undermine those of another and to make the best use of available skills and resources by avoiding duplication of effort and promoting common approaches. One example is the harmonization of reporting systems to allow for their easy exchange and integrated, common environmental impact assessment policies to reduce burden on governments.

d) ensure cost-effectiveness by consolidating and integrating the administrative functions of various MEAs within clusters.

e) combine goal setting and priority setting mechanisms of various MEAs to address ecological linkages among different environmental problems at regional or subregional scales.

f) aggregate support programs for the implementation of the MEAs at the national level to ensure that they take ecological linkages into account.

g) development of harmonized mechanisms to chart progress in relation to goals and priorities agreed at the regional level.

h) reconfigure specialized information and analysis functions of related MEAs within a cluster to support integrated assessment on an ecosystems basis.

14. The clustering of MEAs will benefit their implementation at the national level: by assisting governments in tracking the many international norms they must comply with and linking discussions in one convention process to those in another; and in integrating numerous international commitments with national development plans.

Clustering and Implementation of Sustainable Development

15. The challenge of sustainable development also brings a compelling rationale to the need for coherence among international policy initiatives. It must be emphasized that all multilateral environmental agreements deal with the sustainable use of natural resources and the environment, or the protection of the environment in such a way as to ensure its sustainable use.

16. New and emerging international environmental instruments and the negotiations for those instruments routinely consider and integrate socio-economic dimensions with environmental issues. They require the full utilization of law as an instrument to achieve a balance between environmental and developmental or socio-economic considerations. Recent MEAs are not only setting ambitious goals but also supportive means for their achievement through financial mechanisms and resources, technology transfer and capacity building.

17. Focus on sustainable development requires a more holistic approach. This is an alternative to the narrow and fragmented focus on one particular instrument.

18. The current system for implementing sustainable development by the MEAs in an integrated fashion is deficient. Collaboration among governments, civil society and private business is growing through public policy networks. If the results of these activities and processes are to be

widely accessible - to those involved in each sector, as a basis for national laws or harmonized regional measures and as a resource for implementation of environmental conventions - a new system such as clustering of MEAs is required.

IV. Approaches to Clustering

19. Deliberations at the various meetings of the IGM have identified, three possible approaches to clustering: at the thematic level (of issue-specific MEAs such as the biodiversity related conventions, chemical conventions etc), at the functional level (harmonized reporting, capacity building, issues management, trade related issues etc) and at the regional level.

20. The idea behind this classification is of course to increase the overall effectiveness of the MEAs. First, by focussing on issues in such a way that issues handled by the MEAs feature similar characteristics. Second, that each cluster also exhibits corresponding institutional and organizational characteristics.

IV.A. Clustering at the thematic level

21. The core environmental conventions and related international agreements are basically divided into five clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions, the atmosphere conventions, the land conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, and the regional seas conventions and related agreements. Although the Vienna Convention is an atmospheric agreement, its Montreal Protocol could also be considered a chemicals agreement since it deals with the phasing out of the production and consumption of selected chemicals. The table below is an attempt to organize the various MEAs into thematic clusters.

TABLE 1

Core Environmental Conventions and Related Agreements of Global Significance

MEA	Date adopted	Secretariat
Atmosphere Conventions:		
1. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	1992	UN
2. Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	1997	UN
3. Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer	1985	UNEP
4. Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer	1987	UNEP
Biodiversity-related Conventions:		
5. Convention on Biological Diversity	1992	UNEP
6. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity	2001	UNEP
7. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)	1973	UNEP
8. Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)	1979	UNEP
9. Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)[1]	1995	UNEP

10. Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS)[1]	1991\	UNEP
11. Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, the Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS)[1]		ACCOBAMS Sec.
12. Agreement on the Conservation of Seals in the Wadden Sea[1]	1990	Ind. Sec.
13. Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS)[1]	1991	UNEP
14. Ramsar Convention on Wetlands	1971	IUCN
15. World Heritage Convention	1972	UNESCO
16. International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI)	1995	ICRI Sec
17. Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora	1994	KWS
Chemicals and Hazardous Wastes Conventions:		
18. Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal	1989	UNEP
19. Basel Ban Amendment	1995	UNEP
20. Basel Protocol on Liability and Compensation	1999	UNEP
21. Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Principle for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade	1998	UNEP/ FAO
22. Future Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	2001	UNEP
Land Conventions:		
23. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification	1992	UN
Regional seas conventions and related agreements		
24. Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities	1995	UNEP
25. Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona)	1976	UNEP
26. Kuwait Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution	1978	ROPME
27. Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (Abidjan)	1981	UNEP
28. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific (Lima)	1981	CPPS
29. Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment (Jeddah)	1982	PERSGA
30. Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena)	1983	UNEP
31. Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi)	1985	UNEP
32. Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region (Noumea)	1986	SPREP
33. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki)	1992	HELCOM
34. Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea from Pollution (Bucharest)	1992	BSEP
35. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic	1992	OSPAR
36. Draft Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Northeast Pacific		UNEP

37. Draft Convention for the Protection of the [Marine] [Environment] of the Caspian Sea		
38. The East Asian Seas Action Plan	1981	UNEP
39. Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment	1991	PAME
40. The Northwest Pacific Acton Plan (NOWPAP)	1994	UNEP
41. South Asian Seas Action Plan	1995	SACEP

IV.A.1. Objectives and Priorities

Cluster 1: biodiversity-related conventions

22. The scope of the biodiversity-related conventions ranges from the conservation of individual species (CITES and the Lusaka Agreement) via conservation of species, their migration routes and their habitats (CMS, AEWA, EUROBATS, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS and various MOUs) to the protection of ecosystems (CBD, the Ramsar Convention, the World Heritage Convention and the International Coral Reef Initiative--ICRI). CITES is concerned with ecosystems, specifically with ensuring that trade in specimens of CITES-listed species is limited to as to ensure those species are maintained throughout their range at a level consistent with the roles in the ecosystems in which they occur and well above the level at which they might become eligible for inclusion in Appendix I (Article IV, paragraph 3 of the Convention). The Cartagena Protocol of the CBD specifically aims at protecting both species and ecosystems by promoting the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology. Five regional seas conventions (the Mediterranean, the North-East Atlantic, East Africa, the Wider Caribbean and the South-East Pacific) have protocols or annexes on specially protected areas and wildlife (SPAWs) that cover both individual species and ecosystems. While all of these agreements aim at conserving species and/or ecosystems, several also promote their sustainable use (CBD, CITES, Ramsar and ICRI). The Cartagena Protocol promotes measures related to safeguarding the sustainable use of biodiversity against adverse effects that could be caused by living modified organisms. Likewise, the SPAWs, which are closely linked to CBD, CITES, Ramsar and ICRI, support the sustainable use of marine and coastal species and ecosystems.

Cluster 2: the atmosphere conventions

23. The Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol are closely associated in protecting the environment by eliminating or stabilizing anthropogenic emissions that threaten to interfere with the atmosphere. While the former focuses on the impacts that ozone depletion can have on human health, the latter addresses concerns that climate change may have on food production and economic development. The Montreal Protocol is well on its way to achieving its goal of gradually phasing out 96 listed ozone-depleting substances. Its overriding priority is to provide financial assistance through the Multilateral Fund to eligible developing countries to comply with the provisions of the Protocol and its amendments. The UNFCCC is in an earlier phase of implementation, with much of its future success depending on the operationalization of its Kyoto Protocol.

Cluster 3: the land conventions

24. This cluster is comprised of only one major global convention. The main objective of the UNCCD is to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing

serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa. This objective is to be achieved through effective action at all levels, supported by international cooperation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas. There are very few regional agreements in the fields of arid lands and land degradation. Most notable are the Agreement for the Establishment of the Arab Centre for the Studies of Dry and Barren Land (1970) and the Convention Establishing a Permanent Inter-States Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) (1973).

Cluster 4: the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions

25. The overarching objective of the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions is the protection of human health and the environment from pollution by specific chemicals and hazardous substances. Rotterdam Convention specifically addresses certain banned or severely restricted chemicals, as well as severely hazardous pesticide formulations, subject to international trade. The Stockholm Convention has as its priorities the phasing out of an initial list of 9 chemicals, the restriction to certain acceptable purposes the production and use of DDT, and the reduction or elimination of unintentionally produced chemicals (dioxin and furans). The Convention also has provisions to add further POPs to the treaty, and will require parties with new chemical programmes to prevent the introduction of new POPs onto the marketplace. The scope of the Basel Convention covers a broad range of hazardous wastes, including chemical wastes, subject to transboundary movements, aiming to reduce these movements to a minimum by minimizing the quantity and hazardousness of the wastes generated and by promoting the treatment and disposal of hazardous wastes and other wastes as close as possible to their source of generation. These global MEAs are complimented by regional agreements such as the Bamako Convention and the Waigani Convention, as well as the Protocol to the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources.

Cluster 5: Regional seas conventions and related agreements

26. The 17 regional seas conventions and action plans are a global mosaic of agreements with one over-arching objective: the protection and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources. They have evolved into multi-sectoral agreements addressing integrated coastal area management, including in several cases links to the management of contiguous freshwater basins; land-based sources of pollution; conservation and sustainable use of living marine resources; and impacts of offshore exploration and exploitation of oil and gas. The Barcelona Convention (1976), the oldest of these agreements, fostered the establishment of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development which is serviced by the Secretariat of the Convention. Also included in this cluster are the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA) and the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) which were both adopted in 1995. The purpose of ICRI is to mobilize governments and a wide range of stakeholders to improve management practices, increase capacity and political support and share information on the health of coral reefs and related ecosystems, including mangroves and sea grass beds. In both agreements, the regional seas conventions and action plans are regional building blocks and vehicles for the implementation of the global agreements. From a substantive point of view, the GPA is closely related to the chemicals-related conventions on issues such as agrochemicals, persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals. Likewise, the work of ICRI is closely associated with the biodiversity-related conventions, specifically CBD, CITES and Ramsar.

MEA clusters as tools of coherence

27. MEAs in the above mentioned clusters, although addressing various issues, offer a framework for coherence. The coherence is already manifest through formal and informal mechanisms that promote coordination at national, intergovernmental and inter-secretariat levels. Some MEAs have also created a number of procedures and institutions and bodies have been set up to carry out these functions. Bodies for scientific and technical advice and for assessment of information, as well as bodies for reviewing implementation and assessing compliance and consequential action in case of non-compliance are key actors under their respective governing bodies. With the understanding of the governing body, the secretariats servicing these bodies play a major roles in harmonizing approaches and take initiatives, propose action and develop modes of cooperation.

IV.A.2. Framework for Profiling Thematic Clusters

28. Key dimensions of the conditions that bear on the work of the thematic clusters include finance, information, scientific and technological mechanisms, implementation and ratification procedures, involvement of the civil society and various sustainable development activities. A snap shot view of these considerations that will be important while profiling the thematic clusters is given below.

Finance

29. While some of the global environmental conventions (ozone, biodiversity and climate change) are interlinked in terms of financing the implementation, through the Global Environmental Facility, no such link exists with other conventions. These MEAs do not enjoy any coherent, stable and long-term funding.

30. It is suggested that MEAs in the same cluster could have one financial mechanism for that cluster. Projects could then be so designed as to respond to the obligations of all or at least most of the MEAs on that cluster. This could assist the MEAs in each cluster to integrate their activities at the country level.

31. Also there will be a need for coordinated donor action in this regard to learn about the activities of the international agencies and how they relate to the objectives of the MEAs, individually and collectively. It should also be possible for the thematic clusters to design information products that assist decision makers and stakeholders at national and regional levels to evaluate the complementarity of existing international support and how to use it more efficiently for each thematic cluster.

Information

32. There is variation in the preparation and use of information between the conventions. This creates difficulties at the national level, where the lack of consistency exerts an unnecessary burden - financial, technical and human - on national institutions. It also hampers the exchange and sharing of knowledge between the secretariats. Therefore, there will be a need to streamline methodologies, procedures and formats and analysis at the thematic level of Clustering to guarantee reliability.

33. The increasing use of modern information technology for databases and harmonized Web sites will vastly improve the accessibility to high-quality information. The secretariats of MEAs within a cluster could address data collection from a technical and administrative point of view; definition of terms; harmonization of reporting by the Parties; analysis, compilation and presentation; possible integration of data; public information and need for capacity building at all levels.

34. These secretariats within a cluster could also contemplate the preparation of a cross-convention summary of achievements. Such a summary could highlight not only the commonalities of the

conventions but also the divisive features as a means to assess the overall performance of the Conventions within a cluster.

35. Joint production of educational and promotional materials should also help in reducing costs.

Scientific Mechanisms

36. Scientific assessment is the most characteristic institution of all MEAs and thematic clustering offers a range of options for strengthening this aspect. Several conventions and protocols have subsidiary scientific and technical bodies that provide the COP or MOP with advice and recommendations on the scientific and technical aspects of the implementation of their MEA.

37. A more integrated approach to scientific mechanisms and processes in the MEAs within a cluster could be of benefit for environmental and health protection. The increasing recognition of the co-dependance of ecosystems means that further cooperation between the conventions within a cluster and those outside maybe called for. Also the existing mechanisms could be evaluated, taking into account all dimensions of the issue, e.g. environmental, health, technical and policy factors.

38. It must be mentioned that few MEAs have the necessary resources to undertake scientific assessments of their own or even to review the science assessments undertaken at the national level, with a view to identifying specifically international interest. There will also be an increased need for interdisciplinary research incorporating the environmental, economic and social sciences. Apart from the IPCC, there are no fully developed science assessment mechanisms at the international level. MEAs within a cluster could focus their resources on a major issue of international environmental concern rather than distributing them widely as occurs now.

Implementation review

39. Implementation review is the responsibility of the COPs in most MEAs. One instrument to promote greater coherence among MEAS would be to institute joint implementation review of the Clusters within individual countries. Such a review would require cooperation between the cluster specific MEAs and at the same time foster greater coherence in the implementation efforts of the countries being reviewed.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

40. EIA is a common issue in many MEAs. It is a major tool for implementing an integrated approach to the protection of the environment since it requires a comprehensive assessment of the impacts of an activity on the environment as opposed to the sectoral approach. The clustering approach could consider alternatives to the proposed activity and bring facts and information on environmental impacts of relevance to more than one convention within a cluster.

Development of Common Indicators

41. It will be extremely useful to develop for each cluster of conventions a series of shared/common indicators that would assist countries in measuring the success in the application of that cluster. It must be noted that some conventions are developing indicators. The thematic clustering of conventions will assist in the development of indicators that are common to two or more conventions at the same time.

Ecosystem protection and management

42. Several conventions and protocols have explicit or implicit provisions for measures to be taken to protect the various aspects of the environment from transboundary pollution. An integrated view on ecosystem management could improve the degree of protection afforded to the ecosystems. For, example the interest in the urban environmental problems has increased interest in integrated inter-disciplinary approach to urban settlements.

Protection of human health

43. The development of MEAs has increasingly targeted not only the hazards caused by pollution to the environment, but also those to human health. Some agreements refer directly or indirectly to human health protection as one of the end points of the legislation. This concern introduces the need for epidemiological data and risk assessments for water, food and air. A common approach between issue-specific clusters would be beneficial.

Energy

44. Energy is targeted directly or indirectly by several of the agreements. Promoting energy efficiency and conservation, increasing the production and use of cleaner energy sources, managing energy demand and internalizing externalities in energy prices are major approaches to breaking the trend. Market based mechanisms aimed at motivating energy producers and users to reduce pollution are gaining in importance in governments' approaches to integrating environmental policy with sectoral policies and promoting sustainable development.

Education and awareness raising

45. There is added value in developing coordinated communication strategies within the clusters. The willingness to take on obligations increases when the reasons for the obligations are fully understood and their benefits visible.

Participation by the Civil Society

46. MEAs have distinct modalities for allowing the participation of civil society in their deliberations and decision making process. The cluster specific MEAs can formulate and apply a common approach on this issue.

IV.B. Clustering at the Functional Level

47. There are crosscutting priorities for many MEAs that are primarily of a functional nature. Leading the list are the strengthening of the capacities of Parties or member states to meet their obligations or responsibilities under these agreements, enhancing membership of governments, public education and awareness, strengthened scientific basis for decision-making, and strengthened international partnerships. The most important thematic crosscutting issue is the assessment and management of pollution, which cuts across the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, some biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions and related agreements.

48. Because they are trade-related instruments conventions such as CITES, the Montreal Protocol, the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention have much in common:

implementation and enforcement issues, identification of materials in the Harmonized System of the World Customs Organization, and training and capacity building.

49. On programmatic issues of a crosscutting nature that MEAs could collaborate on, the following issues are proposed:

    a) Implementation and compliance at the country level;
    b) common problems of the trade-related MEAs;
    c) capacity building for state of the environment assessment, risk assessment and subsequent decision-making, including a better link between science and policy.

50. Opportunities also exist for MEAs to work together in capacity building programmes related to the development of national legislation that supports the implementation of conventions and protocols at the country level. On cross-cutting issues such as the prevention and combating of illegal traffic, MEAs could cooperate with other international organizations like Interpol and the World Customs Organization.

51. The last two years has seen a marked rise in the signing of memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between conventions, signaling a period of increasing political will for MEAs to collaborate more closely in the implementation of the programmes of work of their respective agreements.

52. However, this has been concentrated principally in two clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions and action plans. In the atmosphere conventions cluster, no MOUs with other MEAs have been developed. The Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol have ad hoc agreements with other MEAs in areas of common interest. The UNFCCC has cooperative arrangements with CBD, UNCCD and the Ramsar Convention, but no MOUs.

53. In the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions cluster, there are also no MOUs with other MEAs. The Basel Convention has ad hoc cooperative arrangements with CITES, the Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol, the London Convention and its 1996 Protocol, MARPOL, the Bamako and Waigani Conventions and several regional seas conventions and their protocols. The Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions have not entered into force and, therefore, have no MOUs with other MEAs. Nevertheless, close cooperation on an informal basis is taking place between the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention.

IV.C. Clustering at the Regional Level

54. As the number of regional agreements and specialized commitments increase, it will become important to work out policy coherence at the regional level. It must be noted that international environmental governance is highly dependent on nations developing a common view of environmental problems, their urgency and the steps needed to overcome them. As a result, convention processes have increasingly embarked on regional preparatory meetings to develop regional concerns, positions and priorities.

55. The program for further development of Agenda 21 calls on CSD to promote its regional implementation and cites the need for better policy coordination at the intergovernmental level including conventions and for enhanced inter-secretariat collaboration. The UN Secretary-General's reform initiatives have drawn attention at the regional level to the need for joint bureax meetings of major regional organizations as well as improved inter-agency collaboration among all UN bodies active in the region and with non-UN organizations.

56. Other benefits of clustering the MEAs at the regional level will be the engagement of a wider group of experts, policy makers and stake-holders than at the global level and identification of joint regional initiatives on issues such as information resources management or capacity building. While projects of multiple benefits may be designed at any level, coordinating numerous field activities by different international agencies is more likely to be successful at national and regional levels.

57. Governments in each region could convene periodic regional coordination meetings to consider in an integrated manner and in relation to priorities identified in the region the ecological linkages among MEAs and among implementation programs supported by international bodies. Interagency preparations for these meetings could include representatives of both global and regional conventions as well as the global and regional intergovernmental organizations active in the region.

58. An achievable institutional goal is the co-location at the regional level of regional MEA secretariats together with liaison officers representing global MEA secretariats.

V. Coordination at the National Level

59. It is of paramount importance that clustering at the international level (including the financing approach) be replicated at the national level. An integrated national perspective provides a sound basis for moving to wider regional discussion of shared problems, ecological linkages and global influences. This will call for national interdepartmental coordinating processes which address convention specific issues as well as linkages among them. National plans and programs (NAPs) prepared pursuant to the integrated approach of the thematic clusters of the MEAs will assist in identifying environmental issues relevant to more than one convention, environmental resources shared by more than one country and similar environmental issues occurring in more than one country that are not physically shared.

60. The integrated action plans and programmes of the thematic MEA clusters may lead to an integrated National Action Plans to implement the Conventions through and establishing clear national priorities. The development of harmonized information systems will help in combining and analyzing NAPs to diagnose and address shared problems and linkages among them.

VI. Moving Towards the Clustering Approach

Legislative Mandate

61. The first issue for effective clustering is to develop and adopt the appropriate legislative authority for the purpose. So far the existing mechanisms for enhancing coordination and policy coherence have been established mostly for the secretariats of the MEAs in the form of MOUs and in a few cases in the form of joint work plans which were later endorsed by the Conference of the Parties. Thus, the clustering of the MEAs has so far been a bottom down approach led by the secretariats rather than a bottom up approach led by the Contracting Parties and the COPs. Contracting parties have been complaining about the proliferation of treaties and national reports. They must now address these problems and encourage, even direct the MEAs to work together.

62. This legislative authority should establish concrete ways and means for the clusters to operate. This should include the preparation of a joint work plan for all the MEAs in each cluster. The plan should be based on the work plans/strategic plans and COP decisions of each MEA both in questions of substance and modus operandi (including the work of the subsidiary bodies and schedule of meetings)

63. It must be noted that COPs and their subsidiary bodies are self governing since states parties may only influence the work of these organs by acting through them.

64. COP's functions are the following:

    a) it oversees the operation of the convention secretariat;

    b) adopts the procedures governing the exchange of information mandated by the convention;

    c) it assesses the scientific information received by subsidiary bodies;

    d) it ensures the coherence of adopted policies, negotiates convention protocols, amendments and appendices; creates subsidiary bodies;

    e) it oversees the implementation of the convention.

65. COPs also determine the frequency of meetings and decisions are usually arrived at through consensus.

66. The question for decision is therefore whether the COPs should be requested to approve the legislation on clustering? Or should the WSSD in Johannesburg decide on this and its decision be binding on all the COPs? Or should the GMEF take a decision on this regard?

Financing Mechanism

67. The effectiveness of the MEAs is conditioned by their financial health and stability. Negotiations over financial resources and mechanisms were at the heart of UNCED's deliberations. Even a cursory perusal of Agenda 21 would show that each chapter, and often each separate programme within a chapter, contained an estimate of the financial resources if the actions called for were to be successfully implemented. These estimates were in turn broken down between those resources which would be raised domestically and those which would be provided externally through official aid flows, whether bilateral or multilateral or through private investments, loans etc.

68. As mentioned earlier, a single financing mechanism for each of the thematic clusters must be explored and considered. Several projects could then be designed as to respond to the obligations of all or at least most of the MEAs in that cluster.

Coordination at the policy-making level through regular meetings of the Bureaux of the Conference of Parties

69. It is recommended that the Bureaux of the Conference of the Parties meet regularly, (preferably once a year) to consider in an integrated manner the priorities of their programmes of work and linkages with other MEAs and IGO processes.

70. The Agenda for these meetings could encompass objectives such as:

    a) Promotion of cooperation and complementarity at the policy level;

    b) Joint efforts in responding to basic human needs such as poverty alleviation, food security, access to clean water and energy demands, among others;

    c) Building synergies at the programmatic, scientific and technical levels;

    d) Avoiding potential inconsistencies among decisions adopted by the COPs of the MEAs.

    e) Monitoring of implementation of decisions

71. As appropriate, these meetings could be organized at the global level or at the cluster level (for example, the biodiversity-related conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions). UNEP could be asked to be the convener and secretariat of these meetings. The recommendations of these meetings would subsequently be presented to the respective COPs by the Chairpersons of the Bureaux. A programme of work could be prepared for these meetings and presented to the Global Ministerial Environmental Forum to make this idea a reality.

Regular meetings of the subsidiary bodies on scientific and technical aspects (SBSTAs) of the MEAs and collaboration among assessment bodies

72. Scientific and technical assessments are vital to the effective implementation of MEAs. So far these assessments are organized to support particular agreements and negotiations. Certainly there is information that is common across assessments, which would suggest the need for coordination amongst the MEAs to exploit particular linkages.

73. Annual or periodic meetings of the SBSTAs of the MEAs including the STAP of GEF could go a long way in aiding this process of coordination. A comprehensive biennial report could be prepared providing a synopsis of the reports of the panels of different but related MEAs which could also help promote interlinkages and synergies at the scientific and technical level. These joint meetings could be dovetailed with the meetings of the Bureaux of the COPs.

Taking Stock of On-going initiatives, gaps and overlaps

74. MEAs should take stock of ongoing initiatives by undertaking an in depth transparent study on prospects for true synergies and existing bottlenecks involving all stakeholders. Such an overview would not only help to get a comprehensive perspective on the activities of the MEAs but also likely to detect potential room for synergies and better coordination among MEAs and IGOs. In addition, this survey should identify current institutional hurdles and bottlenecks and ask what concrete steps can be taken to facilitate and enhance coordination and collaboration among MEAs. The overview should also arrive at a preliminary cost-benefit analysis of individual initiatives and the ultimate impact of leveraging synergies and how it can be improved. This will require inputs from countries addressing the operational impact and measurable impact of coordination among the MEAs.

Harmonization of information systems, information exchanges and information access

75. Benefits of harmonization of reporting will accrue to all stakeholders, including national governments, MEA secretariats and governance bodies. At the national level, governments will be encouraged to identify a consolidated list of obligations in a cross-sectoral manner, identify national priorities on implementation of MEAs in a holistic manner, improve awareness of national obligations and compliance of MEAs within governments at all levels, identify gaps in national legislation and policies and improve the ability to implement country-driven actions in support of treaty commitments. For additional information concerning harmonization of reporting of the biodiversity-related conventions, please refer to document UNEP/IGM/3/CRP.6.

76. Harmonization of reporting will also benefit MEA secretariats. It will enable them to encourage and support governments in (a) the implementation of their own national priorities; (b) the preparation of global, regional and thematic analyses to help the COPs to assess achievement of treaty objectives and setting future priorities; (c) improving an integrated analysis capacity and an enhanced ability to coordinate interagency programmes of work through sharing of information and experiences; and (d) improved linkages with international environmental monitoring agencies, major data custodians and regional treaties.

77. The future implementation of the harmonization of national reporting can be achieved through short term and medium term objectives. The short-term will encompass objectives such as test and reviewing the opportunities and needs for a range of potential mechanisms for increased streamlining and harmonization, and providing supporting tools and demonstration actions to assist both contracting parties and secretariats in the process of streamlining.

78. In the medium-term, the objectives will be to review the results of these tests and identify how to implement them in the context of the needs and governance structures of the different MEAs, and identify further actions to be taken at the national and international levels to increase streamlining and harmonization, including inter alia capacity building at the national level.

79. Achieving these objectives will require standing linkages between the MEAs in a number of areas, including inter alia:

    a) further harmonization and interlinkages of websites and other information dissemination;

    b) consistency on information management practices and technologies;

    c) coordination of scientific methodology considerations such as indicators;

    d) developing and coordinating a joint capacity building programme in information management and related Internet technology.

Compliance and enforcement

80. There is a need to focus the attention of the MEAs within clusters on the advancement and enhancement of the implementation of agreed international norms and policies, as well as to foster compliance with environmental principles and international agreements.

81. Proposed areas of coordinated action between the MEAs include:

a) joint promotion and strengthening of regular exchange of information, training and public awareness programmes to support compliance with MEAs, including at the cluster level;

b) undertaking joint research initiatives to assess and determine the extent, size and magnitude and nature of legal and illegal trade in MEAs;

c) joint development of guidelines for cooperation at national, regional and global levels on compliance and enforcement of MEAs;

d) coordinated action to support parties to the environmental conventions to develop and/or strengthen national laws and regulations to enhance enforcement and compliance with MEAs.

A more cost-effective and rational organization of the meetings of the MEAs

82. The proliferation of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties, inter-sessional consultations and meetings of the Subsidiary Bodies on Scientific and Technical Advice are costly and unsustainable. There are considerable savings to be realized by rationalizing and systematizing the various meetings held under the aegis of the MEAs. The prevailing situation with shortage of funds should also provide an impetus for developing a sound strategy for organizing these consultations.

83. The most obvious way is to host COPs of conventions within a cluster back to back in the same location. The most obvious costs are for conference facilities, which are usually covered by the host government. Additionally there are considerable costs borne by the participating delegates, observers and the media to cover airfares and accommodation. Finally, there are costs related to setting up temporary offices and communication infrastructure. Additionally there will almost certainly be cost savings for the secretariats by opting to pool resources when hosting two COPs back to back. Similarly, governments would be able to realise cost-efficiency gains by maintaining the same communications infrastructure for both conventions. In addition, carefully planned back-to-back events would facilitate greater substantial crosscutting negotiations, and would probably weed out substantive inconsistencies or grey area issues that still exist within the international regime of international law.

84. The joint meetings of the COPs and their subsidiary bodies may seem difficult to achieve, but after some experience, we should be able to arrive at a situation in the future where MEAs in the same cluster could have a common Bureau/Standing Committee without necessarily having to reach the point of merging the MEAs.

Co-location of MEA secretariats including common administrative support

85. Co-location of secretariats could be an important cost saving mechanism, since a large number of administrative services and information management systems could be shared.

UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/7

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans

Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Improving the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities through Improved Coastal and Ocean Governance

MINISTERIAL HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT AND MONTREAL DECLARATION ON THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

Note by the secretariat

1. Ministers and other high-level officials attending the first Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (Ministerial/High-level segment to be held on 29-30 November 2001), are invited to provide strategic policy guidance to further the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, particularly on coastal and ocean governance and on financing the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, building on the discussions of the multi-stakeholder segment of the Intergovernmental Review Meeting to be held from 26 to 28 November 2001, prior to the ministerial segment.

2. Ministers and other high-level officials will be invited to incorporate that guidance into the Montreal Declaration on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities. They will also be invited to provide direction on how to ensure implementation of the Montreal Declaration by the wider international community, including actions relating to the forthcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in Johannesburg, in September 2002.

3. It is envisaged that the Montreal Declaration will reflect the commitments and determination of the Ministers and High-level officials to effectively address the protection of the coastal and marine environment from land-based activities in the broader context of sustainable development, integrated river basin and land-use planning, and coastal and ocean management. The overarching aim of this process and the final Montreal Declaration is to enhance the health and livelihoods of coastal populations and reduce poverty.

4. The Montreal Declaration is expected to include elements on: the status report on implementation of the Global Programme of Action, for the period 1995-2001; the approach to developing the draft recommendations for decision-making on municipal wastewater; the costed work programme of the Global Programme of Action for the period 2002-2006; improved implementation of the Global Programme of Action through improved coastal and ocean governance; building partnerships and financing the implementation of the Global Programme of Action; concrete recommendations to the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) at its twenty-second session; and concrete recommendations to the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002.

5. In this context, ministers and other high-level officials are invited to consider the attached agenda paper on coastal and ocean governance, giving particular regard to:

(a) The specific actions required at the international, regional, national and local levels;

(b) The role of Governments, regional and international governmental and non-governmental organizations, financial institutions, private sector and civil society;

(c) The institutional, legislative and financial issues.

A. Introduction

6. Some 80 per cent of the pollution load to the oceans originates from land-based activities. The economic value of goods and services provided by the oceans has been estimated at $23 million million per annum[1].

7. Land-based sources of marine pollution and the physical alteration and destruction of coastal habitat impact on both the natural and human resource base, habitats and species, and thus on the health and well-being of coastal communities and their hinterlands. The seriousness of the problem is illustrated by the impact of municipal wastewater discharges (sewage), which have been identified as one of the most significant threats to sustainable coastal development worldwide. For example, pathogenic organisms in wastewater-contaminated marine and estuarine waters cause massive transmissions of infectious diseases to bathers and consumers of raw and undercooked shellfish, with a global economic impact recently estimated at $10 thousand million per annum[2].

8. In a serious attempt to respond to these problems, 108 Governments and the European Commission committed themselves to protect and preserve the coastal and marine environment by adopting the Global Programme of Action and the Washington Declaration on Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities at an Intergovernmental Conference in Washington, DC, in November1995 (UNEP (OCA)/LBA/IG. 2/7, UNEP (OCA)/LBA/ IG.2/6).

9. The basic premise of the Global Programme of Action is that a clean and healthy coastal and marine environment is essential for many of the goods and services that directly or indirectly support national economic development, and that incorporating the Global Programme of Action into national development plans or environmental policies will address key issues such as food security, poverty alleviation, public health, and the conservation and protection of coastal and marine ecosystems. Consequently, the Global Programme of Action adopts an integrated policy approach to the multisectoral challenges of coastal and marine degradation. Successful implementation of the Global Programme of Action will result in environmental, economic and social benefits, and lead to integrated coastal zone and watershed management.

10. Coastal zones and oceans currently do not receive the international attention they deserve, commensurate with their importance and contribution to the economic and social well-being of the coastal population which accounts for approximately 50 per cent of the world population.

11. The awareness of the impact of land-based activities on the coastal and marine environment, and the need to implement the Global Programme of Action to ensure long-term sustainability of this vital resource, is generally low. As a result, the Global Programme of Action has yet to translate its potential into fully effective action across a broad front. Effective coordination mechanisms are needed, around which the objectives and activities of the Global Programme of Action can coalesce, thus enlisting broad stakeholder involvement and mobilizing political will to implement the Programme.

B. The challenge of the first Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action

---

[1] Costanza, R. *et al.* 1998. The value of ecosystem services: putting the issues in perspective. *Ecological Economics*, 25 (1998) 67-72

[2] GESAMP 2001. Protecting the Oceans from Land-based Activities – Land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment. Rep. Stud. GESAMP No. 71, 162 pp, GESAMP 2001. A Sea of Troubles. Rep. Stud. GESAMP No. 70, 35 pp.

12. The challenge of this first Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action is to change the situation described above, by involving Governments, the private sector, civil society, donor, financial and multilateral communities, in efforts to:

(a) Bring to the fore the social, economic, human health and environmental benefits that can be derived from implementing the Global Programme of Action;

(b) Bring the Global Programme of Action into the mainstream of national policies and programmes, within the framework of regional and global cooperation;

(c) Develop realistic guidance on how to finance the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

IMPROVING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES THROUGH IMPROVED COASTAL AND OCEAN GOVERNANCE

A. Primary issue for consideration

13. What needs to be considered primarily are the specific measures required to improve the current coastal and ocean governance framework for the purpose of accelerating implementation of the Global Programme of Action at global, regional and national levels.

B. Setting the scene

14. The activities under the Global Programme of Action are closely related to the work of a number of global and regional conventions and multilateral agreements, as well as to that of United Nations organizations, international financial institutions and other partners. The Global Programme of Action's integrated and action-oriented approach offers opportunities for the development of synergies and linkages: between Governments, within the United Nations and multilateral system, and with other partners. The first Intergovernmental Review Meeting on the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action lends itself, therefore, to a discussion about enhancing coastal and ocean governance, with the overall goal of improving the delivery of the Programme. In this regard, this first intergovernmental review can contribute to global discussions on environmental governance more broadly (UNEP Governing Council decision 21/21 of 9 February 2001), and their translation into concrete action and measurable progress at the regional and national levels.

15. In particular, it is anticipated that the outcomes - including the Montreal Declaration - of the first Intergovernmental Review Meeting will have direct relevance to governance issues to be considered, inter alia, at the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)-Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) Global Conference on Oceans and Coasts at Rio+10 (Paris, 3-7 December 2001), the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2-11 September 2002) and future meetings of the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process established to facilitate the annual review by the General Assembly of developments in ocean affairs (Consultative Process on Ocean Affairs).

C. Global context

16. Mindful of the importance of the oceans and seas for the earth's ecosystem, including climate change, in terms of providing the vital resources for food security, sustaining economic prosperity, and the well-being of present and future generations, the United Nations General Assembly, at its fifty-fourth session, emphasized the need to improve cooperation and coordination at both intergovernmental and inter-agency levels, in order to address all aspects of oceans and seas in an integrated manner.

17. This need led to the establishment of the Consultative Process on Ocean Affairs, a process designed to help prepare for the annual oceans discussion by the General Assembly by focusing on improving coordination between Governments and the United Nations system within the framework of the existing architecture of global ocean governance.

18. Based on the recommendations of the Consultative Process on Ocean Affairs, the General Assembly, at its fifty-fifth session, expressed deep concern at the degradation of the marine environment, particularly from land-based activities. Emphasizing the need for international cooperation to address this problem, the General Assembly reaffirmed the importance of ensuring full implementation of the Global Programme of

Action and called upon relevant United Nations agencies and programmes to fulfill their roles in support of the Programme.

19. Due to its focus on the benefits to the marine environment, the Global Programme of Action is frequently identified by the international community as a "marine" initiative. However, the Programme is actually a terrestrial initiative requiring integration of freshwater management with coastal zone management in a holistic ecosystem approach. There is a clear need to strengthen the linkages between international freshwater, coastal and marine initiatives in order to draw out the benefits of integrated action.

D. Regional context

20. At the regional level, the international community (through the Global Programme of Action) has recognized the UNEP regional seas programmes as a key mechanism for implementing the Global Programme of Action. Some of the regional seas programmes have well-developed mechanisms and legal frameworks which provide the necessary infrastructure to support the implementation of a complex and demanding programme such as the Global Programme of Action. However, the various regional seas programmes (both those linked and those not linked to UNEP) are not equal in terms of political support, infrastructure, expertise or their financial capacity to implement effective action to address land-based activities. In some regions, multilateral legal instruments either do not exist or are outdated. Where multilateral legal instruments do not exist, it is not certain that non-binding action plans or programmes of work would be sufficient to ensure implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

21. If the regional seas programmes are to become the main mechanism for the regional delivery of the Global Programme of Action, their capacity to do so must be enhanced. It is timely, therefore, to reflect on the different world in which the regional seas programmes are now operating, in relation to the one in which they were conceived in the 1970s.

E. National and local context

22. Action at the national level is fundamental and the main guarantee for the protection of the marine environment from land-based sources of pollution. National action can reflect local priorities and circumstances, including unique ecosystem characteristics, social, cultural and economic dynamics. Key actions at the national level can include, but are not limited to:

(d) The development and/or adaptation of national programmes of action, multi-sectoral strategies or policies, legislation and administrative or fiscal measures relevant to land-based activities;

(e) The development, funding and implementation of concrete projects at the national, provincial and local levels.

23. The main objectives of the Global Programme of Action should be incorporated into national policies and programmes, such as sustainable development strategies, local Agenda 21s and environmental strategies. This will consequently ensure that the Programme will be progressively incorporated in the international arena. As decisions regarding the protection of the marine environment are systematically discussed and adopted in appropriate international forums, implementation of the Programme will be enhanced through various regional and global instruments.

F. Stakeholders

24. Since the adoption of the Global Programme of Action in 1995, awareness has been raised of the crucial role of the private sector and civil society in moving the sustainable development agenda forward. It is clear

that, for the Global Programme of Action to be successful, its implementation should involve not only Governments, but also other stakeholders and new sources of finance.

25. Active participation by non-government stakeholders in implementing the Global Programme of Action will increase acceptance of responsibility for marine pollution. It will strengthen present efforts but will also produce new and innovative ways of addressing marine pollution and further integrating sectoral management as it relates to the natural environment.

G. Options for improving the current coastal and ocean governance framework for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action

26. The following list of options relating to the primary issue outlined above, are provided for consideration by ministers and high-level officials attending the first Intergovernmental Review Meeting of the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action. It is a non-exhaustive list and other options may be proposed during the multi-stakeholder segment of the meeting:

(f) Incorporate (bring into the mainstream) the Global Programme of Action more effectively into the mandates and work plans of: United Nations organizations; global conventions and multilateral environmental agreements; regional conventions and multilateral environmental agreements; regional seas conventions and action plans; international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility, by, for example:

Governments (working unilaterally or as groups) seeking to incorporate the Global Programme of Action into the mandates and work plans of existing global and regional mechanisms and organizations through, inter alia, decisions by Conferences of the Parties, memoranda of understanding and joint programmes between multilateral environmental agreements related to Global Programme of Action objectives;

Calling for the inclusion of an oceans cluster on the agenda of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, and feeding the outcomes of the first Intergovernmental Review Meeting of the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action into that cluster, as well as the output of other international coordination mechanisms such as the United Nations Informal Consultative Process on Oceans;

(g) Facilitate global, regional and national cooperation and linkages between initiatives, agreements and organizations relating to the management of river catchment basins, the coastal zone and the marine environment, by, for example:

(i)Strengthening institutional cooperation between river basin authorities, port authorities and coastal managers;

Incorporating coastal management considerations into relevant legislation and regulations pertaining to river basins;

Making optimum use of forums such as the International Conference on Freshwater (Bonn, 3-7 December 2001), the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, September 2002), the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (The Hague in 2002), and the Third World Water Forum (Kyoto, March 2003);

(h) Broaden the scope and strengthen the capacity of regional seas programmes to implement the Global Programme of Action, by, for example:

(ii)Calling on the Conferences of the Parties to address implementation of the Programme of Action as a standing agenda item;

(iii)Encouraging regional seas conventions and action plans to adopt legally binding measures, such as specific protocols, to address regional problems of land-based activities;

(iv)Bringing into the mainstream regional seas programmes with regional development and watershed management plans;

(v)Using regional seas programmes to provide forums for involving all stakeholders, including regional development banks, economic commissions, United Nations organizations and civil society, in cooperative actions to address priority problems;

(i) Improve cross-sectoral cooperation among regional organizations and agreements, such as the UNEP Regional Seas Programme, the UNESCO-IOC regional commissions, regional fisheries management organizations, regional health organizations, regional ministerial forums, economic and social commissions and development banks, by, for example:

(vi)Developing joint work programmes;

(vii) Participating in respective governing bodies;

(j) Incorporate the Global Programme of Action into national, provincial or local development and action plans, by, for example:

(viii)Developing national programmes of action on land-based activities;

(ix)Incorporating the Global Programme of Action objectives into integrated natural resource management, development and sectoral policies, such as tourism, fisheries, energy and transport;

(k) Facilitate, at all levels, extensive stakeholder participation and commitment to implement the Global Programme of Action, by, for example, bringing key stakeholders, such as the private sector, financial institutions, and civil society, together around concrete problems in innovative partnerships to assess, finance and implement appropriate technological, institutional and financial solutions to the problems.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4.5.1

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

A Summary of Critical Problems and Issues Facing Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

A Summary of Critical Problems and Issues Facing Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

For the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, fourteen regional seas programmes provided documents on critical problems and issues that they are facing in their respective regions. To facilitate the Roundtable Discussion under agenda item 5, UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions has summarized the major points presented, which are provided below by region. A number of common issues cut across several regional seas programmes. A the top are conservation of natural resources, including coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass beds and fisheries, followed by resource mobilization, capacity building, responding to marine pollution, land-based sources of pollution and monitoring and assessment.

South Asian Regional Seas Programme

1. Do not feel that a convention is needed at this time.
2. Mobilization of additional financial resources to the SACEP Trust Fund for programme implementation. Have bit been in attracting required additional resources.
3. Lack of trained personnel in the region. Possible solution would be to establish a network of training activities among regional seas programmes that would be open to participation of all regional seas programmes.
4. Principal critical substantive issues be addressed include: integrated coastal zone management, national and regional oil spill contingency planning, human resource development through strengthening of regional centres of excellence, protection of the marine and coastal environment from land-based sources of pollution.

Barcelona Convention and Mediterranean Action Plan

1. Major emphasis placed on the development of a comprehensive legal framework.
2. Priority given to improving national capabilities to monitor and assess marine pollution.
3. The major challenge is to successfully assist and accompany the governments, through a long term process, in the identification and application of appropriate financial and technological instruments, the full involvement of the private sector, the building of adequate national institutional and scientific structures, and finally the proper participation of citizens and NGOs. This is basically being done within the framework of the Mediterranean's Strategic Action Plan (SAP).
4. Through the SAP, sectoral strategic plans have been prepared, financial instruments are being identified on a country by country basis, capacity building is being promoted, national inter-ministry coordination committees have been established, pre-investment studies for priority projects have been conducted and the institutional basis for the formulation of national action plans have been created.
5. Beside marine pollution, other priority substantive areas include nature conservation and integrating environment ad development, largely through the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development.

East Asian Seas

1. Contributions by Member States inadequate to support the EAS Regional Coordination Unit and the implementation of programme activities (projects).
2. A major challenge is the differing stages of development of the Member States that range from developed countries to countries still recuperating from the ravages of war (Cambodia).
3. Language of documentation a serious problem since documents are principally in English but with few exception (Australia and Singapore) English is not a major language in the Member States.
4. EAS recently adopted a ten-year plan that focuses on reducing marine and coastal degradation but is very dependent on suitable funding. Major funds have been mobilized for the South China Seas

Project from the Global Environment Facility that is closely linked to the GPA Regional Programme of Action.

5. Critical issues being addressed include reducing the loss of mangrove forests and biodiversity through environmentally sound shrimp farming and GIWA.
6. Innovate funding options need to be explored.

Kuwait Regional Convention and Protocols

1. Like the Mediterranean, this programme has a strong legal framework.
2. Nevertheless, major challenges face the region in reducing pollution and environmental degradation.
3. Major environmental challenges include land-based sources of pollution, offshore operations, pollution from ships, largely from oil spills, and conservation of biodiversity. In recent years biodiversity has been severely impacted by extremes of temperature, salinity, sedimentation and pollution. Marine mortality episodes have become a familiar phenomena, affecting fish, dolphins, dugongs, whales, waterfowl, algae and coral.
4. The draining of the marshlands of Mesopotamia is posing a serious threat to the ecological balance of the region.
5. ROPME is placing great importance on the use of satellite based technologies for environmental monitoring and research activities.

The Red Sea and Gulf Aden

1. A priority of this regional seas programme is to address threats to the coastal and marine environment. These include the degradation of the arid coastal zone, the disturbance of coastal wetland, the clearing and degradation of mangroves, the loss of seagrass beds and the destruction of coral reefs.
2. On the management side, PERSGA is promoting activities in the following areas: environmental assessment, survey of natural habitats and formulation of plans for their protection, evaluation of the status of marine mammals, development of an oil spill trajectory model for the Red Sea, establishment of a network of sea level gauges and regional training activities.
3. A major activity of this regional seas programmes, with funding from the GEF and support from UNEP is the development of a Strategic Action Programme for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden that contains elements on capacity building, reducing navigation risks and marine pollution, sustainable use and management of marine resources, conservation of biodiversity, including the development of a regional network of marine protected areas, integrated coastal zone management and public awareness and participation.

The Abidjan Convention for Western and Central Africa

1. Need to update and restructure the Abidjan Convention and its associated Protocol to respond to the realities and changing circumstances faced by Member States.
2. The critical need to develop a sustainable financing mechanism.
3. The critical need for more cost-effective regional coordination arrangements and mechanisms.
4. Increased coordination between the Abidjan and the Nairobi Conventions.
5. Besides financial constraints, the most critical issue facing this convention is the lack of capacity for communication. This is basically a technological obstacle.

The Helsinki Convention for the Baltic Sea

1. The focus of the convention has shifted in emphasis away from marine pollution from shipping to land-based sources of pollution.
2. Establishment of new reporting requirements and more timely assessment products.
3. Reduction and elimination of pollution from land-based sources of pollution, with special focus on the agricultural sector.
4. Revitalization of the Baltic Seas Joint Comprehensive Environment Action Programme (JCP), including the involvement of the private sector through the establishment of joint private-public partnerships.

5. Sharing of experiences with other regional seas programmes, including through the Twinning Arrangement between the Helsinki and Nairobi Conventions.
6. Resource mobilization has been an area of priority concern and action and a great detail of detail is provided on how this issues has been addressed.
7. Other critical issues addressed include eutrophication, hazardous substances, relevant issues from land transport sector, relevant issues from maritime transport sector, environmental impacts of fisheries management and practices and the protection and conservation of marine biodiversity.

Nairobi Convention for East Africa

1. Major area of concern is the joint implementation of the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions.
2. Strengthening of the institutional infrastructure of the convention.
3. Protection and management of coral reefs through the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) funded largely by the United Nations Foundation.
4. Operationalization of the Twinning Arrangement with the Helsinki Convention, focussing on monitoring and assessment, prevention of pollution from land-based sources, nature conservation and integrated coastal zone management and lessons learned regarding the involvement of international financial institutions.

South-East Pacific (Lima Convention)

1. This regional seas programme has a highly developed legal framework consisting of a convention and five protocols and agreements.
2. Research and monitoring of the marine environment.
3. Integrated coastal zone management.
4. Marine and coastal protected areas and biodiversity.
5. Conservation of the marine mammals of the South-East Pacific.
6. Impacts of climate change of marine and coastal ecosystems.
7. A major focus of the Action Plan has been national capacity building.
8. Lack of funds is the major problem that the Action Plan is currently facing.

Caribbean Environment Programme

1. Financial situation has improved, but major challenges still remain concerning maintaining the level of Government support currently enjoyed.
2. Three main strategic objectives include improved project planning and management, increased marketing and stakeholder involvement.
3. Resource mobilization has become a major focus, which explains why the financial situation has improved.
4. Part of the success has been to market itself effectively with the Member States.
5. More attention being given to the involvement of the private sector and NGOs.
6.

Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)

1. Prevention of marine pollution from land-based sources of pollution is a top priority.
2. Prevention of marine pollution from offshore oil and gas activities.
3. Prevention of marine pollution from shipping.
4. Implementation of existing legal instruments such as UNCLOS, the London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution form the Disposal of Wastes at Sea, and the UN ECE Protocols on POPs and heavy metals.
5. Integrated and cost effective actions in areas such as integrated ocean management and capacity building.

Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP)

1. Priority at the moment is the establishment of the Regional Coordinating Unit for NOWPAP, which will be decided at the Sixth Intergovernmental Meeting in Tokyo in early December 2000.
1. Governments in the future may consider the establishment of a legal framework for this regional seas programme.
2. Establishment of a comprehensive database and information management system.
3. Survey of national legislation, objectives, strategies and policies.
4. Establishment of a collaborative regional monitoring programme with the assistance of IOC/UNESCO.
5. Development of effective measures for regional co-operation in marine pollution preparedness and response, with the assistance of IMO.
6. Establishment of supportive regional activity centres (RACs).
7. Public awareness on the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment.

Black Sea Environment Programme

1. Ecosystem degradation from eutrophication and the over exploitation of marine and coastal resources.
2. Inadequate sewage collection and treatment.
3. Industrial hot spots.
4. Lack of port reception facilities and high risks of accidental pollution.
5. Threats to ecosystems.
6. Have carried out a transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) which led to the formulation of the Strategic Action Plan for the Rehabilitation and Protection of the Black Sea (SAP), with support from the GEF.
7. The First Phase of the Black Sea Environment Programme focused on the development and implementation of proper environmental legislation and policies, capacity building, and the facilitation of preparations for environmental investments.
8. A major priority is the GPA.
9. Future financial requirements will need to be attended.

North-East Pacific (NEP)

1. A convention is being negotiated and should be adopted by the middle of 2001.
2. A regional diagnostic assessment of land-based sources of pollution has been initiated.
3. Coordination with the Wider Caribbean is being considered.
4. Monitoring and assessment of marine pollution will be a priority.
5. A strong sustainable development focus is being developed which includes the issue of sustainable management of fisheries, integrated coastal zone management, food security, environmental security and the active involvement in the programme of the private sector, local authorities and civil society.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/2

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Caspian Sturgeon Resources: Stakeholders' Meeting (Palais de Nations, 12-13 July 2001)

Caspian Sturgeon Resources: Stakeholders' Meeting
Palais des Nations, 12-13 June 2001

Report of the Meeting

Abbreviation list

CBD:	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEP:	Caspian Environment Programme
CITES:	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CMS:	The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
EU/TACIS:	European Union initiative for the New Independent States and Mongolia
FAO:	Food and Agricultural Organisation of UN
IUCN:	The World Conservation Union
TRAFFIC:	Traffic International
UNEP:	United Nations Environment Programme
WCO:	World Customs Organisation

List of participants

Attached as Annex I.

List of documents distributed

- Conservation and Sustainable Use of Caspian Sturgeon: Action Proposals by officials of CMS, CBD, CITES, CEP, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, IUCN, World Bank, Ramsar Convention, Interpol, and TRAFFIC following a meeting in Geneva on 15-16 February 2001 (Draft as at 19 April 2001)
- Doc. AC. 16.7.2 Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.): Acipenseriformes, Sixteenth Meeting of the CITES Animals Committee, Shepherdstown, USA, 11-15 December 2000
- SC45 Doc. 12 Interpretation and implementation of the Convention: Significant Trade in Specimens of Appendix-II Species, Forty-fifth Meeting of the Standing Committee, Paris,

19-22 June 2001

- Protocol (report) of the 15th Extraordinary Meeting of the Caspian Sea Water Bioresources commission, Baku, Azerbaidjan, 22-23 May 2001, submitted by the Azeri delegation
- Statement of the Participants of Meeting the representatives of Caspian Range States Fishery Corporation ("the Baku Declaration" - official title as distributed), Baku, Azerbaidjan, 23 May 2001, submitted by the Azeri delegation
- Statement of the Caspian States Regarding Cooperation in Sturgeon Conservation and Sustainable Use, Final Document, Geneva, 13 June 2001

- **Background**

Several international bodies undertake activities in support of the five littoral States that affect the conservation and utilisation of the five species of sturgeon *(Acipenser gueldenstaedtii; A. nudiventris; A. persicus; A stellatus and Huso huso).* International organisations highly active in the Caspian area include UNDP, UNEP, EU/TACIS and the World Bank, who all operate in partnership with the littoral States through the Caspian Environment Programme (CEP).

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) has become a major actor since the Convention's Parties voted at their 1997 conference to place all Caspian sturgeon species on Appendix II. As a result international trade in sturgeon products (including caviar) has required a CITES permit since April 1998. The CITES Conference of Parties in April 2000 strengthened these controls by adopting a universal labelling system for caviar exports, and requiring all range states to establish co-ordinated, intergovernmental, annual export and catch quotas from 2001 for all commercial international trade in sturgeon specimens. Countries not establishing quotas are deemed by CITES to have zero quotas for the year in question. CITES also declared that all other species of sturgeon should be included in its ongoing Review of Significant Trade. Following discussion of the review by the CITES Animals Committee in December 2000, selected Caspian littoral States received recommendations from the CITES Animals Committee in February 2001. In general these recommendations include a reduction of sturgeon catch and caviar exports in 2001 and the implementation of measures including assessments of sturgeon population levels (with support from FAO) and improved enforcement, licensing, identification, labelling and hatchery control systems.

In view of the crisis affecting sturgeon resources in the Caspian, and the imminence of reduced or zero export quotas under CITES, the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions and Regional Office for Europe convened an inter-agency meeting on 15-16 February 2001 in Geneva. All the agencies listed below were invited to attend together with others who also have a significant interest in sturgeon conservation or trade issues: the

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention); TRAFFIC; the World Conservation Union (IUCN); Interpol; the World Customs Organisation; the World Bank; and Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO).

The immediate objective of the inter-agency meeting was to prepare the ground for a high level approach to the Governments of the five littoral States. The approach would be designed to advise and assist the Government authorities to implement effective measures to protect sturgeon resources. Such measures would enable the littoral States to meet the requirements of CITES, facilitate implementation of CBD and CEP, and above all, ensure that sturgeon fisheries were in future exploited on a fully sustainable basis.

The inter-agency meeting allowed valuable exchanges of information, particularly about existing and proposed fisheries management *regimes;* the CITES Significant Trade Review process; the need for scientific assessment of sturgeon population levels; other issues affecting the Caspian ecosystem; and the necessity of eliminating organised criminal involvement in the international caviar trade and eradicating domestic poaching and illegal trade.

The meeting drew up the following proposals for transmission to the five littoral States, and asked UNEP to take the lead in organising a high level meeting, including fisheries ministers of the littoral States, in April 2001.

In this light, UNEP decided to convene a meeting between intergovernmental agencies (UNEP, CITES, CEP and EU/TACIS) and Caspian Littoral States in Geneva, from 12-13 June 2001. The objectives of the meeting was:

General Objectives:

a? To establish mutual understanding of the conservation and socio-economic crisis now affecting the Caspian sturgeon fishery
b? To seek maximum level of agreement from Littoral States and international agencies to the action required to address and overcome this crises
c? To establish a process which could facilitate implementation of action proposals agreed by the States and agencies, building on the existing work led by EU/TACIS
d? To seek potential funding sources to help rebuild the sturgeon fisheries and the communities who depend on them

Specific Objectives:

e? To help the Littoral States prepare for the upcoming 45th Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in Paris, 19-22 June 2001

f? To encourage all Littoral States to participate in the meeting of fisheries and foreign affairs officials on 3-4 July 2001 to establish a commission of the conservation and utilisation of bioresources of the Caspian Sea

Opening of the Meeting / Introduction

1? The Chair (Robert Hepworth, UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions) opened the meeting, welcoming delegates. He briefly recalled the background of the discussions on Caspian Sturgeon issues to date, particularly referring to the UNEP-organised meeting held in February 2001, which drew interest from many international stakeholder bodies for a continued effort, and described that this particular meeting aims to focus on Governments to review various key aspects in the Draft Action Proposal document.

2? The agenda was introduced, and adopted. The objectives of this meeting (as above) was also highlighted.

3? W. Wijnsteckers, Secretary General of CITES explained the Convention's decision-making process and legal basis for action on the Caspian Sturgeons issue. He highlighted the two issues of focus from CITES' perspective, namely to establish a short-term strategy to prevent a negative decision by the Standing Committee in the upcoming meeting and a long-term arrangement for sturgeon stock management. As background information leading to the current position of CITES on Caspian Sturgeons, reference was made to the following documents as the legal basis for consideration of actions: Recommendations by the Animals Committee (Doc. AC. 16.7.2) and pre-meeting document for the upcoming 45 th Meeting of the Standing Committee (SC45 Doc. 12).

4? He emphasised that, in order to prevent the CITES Standing Committee from enforcing negative measures which may include suspension of trade, it was crucial that the Parties came with a collective and harmonised approach in the region on actions that highlight aspects of scientific research, mechanism(s) to regulate and control legal harvesting/trade, as well as a strong commitment to control illegal trade. Addressing the issue of reducing illegal harvest/trade was of particular importance, as that main problem in the region resided in the illegal harvest, which is estimated to be more than 10 times that of the legal harvest.

5? The representatives of the Caspian Littoral States present at the meeting (Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Iran) made short interventions describing current efforts for improvement in their national management/enforcement activities for the

conservation of Caspian Sturgeon stocks, as well as any questions or comments arising from the CITES Secretariat's presentation. They stated that the suspension or any strict measures regulating trade in Caspian Sturgeon products would result in significant damage to their fishing industry and the overall economy, and stressed the urgent need for the adoption of a regionally integrated and scientifically sound recommendations to avoid a negative decision by the CITES Standing Committee.

6? M. Lindeque, Chief, Scientific co-ordination Unit, CITES Secretariat,responded to the questions and added details to the CITES process regarding the Caspian Sturgeons which dates back to 1997. He also presented four possible scenarios for the decisions that may result in the upcoming CITES Standing Committee Meeting, depending on the outcome of this meeting:

Option 1: Rejection of the recommendations of the Animals Committee would likely lead to a complete ban on the trade in Caspian Sturgeon products.

Option 2:Acceptance of the recommendations of the Animals Committee with no additional action plans proposed would lead to an 80% reduction in trade.

Option 3: Presentation the ongoing efforts and further plans of action for improvement in the conservation of Caspian Sturgeon stocks may be possibly used to negotiate a trade reduction of less than 80%.

Option 4: Acceptance of a major reduction in trade as well as the recommendations of the Animals Committee with additional presentation of the ongoing efforts and concrete plans for action for improvement in the conservation of Caspian Sturgeon stocks to be completed before the end of 2001 may be used to request a delay in the final decision on trade until next year.

He added that reaching the better options, namely Option 3 or Option 4, would be possible through a strong commitment by member states to engage in concrete actions covering various subject areas concerning the Caspian Sturgeon stocks on regional basis.

Current Management and Enforcement

8? J. Sellar, Senior Enforcement Officer, CITES Secretariat, gave a short presentation regarding the current efforts in management and enforcement of Caspian Sturgeon products. He explained that the enforcement action was clearly being stepped up in some consumer states, which major seizures and prosecutions have been reported. The CITES Secretariat have been working closely with Interpol and WCO in this regard. He informed that further assistance is available at international level to support enforcement by Caspian Range States, such as specialised training and capacity-building as well as targeting of organised crime. He expressed the CITES Secretariat's concerns about reported attempts to bribe and harass officials, and stressed the need to trace such incidents openly. The

successful enforcement efforts seen in the Russian Far East tigers show the kinds of achievement that can be reached through focused efforts by dedicated enforcement units, with technical and financial support from the international community, and encouraged the Caspian States for cooperation in a similar manner.

9? The presentation was followed by discussion among the delegates from Caspian Littoral States, CITES, CEP and EU/TACIS, mainly focusing on the establishment of a tagging system to determine the Caspian Sturgeon migration routes, and the planned special multi-agency scientific inspection expedition, which had been recommended by the CITES Animals Committee during its meeting in December 2000. The following issues regarding the expedition were raised for consideration and discussion:

- Timing of visit/inspection to coincide with hatcheries activities
- State endorsement, safeguarding and backing of inspectors from each Caspian Littoral State
- Nomination of scientists from each Caspian Littoral State
- Terms of reference and methodology of inspection
- Timing of the first organisational meeting for the expedition (scheduled for 3-4 July 2001)

Discussion of the Inter-Agency Action Proposal

10? The Meeting reviewed a revised Inter-Agency Action Proposal drafted by EU/TACIS based on the draft Inter-Agency Action Proposal prepared by UNEP prior to the Meeting with initial general comments from participants.

11? Some of the main points that were added to the revised Inter-Agency Action Proposals were:

- Stipulation of all recommendations by the CITES Animals Committee
- References to the efforts made by the Caspian Bioresource Commission, including the Baku Declaration
- Reference to activity support by EU/TACIS
- Development of a harmonised identification scheme, including DNA testing and tagging system

12? The final document (Annex II) was agreed by the participants, and the Meeting was officially closed.

Annex 1 - List of Participants

AZERBAIJAN

Tariel Feyruz Mammedov	First Deputy-Chairman State Fishery Cooperation Concern Tabriz Str., 49 Baku 370008 Azerbalik Azerbaijan Republic Phone: 994 12 66-19-18 Fax: 994 12 93-61-00

IRAN

Javad Amin-Mansour	Counsellor, Iran Mission in Geneva
Amir Arjornand Ardechir	Legal Adviser, Iran
Mohammad Pourkazemi	Director of International Sturgeon Reserach Institute and Scientific Authorities of CITES in the field of Sturgeon in Iran
Mohammad Reza Hosseini	Managing Director of Shilat Trading Co. (exclusive exporter of Iranian caviar) management authority of eltes, in the field of sturgeon in Iran

KAZAKHSTAN

Yeleushov Bek-Bulat Saduakhasovich	Director of the Department of the Chief State Environmental Protection Inspection of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Republic of Kazakhstan, Head of the CITES Administrative Authority in the Republic of Kazakhstan Ministry of Natural Resources Environmental Protection 1, Satpaeyv Street, Kokshetau Akmolinskaya obl. Republic of Kazakhstan 475000 Tel: 8 31622-50478 Fax: 8 31622-55431

Dzhamalova Vera Dzhaksanovna	Deputy Head of the Animal Life Directorate of the Forestry, Fishery and Hunting Committee of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection 1, Satpaeyv Street, Kokshetau Akmolinskaya obl. Republic of Kazakhstan 475000 Tel: 8 31622-50478 Fax: 8 31622-55431 Republic of Kazakhstan Tel: 7 31622-50420 Fax: 7 31622-50420

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Ivakhnenko Roman	Chief, State Committee for Fisheries of the Russian Federation Rozhdestvensky blvd., 12 10303 1, Moscow, Russia Tel: 095 928-2758 Fax: 095 9283344 Email: Ivakhnenko@fishiom.ru
Makoedov Anatoly	Deputy Chairman State Committee for Fisheries of the Russian Federation 103031 Roshdestvensky blvd., 12 Moscow, Russian Federation Tel/Fax: 095 9285527
Nikonorov Sergey	Deputy Head of the CITES Sturgeon Scientific Authority of the Russian Federation State Committee for Fisheries of the Russian Federation 10303 1, Rozdestvensky blvd., 12 Moscow Russian Federation Tel: 095 29902-74

CASPIAN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Timothy Turner	Programme Coordinator Caspian Environmental Programme Government Building 40 Uzeir Hadjibeyov St., Room 108 Baku 370016 Azerbaijan Tel: 994-12-97-17-85 Fax: 994-12-97-17-86 Email: ttumer@caspian.in-baku.com
Gunn Stuart	Project Manager EU/Tacis Support to the Caspian Environment Pprogramme Fax: 994-12-97-17-86 Email: stuartgurin(a-)cast)ian.in-baku.com
Marcella Nanni	Legal Adviser, TACIS Support to Caspian Environment Prograrnme
Labon Arkadiusz	EU/Tacis Support to the Caspian Environment Programme
UNEP	
Willem Wijnstekers	Secretary-General Convention for International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES) CITES Secretariat 15 Chemin des Anemones Case postale 456 CH-1219 Chatelaine Geneva, Switzerland Tel: 4122 917 8139/40 Fax: 4122 797 3417 Email: cites@unep.ch
Frits Schlingemann	Director and Regional Representative Regional Office for Europe 15 Chemin des Anemones 1219 Chatelaine, Geneva Switzerland

Tel: 4122 78276/78291
Fax: 4122 797 3420
Frits.schlingemann@unep.ch

Robert Hepworth

Deputy Director
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
East Africa
Tel: 254 2 623260
Fax: 254 2 623926
Email: Robert. HepworthAunep.orP,

John Sellar

Senior Enforcement Officer
Convention for International Trade of
Endangered Species (CITES)
CITES Secretariat
15 Chernin des Anemones
Case postale 456
CH-1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 4122 917 8139/40
Fax: 4122 797 3417
Email: citesAunep.ch

Malan Lindeque

Chief of the Scientific Coordination Unit
Convention for International Trade of
Endangered Species (CITES)
CITES Secretariat
15 Chemin des Anemones
Case postale 456
CH-1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 4122 917 8123
Fax: 4122 797 3417
Email: malan.1indeque@unep.ch

Marceil Yeater

Convention for International Trade of
Endangered Species (CITES)
CITES Secretariat
15 Chemin des Anemones

Case postale 456
CH-1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 4122 917 8139/40
Fax: 4122 797 3417
Email: marceil.yeater@unep.ch

Danica Valnicek

Associate Legal Expert
Regional Office for Europe
15 Chemin des Anemones
1219 Chatelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: 4122 917 8111
Fax 4122 797 3420

Haruko Okusu

Associate Programme Officer
Biodiversity-related Conventions
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
East Africa
Tel: 254 2 623767
Fax: 254 2 623926
Email: Haruko.Okusu@unep.org

Annex 2 - Statement of the Caspian States regarding cooperation in sturgeon conservation and sustainable use

The five Caspian range states, the Azerbaijan Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan Republic, Russian Federation and Turkmenistan having met in Baku on May 23 2001, and having attended (with the exception of Turkmenistan), the Caspian Sturgeon Resources: Stakeholders' Meeting in Geneva, organized by The United Nations Environment Programme on June 12 and 13 2001 under the chairmanship of UNEP and participation of the CITES and CEP Secretariats, and EU-TACIS;

Concerned about the unsatisfactory state of sturgeon stocks, illegal fishing and illegal trade;

Fully understanding the need for, and concerned about the conservation of the sturgeo stocks in the Caspian;

Mindful of economic and social interests of the range states;

Recognizing that national and international financial support has already been provide towards Caspian fisheries conservation;

Mindful of the requirements of international conventions that most of them are party to.

Have decided on:

A. Immediate measures, to be taken within 12 months

1? The necessity of concluding by the end of 2001 the negotiations on an agreement on the conservation and utilization of bioresources of the Caspian Sea developed by the five range states with the assistance of EU/Tacis. The provisions of the agreement when implemented will satisfy the main requirements of CITES concerning the establishment of a coordinated approach to the management of shared fish resources.

2? Requesting the Food and Agriculture Organization to share its experience in the operation of fisheries management organizations and management of shared resources, as well as in the field of unregulated fisheries, that the range states need to apply.

3? Managing the sturgeon resources within management plans developed and approved under the framework of the agreement on the conservation and utilization of bioresources of the Caspian sea referred to under item 1. The scientific basis of management plans would be determined in a coordinated research effort of all parties to the agreement.

4? Working out a programme for comprehensive resources surveys to be conducted on a regular, quarterly basis, as a cooperative effort towards creating a sound basis for the management of the resources.

5? Following on the resources surveys conducted in the recent past in selected parts of the Caspian and in order to carry out a comprehensive survey of fishery resources abundance and distribution in the entire Caspian starting from the summer of 2001, the first one supported financially by TACIS, all littoral states undertake to speed up the process of finalizing the design and methodology of the survey, granting permission for the research vessel to work in their waters, and nominating scientists to participate in the survey.

6? Increasing efforts in each Littoral state to combat illegal harvesting and illegal trade.

7? Engaging Interpol to conduct an analysis of illegal sturgeon trade. Requesting the CITES Secretariat in cooperation with Interpol and WCO to conduct a study of enforcement needs to assist in the effective implementation of required controls.

8? Making available samples of sturgeon products for DNA testing, and working out a program on molecular biological investigation in cooperation with IUCN (SSG) in order to perform the resolutions of the Conference of the Parties of CITES, provided funds for this purposes are made available by donors.

9? Seeking agreement by the GEF for a PDF (B) proposal for the rehabilitation of sturgeon resources upon the request of littoral states.

10? Ensuring full participation by the end of 2001 in the caviar labeling system, by all five littoral states, agreed at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in April 2000.

11? Request CITES to verify the status of implementation of all the above undertakings, where necessary via multi-agency inspection missions, subject to funding being made available to CITES Secretariat.

B. Medium term actions to be taken within the next 3 to 5 years

1? Improving access to data and information on sturgeon conservation and utilization in the Caspian Sea by establishing databases and exchanging information within the region as well as with FAO, IUCN, CEP and other agencies as appropriate.

2? Improving and harmonizing methodology for setting quotas.

3? Carrying out a comprehensive review of the status of all sturgeon species and the outlook for their future development. Seeking financial and technical assistance in this field from international organizations and donors.

4? Establishing, in a cooperative effort of all states, a standard collection of sturgeon DNA samples for all scientific purposes. Developing a unified method of DNA analysis to be applied to sturgeon research.

5? Establishing a regular dialogue with legitimate local and international commercial bodies with an interest in sturgeon; and, seeking improved cooperation from commercial bodies in promoting and financing the conservation and sustainable use of all sturgeon species. Requesting CITES to take a lead in this activity in cooperation with TRAFFIC, IUCN and UNEP.

6? Examining the case for a universal eco-labeling system for sturgeon products. Requesting CITES to lead the activity in cooperation with FAO, trade bodies and the Marine Stewardship Council.

The members of the Caspian Sea Water Bioresources Committee: Azerbaijan Republic, Kazakhstan Republic, Russian Federation and Turkmenistan agree to implement all the recommendations of the Animals Committee, but confirm their collectively agreed sturgeon catch and export quotas for the year 2001, as determined by the 14th session of the

Committee held on December 19 and 20, 2000 in Astrakhan and ask the Standing Committee in consultation with the CITES Animal Committee to decide on the retaining of the declared quotas of the Committee members in order to allow them to obtain necessary financial means for sturgeon reproduction and conservation.

Geneva, 13 June 2001

UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/3

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Geographical Overlapping between the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, and Marine Regional Fisheries Bodies

Geographical overlapping between the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, and Marine Regional Fishery Bodies

Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans	Marine Regional Fishery Bodies (Active)
Abidjan Convention	AAFC, CECAF, COREP, ICCAT, SEAFO, SRCF
Barcelona Convention	GFCM, ICCAT
Bucharest Convention	GFCM, ICCAT
Cartagena Convention	ICCAT, OLDEPESCA, WECAFC
Helsinki Convention	IBSFC, ICES, NAMMCO, NASCO
Jeddah Convention	IOTC, WIOTO
Kuwait Convention	IOTC, RECOFI, WIOTO
Lima Convention	CPPS, IATTC, OLDEPESCA
Nairobi Convention	AAFC, CCSBT, IOTC, SWIOFC, SEAFO, WIOTO
Noumea Convention	CCSBT, FFA, SPC, WCPFC
OSPAR Convention	ICCAT, ICES, NAMMCO, NASCO, NEAFC
Action Plan for the Arctic Region	ICES, NAFO, NAMMCO, NASCO, NEAFC
Action Plan for the East Asian Seas	APFIC, CCSBT, FFA, IOTC, NPAFC, PICES, WCPFC
Action Plan for the North West Pacific	NPAFC, PICES, WCPFC
Action Plan for the South Asian Seas	IOTC, WIOTO
Convention and Action Plan for the Caspian Sea	
Convention and Action Plan for the Northeast Pacific	CPPS, IATTC, NPAFC, OLDEPESCA
Cooperation Programme for the Upper South West Atlantic	CCSBT, CTMFM, ICCAT, WECAFC

Regional Fishery Bodies by type:

- Management Bodies: CCAMLR, CCSBT, GFCM, IATTC, IBSFC, ICCAT, IOTC, IPHC, IWC, NAFO, NASCO, NEAFC, NPAFC, PSC, SEAFO, SWIOFC, WCPFC
- Advisory Bodies: AAFC, APFIC, CECAF, COREP, CPPS, CTMFM, FFA, NAMMCO, OLDEPESCA, RECOFI, SRCF, WECAFC, WIOTO
- Scientific Bodies: CWP, ICES, PICES, SPC

Regional Fishery Bodies by region:

- Global and Trans-Ocean: APFIC, CCAMLR, CCSBT, CWP, IWC, OLDEPESCA
- Atlantic Ocean Region: AAFC, CARPAS, COREP, CECAF, CTMFM, IBSFC, ICCAT, ICES, NAFO, NAMMCO, NASCO, NEAFC, SEAFO, SRCF, WECAFC
- Pacific Ocean Region: CPPS, FFA, IATTC, IPHC, NPAFC, PICES, PSC, SPC, WCPFC
- Indian Region Ocean: IOTC, RECOFI, SWIOFC, WIOTO

FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies:

- FAO Regional Fishery Bodies: APFIC, CECAF, CWP, GFCM, IOTC, RECOFI, SWIOFC, WECAFC
- Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies: AAFC, CCAMLR, CCSBT, COREP, CPPS, CTMFM, FFA, IATTC, IBSFC, ICCAT, ICES, IPHC, IWC, NAFO, NAMMCO, NASCO, NEAFC, NPAFC, OLDEPESCA, PICES, PSC, SEAFO, SPC, SRCF, WCPFC, WIOTO

LIST OF REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES' ACRONYMS

AAFC: Atlantic Africa Fisheries Conference
APFIC: Asia-Pacific Fisheries Commission
CARPAS[1]: Regional Fisheries Advisory Committee for the Southwest Atlantic
CCAMLR: Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CCSBT: Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CECAF: Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic
COREP[2]: Regional Fisheries Committee for the Gulf of Guinea
CPPS: South Pacific Permanent Commission on the Exploitation of the Marine Resources of the South Pacific
CTMFM: Joint Technical Commission for the Argentina/Uruguay Maritime Front
CWP: Co-ordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics
EPTFA (OAPO)[3]: Eastern Pacific Tuna Fishing Organization
FFA: South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency
GFCM[4]: General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean
IATTC: Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
IBSFC: International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission
ICCAT: International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
ICES: International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
ICSEAF[5]: International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries
IOFC[6]: Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission
IOTC: Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
IPHC: International Pacific Halibut Commission
IWC: International Whaling Commission
NAFO: Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization
NAMMCO: North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission
NASCO: North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization
NEAFC: Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission
NPAFC: North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission
OLDEPESCA: Latin-American Fisheries Development Organization
PICES: North Pacific Marine Science Organization
PSC: Pacific Salmon Commission
RECOFI[7]: Regional Commission for Fisheries
SEAFO[8]: Southeast Atlantic Fisheries Organization
SPC: Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SRCF (CSRP): Sub-Regional Commission on Fisheries
SWIOFC[9]: Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission
WCPFC[10]: Western And Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WECAFC: Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission
WIOTO[11]: Western Indian Ocean Tuna Organization

---

[1] Not active since 1974.
[2] Signed at Libreville, Gabon, 21 June 1984. Not yet in force.
[3] Signed at Lima, Peru, 21 July 1989. Never entered in force.
[4] The amendments to the agreement (agreed upon in 1997) have not yet entered in force.
[5] Abolished
[6] Abolished
[7] Approved by the FAO Council, Rome, 11 November 1999. Not yet in force.
[8] Done at Windhoek, Namibia, 20 April 2001. Not yet in force.
[9] Convention not yet formally completed.
[10] Done at Honolulu, 5 September 2000. Not yet in force.
[11] The Organization is not currently operative, probably because of financial constraints.

UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/4

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

Provisional List of Participants

I - Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution (Barcelona)

Mr. Lucien Chabason
Coordinator
Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan
Barcelona Convention (MAP/RCU)
48 Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 35 Athens, Greece
Tel: 30 1 7273100
Fax: 30 1 7253196/7 72134200
Email: chabason@unepmap.gr **or** unepmedu@unepmap.gr

Mr. F.S. Civili
MEDPOL Coordinator
Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan
Barcelona Convention (MAP/RCU)
48 Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 35 Athens, Greece
Tel: 30 1 7273100
Fax: 30 1 7253196/7 72134200
Email: unepmedu@unepmap.gr

Convention for Cooperation in the Protection & Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (Abidjan)

Madame Nassere Kaba
Acting Coordinator
Regional Coordinating Unit for West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF/RCU)
Abidjan Convention, c/o The Dept. of Environment
Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest
20 BP 650 Abidjan 20\Cote d'Ivoire
Tel: 225 20 211183/20 21 06 23
Fax: 225 20 21 0495
Email: biodiv@africaonline.co.ci

Convention for the Protection Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi)

Mr. Magnus N'goile
Director General
NEMC
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 007 222 812 340 049/811 340 049
Fax: 007 222 51 668 611
Email: magnus@simbanet.net

Mr. Maurice J.L. Loustau-Lalan
Principal Secretary
Environment Division, Ministry of Environment
P.O.Box 1145, Botanical Gardens
Mahe, Seychelles
Tel: 248 225 505
Fax: 248 225 131
Email: maurice@seychelles.net

Kuwait Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution (ROPME)

Mr. Abdul Rahman Al-Awadi
Executive Secretary
Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME)
P. O. Box 26388, 13124 Safat
State of Kuwait
Tel: 965 5312140-3 Ext 111
Fax: 965 5335246, 5324172
Email: ropme@qualitynet.net or ropme@kuwait.net

Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea & the Gulf of Aden Environment (Jeddah-PERSGA)

Mr. Nizar Ibrahim Tawfiq
Executive Director
Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the
Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Region (PERSGA)
P. O. Box 53662,
Jeddah 21583,
Saudi Arabia
Tel: 966 2 657 3224
Fax: 966 2 652 1901
Email: dirar.nasr@persga.org or persga@persga.org

South Asian Seas Action Plan

Mr. Mahboob Elahi
Director
South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)
No. 10 Anderson Road, Off Dickman's Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 941 5989 376
Fax: 941 589 369
Email: mehali@eureka.lk

Mr. Prasantha Abeyegunawardene
South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)
No. 10 Anderson Road, Off Dickman's Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka

Tel: 941 5989 787
Fax: 941 589 369
Email: pd_sacep@eureka.lk

East Asian Seas Action Plan

Mr. Hugh Kirkman
Coordinator
East Asia Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (EAS/RCU)
UN Building, 9th Floor, Block A
Rajdamnern-Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: 66 2 288 1889/1860/8008/8007
Fax: 66 2 281 2428
Email: Kirkman.unescap@un.org
Web: www.roap.unep

North-West Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP)

Mr. Masamitsu Oritani
Executive Director
Northwest Pacific Region Environmental Cooperation Center (NPEC)
Tel: 81-76-445-1571
Fax: 81-76-445-1581
E-mail:

Mr. Masayuki Ozaki
Section Chief
Northwest Pacific Region Environmental Cooperation Center (NPEC)
Tel: 81-76-445-1571
Fax: 81-76-445-1581
E-mail: ozaki@npec.or.jp

Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region (Noumea-SPREP)

Ms. Mary Power
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
P. O. Box 240, Apia,
Western Samoa
Tel: 685 21 929
Fax: 685 20 231
Email: sprep@samoa.net or sprep@sprep.org.ws

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific (Lima)

Mr. Ulises Munaylla Alarcon
Comision Permanente del Pacifico Sur (CPPS)
Coruna 2061 y Whimper
Quito, Equador

Tel: 593 2 234 331/5/6
Fax: 595 2 234 374
Email: cpps@ecuanex.net.ec or ulisesmunavlla@andinanet.net

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena)

Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares
Coordinator
Caribbean Environment Programme
Regional Co-ordinating Unit (CAR/RCU)
(Cartagena Convention)
14-20 Port Royal Street
Kingston, Jamaica
Tel: 1 876 922 9267/8/9
Fax 1 876 922 9292
Email: uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com or nac.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com

Convention for the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution (Bucharest)

Ms. Sema Acar
Coordinator
Black Sea Environmental Programme
Dolmabahce Sarayi
II.Harekat Kosku 80680 Besiktas
Istanbul, Turkey
Tel: 90 212 227 9927/8/9
Fax 90 212 227 9933
Email: semaacar@blacksea-environment.org

Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic (OSPAR)

Mr. Alan Simcock
Executive Secretary
Commission for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic
New Court, 48 Carey Street
London WC2A 2JQ
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 207 242 9927
Fax: 44 2074305225
Email: secretariat@ospar.org

Programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)

Ms. Soffia Gudmundsdottir
Executive Secretary, PAME International Secretariat
Hafnarstraeti 97, 600 Akureyri, Iceland
Tel: +354 461 1355/3350
Fax: +354 462 3390
Email: pame@ni.is or soffiag@ni.is

Mr. Jim Osborne
Chief Marine Environment
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Canada KIA0H3
Tel: 819 953 2265
Fax: 819 953 0913
Email: Jim.Osborne@ec.gc.ca

Caspian Environment Programme

Mr. Tim Turner
Room,108, 3rd Entranch
Government House
40 Uzier Hadjibeyov Street
Baku-370016 Azerbaijan
Tel: 994 12 971785/938003
Fax: 994 12 971786
Email: caspian@caspian.in-baku.com

II - Global Environmental Conventions

Basel Covention Secretariat

Ms. Sachiko Kuwabara Yumamoto
Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Basel Convention (SBC)
International Environment House
15 chemin des anemones, 1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8213
Fax: 41 22 797 3454
Email: Sachiko.Kuwabara@unep.ch

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)

Mr. Willem Wijnstekers
Secretary General CITES
International Environment House
Chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+4122) 917-8139/40
Fax: (+4122) 797-3417
Email: willem.wijnstekers@unep.ch

III - International Organizations

International Oceanographic Commission (IOC-UNESCO)

Mr. Geoffrey L. Holland
Past Chairperson
IOC/UNESCO
2WE Associates Consulting Ltd.
24-295 Lower Ganges Road
Saltspring Island
B.C. V8K 1T3
Canada
Tel 250 537 4472
Fax 250 537 4850
Email: hollandg@saltspring.com

Mr. Colin Summerhayes
Director
Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) Project Office,
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) UNESCO
1, rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15
France
Tel: 33 1 45 68 40 42
Fax: 33 1 45 68 58 13
Email: c.summerhayes@unesco.org

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Mr. Stephen J. de Mora
Head, Marine Environment Laboratory (MEL)
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
4 Quai Antoine 1 er, B.P. No. 800 MC-98012
Principality of Monaco
Tel: 377 97 97 72 36
Fax: 377 97 97 72 76
Email: S.de_Mora@iaea.org

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Mr. Benedict Satia
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: 3906 570
Fax: 39 06 570
Email: benedict.satia@fao.org

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

Mr. Fernando Guzman
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
Ocean Affairs Division (OCA)

World Weather Watch Department (WWW)
Room 7L445, 7 bis Avenue de la Paix
CP-2300 1211
Geneva 2 Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 730 8111
Fax: 41 22 730 8181
Email: fguzman@netra1.wmo.ch or fguzman@www.wmo.ch

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)

Ms. Anne Rogers
Senior Officer
United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Division for Sustainable Development
Natural Resources & Minerals Branch
United Nations Plaza, Room DC2-2274
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: 1 212 963 2476
Fax: 1 212 963 1795
Email: rogersa@un.org

Oceans and Law of the Sea

Mr. Julio A. Baez
Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS)
United Nations
Headquarters
New York NY 10017
USA
Tel: 1 212 963 1234
Fax: 1 21 963 48797
Email: baez1@un.org

International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds 1971 and 1992 (IOPC Funds)

Mr. Masamichi Hasebe
Legal Counsel IOPC Funds
Portland House, Stag Place
London, SW1E 5PN
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7592 7100
Fax: +44 20 7592 7111
Email: masamichi.hasebe@iopcfund.org

IV – United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Division of Environmental Conventions (DEC)

Mr. Jorge E. Illueca
Assistant Executive Director

UNEP/Division of Environmental Conventions
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: 254 2 3494/4011
Fax: 254 2 624300
Email: jorge.illueca@unep.org

Mr. Ellik Adler
Chief, Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
UNEP/Division of Environmental Conventions
P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 2 624544
Fax: 254 2 624618
Email: Ellik.Adler@unep.org

Mr. J. Ignacio de Leiva Moreno
Programme Officer Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans
UNEP/Division of Environmental Conventions
P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 2 623767
Fax: 254 2 624618
Email: Ignacio.deleiva@unep.org

Division of Environmental Impact Assessment & Early Warning (DEWA)

Mr. Timothy Foresman
Director
Division of Environmental Assessment & Early Warning (DEWA)
United Nations Environment Programme
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Tel: 254 2 623231
Fax: 254 2 623943
Email: Tim.foresman@unep.org

Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)

Ms. Wanda Hoskin
Industry Sectors Unit
UNEP
Division of Technology, Industry and Economics
39-43 Quai Andre Citroen
75739 Paris Cedex 15, France
Tel: 33 1 44 37 76 16
Fax: 33 1 44 37 14 74
Email: wanda.hoskin@unep.fr

Regional Office for North America (RONA)

Ms. L. Brennan Van Dyke

Regional Director
UNEP
Regional Office for North America
Washington D.C. 20006
U.S.A.
Tel:1 202 785 0465
Fax:1 202 785 2096 / 4871
Email: Brennan.Vandyke@rona.unep.org

GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION COORDINATION OFFICE (GPA)

Mr. Robert Droop
Programme Officer
Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action
for the Implementation of the Marine Environment from Land Based Activities (GPA)
P. O. Box 16227, 2500 BE
The Hague The Netherlands
Tel: 31 70 311 4466
Fax: 31 70 311 4485
Email: R.Droop@unep.nl

Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)

Mr. Dag Daler
Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)
SE – 39182 Kalmar
Sweden
Tel: 46 480 447 350
Fax: 46 480 447 355
Email: info@giwa.net

WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING CENTRE (WCMC)

Mr. Mark Collins
Director
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 ODL
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 1223 277314
Fax: 44 1223 277136
Email: mark.collins@unep-wcmc.org

V – NGOs, Regional Fishery Bodies, the Private Sector and Special

The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

Mr. John Waugh
Marine Programme Coordinator

IUCN-The World Conservation Union
C/o Washington Office
1630 Connecticut Avenue NW #300
Washington D.C. 20008 USA
Tel: 1 202 518 2057
Fax: 1 202 478 0051
Email: jwaugh@iucnus.org

International Ocean Institute (IOI)

Dr. Elisabeth Mann Borgese
Honorary Chair IOI
Dalhousie University
1226 LeMarchant St.
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Canada
Tel: +1 902 494 1737
Fax: +1 902 494 2034
Email: f.bailet@dal.ca

ECOSOC

Ms. Beth Hiblin
International Admin & Policy
UNED Forum
3 Whitehall Court
London
SW1A 2EL
UK
Tel: +44 (0) 20 7839 7171
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7930 5893
Email: bhiblin@earthsummit2002.org

International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Limited (ITOPF)

Dr. Ian White
Managing Director (ITOPF)
Staple Hall, Stonehouse Court, 87-90 Houndsditch
London EC3A 7AX
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)20 7621 1255
Fax: +44 (0)20 7621 1783
Email: ianwhite@itopf.com

International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)

Mr. Eric Calonne (Vice Chair of IPIECA's Oil Spill Working Group)
Trading Division
Shipping
General Manager, Environment and Safety
Tour Galilee / G 02070

51 Esplanade du General du Gaulle La Défense 10
92907 Paris La Défense Cedex
France
Tel: +331 4135 2089
Fax: +331 4135 2089
Email: eric.calonne@totalfinaelf.com

Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CCEMTL)

Mr. Hans Herrman
Program Head, Biodiversity Conservation
Commission for Environmental Cooperation
393 St. Jacques West, Suite 20
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Tel: +514 350 4302
Fax: +514 350 4314
Email: hherrman@ccemtl.org

Mr. Scott Vaughan
Head of Environment,
Economy and Trade Program
Commission for Environmental Cooperation
393 St. Jacques West, Suite 200
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Tel: +514 350 4302
Fax: +514 350 4314
Email: svaughan@ccemtl.org

Latin American Crop Protection Association (LACPA)

Mr. Alfredo Ruiz
President
Latin American Crop Protection Association
444 Brickell Avenue, Ste. 705
Miami, Florida 33131
USA
Tel: +305 373 3713
Fax: +305 373 4642
Email: alfredoruiz@inetmail.att.net

International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission (IBSFC)

Mr. Lauri Vaarja
Chairman IBSFC
Ul. Hoza 20
00528 Warsaw, Poland
Tel: +48 22 628 8647
Fax: +48 22 625 3372
Email: ibsfc@polbox.pl

Latin-American Fisheries Development Organization (OLDEPESCA)

Mr. Carlos Mazal
Executive Director
OLDEPESCA
Las Palomas 422
Lima 34, Peru
Tel: +511 4210245
Fax: +511 22106621
Email: cmazal@terra.com.pe

Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)

Mr. Esteban de Salas
Executive Secretary CCAMLR
PO Box 213
North Hobart, 7000
Tasmania, Australia
Tel: +61 3 62310366
Fax: +61 3 62349965
Email: steven@ccamlr.org

VI - Governments

Canada

H.E. Mr. David Anderson
Minister of the Environment
Ministry of the Environment
House of Commons
10 Wellington Street
Ottawa, K1A 0H3
Canada
Tel: 613 997 1441
Fax: 613 953 3457

Iceland

Mr. Magnus Johannesson
Secretary General
Ministry for the Environment
Vonarstraeti 4
150
Reykjavik
Iceland
Tel 354 560 9608
Fax 354 562 4566
Email: Gudny.ingadottir@umh.stjr.is

UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.4/INF/5

Original: English

Fourth Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Montreal, 21-23 November 2001

MEMORANDUM OF COOPERATION
between
The Secretariat of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme
and
The Secretariat of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific

Considering that the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific – CPPS, created in 1952, is the appropriate maritime organization of the South East Pacific Region, and acts as a Regional Coordinating Unit of the Plan of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific, approved in 1981 by the Governments of Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Panamá and Perú.

Taking into account that the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme-SPREP, is the intergovernmental organization, created in 1982, by the Governments and Administrations of 22 Pacific islands countries and four developed countries with direct interests in the Pacific islands region.

Recalling that the Plan of Action for the Protection for the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific as well as the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Zone of the South East Pacific (1981, Lima Convention) establish the bases for achieving a regional cooperation among Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Panamá and Perú in order to protect the marine and coastal environment.

Noting that the new orientations derived from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development have permitted the fast adaptation of the Plan of Action, prioritizing its activities in areas which include, inter-alia: the research, monitoring and control of the marine pollution; the integrated coastal zone management; the conservation and management of marine and coastal protected areas; the protection of the marine biological diversity and effects of climate change on the marine and coastal ecosystems.

Noting that the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme work falls into the areas of: Biodiversity and Natural Resource Conservation; Climate Change and Integrated Coastal Management; Waste Management; Prevention Pollution; Environmental Management and Environmental Education.

Recalling further that the regional convention of protocols in the framework of the Plan of Action for the Protection for the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific are: Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas in the South East Pacific; Agreement on Regional Cooperation in Combating Pollution in the South East Pacific by Hydrocarbons and other Harmful Substances in cases of Emergency; Complementary Protocol on the Agreement for Regional Cooperation in Combating Pollution in the South East Pacific by Hydrocarbons and other Harmful Substances in Cases of Emergency; Protocol for the Protection of the South East Pacific Against Pollution from Land - Based Sources; Protocol for the Conservation and Management of Protected Marine and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific and Protocol for the Protection of the South East Pacific against Radioactive Pollution.

Taking into account the recommendations of the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans which was held in Monaco in November 2000, specially the need to promote the negotiation and implementation of twinning arrangements between regional seas conventions.

Noting that the South Pacific Marine Area are characterized by their well- know rich marine biodiversity, including interconnected systems and species of enormous global significance and representing the most productive marine upwelling systems in the world.

Recognizing that the Secretariat of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the Secretariat of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific in its capacity of Regional Coordinating Unit of the Plan of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South East Pacific , wish to promote cooperation in the most extensive area of the South Pacific region on the protection of the marine environment and coastal areas, agree as follow:

I. Coordination of Activities

a). *Cooperate in the development of joint activities to the protection of marine environment and coastal zones, which includes the following areas of work:*

- *Research and monitoring of the marine pollution*
- *Integrated marine and coastal zone management*
- *Marine and coastal protected areas*
- *Climate change*
- *Biodiversity and Natural Resources Conservation*
- *Environmental Education.*

b). *Coordinate biregional meetings between South East Pacific region and Pacific Islands region, to review the state of the marine environment in the South Pacific as a whole.*

II. Exchange of Information

a. *The Secretariats will establish procedures on regular exchange of information in their respective fields of action, exploring the possibility for the staff of both institutions to participate as observers at their relevant meetings*

b. *The Secretariats will focus on methods to exchange information on the protection of marine environment and coastal areas, mentioned in Part I of this Memorandum, considering the possibility to establish a bilateral clearing house mechanism.*

III. Institutional Aspects of Cooperation

Aspects of Institutional Cooperation include:

a. *The Secretariats should explore mechanisms to the best practice of coordination of its activities.*
b. *Other aspects of institutional cooperation include a mutual participation of the representatives of the Secretariats to their relevant meetings.*
c. *The Secretariats according to the mandates of its respective Members Countries, will be able to establish a bilateral committee to explore other fields of cooperation.*

IV. Consultations, Reporting and further Guidance

The Secretariats will arrange further consultations in order to implement this memorandum of cooperation. They will also report the measure taken on this issue to their respective governing bodies and will seek further guidance on new areas of cooperation

V. Review, Amendment and Termination

The present memorandum may be reviewed and amended following the request of either Part giving one month of writing notice.

The Parties sign the present memorandum of cooperation in four originals of which two, one in English and one in Spanish, will be for each Secretariat.

Tamarii Tutungata
Director of the SPREP

Fabián Valdivieso Eguiguren
General Secretary of the CPPS
RCU of the South East Pacific Action Plan

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants only

UNEP(DEC)/RS.3.8

Original: English

Third Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
and Action Plans
Monaco, 6 -11 November 2001

Report of the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

REPORT OF THE THIRD GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS

CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

MONACO, 6-11 NOVEMBER 2000

REPORT OF THE THIRD GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

Introduction

The Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans was held at the Hotel Marriot, Monaco, from 6 to 10 November 2000, at the invitation of the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA) and the Government of Monaco.

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

A. Opening statements and organizational matters

1. The meeting was opened at 9 a.m. on Monday, 6 November 2000 by Mr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme. After welcoming all participants, he asked Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Minister for International Cooperation for Environment and Development of Monaco, to convey thanks and gratitude to His Serene Highness Prince Rainier of Monaco for the hospitality that his Government had demonstrated in supporting the meeting. He also thanked the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for co-hosting the meeting.

2. He was gratified to note that the current meeting brought together the Directors or Bureau Members of 17 of the world's regional seas programmes to discuss areas of common concern, and to renew joint efforts to safeguard oceans and coastal areas. The Southwest Atlantic was the only major populated coastal area where countries still had to come together in a collaborative effort to address the major threats to their marine and coastal environment, and UNEP would renew its efforts to facilitate a regional seas programme for that vital region. Also participating were the Directors and representatives of the secretariats of eight multilateral environmental agreements, making the current session the largest meeting ever of multilateral environmental agreements. Such outstanding attendance was surely a reflection of the importance that the Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans had assumed.

3. The meeting was one of the most critical for collectively addressing the environmental problems facing the world's oceans and coastal areas. Seven out of 10 people today lived within 80 kilometers of the coast. Half of the world's cities with a population in excess of one million were sited near tide-washed river mouths. As much as 80 per cent of all marine pollution originated from municipal, industrial and agricultural wastes and run-off, with the rest coming from ships and oil drilling. Many

species of fish, marine mammals and turtles were threatened. One-fourth of all coral reefs had been eliminated and one-third were severely threatened. Rising sea levels caused by human greenhouse gas emissions threatened to displace both human settlements and natural ecosystems. The duty to address those problems was shared by many global and regional treaties, action plans and organizations. It was necessary to improve collaboration amongst those regimes and accelerate global action to return the sea to health.

4. To that end, the meeting had four principle objectives: to promote and increase horizontal collaboration among regional seas conventions and action plans in addressing more effectively the protection and sustainable use of the marine environment; to strengthen the linkages between the regional seas conventions and action plans and global environment conventions and related agreements; to strengthen the linkages between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Sources of Pollution (GPA) through agreed concrete actions; and to continue to move forward the vitalization of the regional seas conventions.

5. The recommendations of the Second Global Meeting had served as a blueprint for programming UNEP support to the regional seas programmes for the period 1999 to 2001. The Third Meeting should build on those recommendations, and it was to be hoped that the recommendations made on the current agenda items would serve as elements for the proposed actions on oceans and coastal areas to be presented to the Governing Council of UNEP at its twenty-first session, in February 2001.

6. UNEP was committed to give priority to the provision of programmatic support to the work programmes of the regional seas conventions and action plans, especially where their priorities interfaced with the priorities of UNEP's programme of work, such as: the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Sources of Pollution (GPA); the Global International Water Assessment (GIWA), funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF); Integrated Coastal Area Management; the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI), particularly through the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN); increased collaboration and synergies among conventions; and improved collaboration among partner agencies, stakeholders and civil society in addressing ocean and coastal issues. Recognizing the expertise available within the IAEA-MEL, he strongly endorsed the work of the laboratory and recommended that the regional seas conventions and action plans make full use of what it was able to offer.

7. For UNEP to vitalize the regional seas programmes, it was necessary to identify the priority challenges that needed to be met head-on and effectively. He was particularly concerned that a number of regional seas conventions and action plans were in very difficult and unsustainable financial circumstances, but discussion also needed to be based on the realization that there were obstacles or constraints that fell outside of the control of UNEP. Those constraints included: lack of political will on the part of member

Governments in certain regional seas programmes due to territorial disputes, lack of formal diplomatic relations and/or other disputes; inadequate financial resources committed, or inadequate capacity at the regional and/or national levels, for implementing the convention and action plan effectively and efficiently; and inadequate legal instruments for effectively addressing the assessment and management of marine and coastal resources. It was the task of UNEP to formulate responses to those constraints and to identify the areas for priority attention.

8. Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Minister for International Cooperation for Environment and Development of Monaco, welcomed all participants on behalf of the Government of Monaco. After describing his country's involvement in the activities of the environmental conventions and of the Barcelona Convention and the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP), in particular, he drew attention to Monaco's role in the conservation of cetacean species through its hosting of the interim secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, the Mediterranean Sea and the Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS). In addition, Monaco cooperated with France and Italy in the creation of a subregional sanctuary for marine mammals within their shared waters.

9. To enhance the synergies within the regional seas conventions and action plans, it was necessary to have not only the will of the secretariats, but also the zeal of the contracting parties. Strengthening the programmes also called for better consistency in the listing of species and in national reporting systems; meaningful use of the work of the global conventions; and greater emphasis on the socioeconomic realities of the issues raised. He attached great importance to UNEP's strong expression of support for the regional seas programmes as the main mechanism for UNEP's implementation of Chapter 17 of Agenda 21. In conclusion, noting the differentiation between the various regional structures and action plans, he expressed the view that the twinning of regional seas agreements, as had recently been the case between the Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention) and the Nairobi Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment in the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention), was a good example of action to strengthen programmes experiencing problems and he encouraged further such activity.

10. Mr. Stephen de Mora, Head of the Marine Environment Studies Laboratory (MESL) of the Marine Environment Laboratory (MEL) of IAEA, welcomed participants and extended an invitation to tour IAEA-MEL in Monaco. At the current meeting, a number of crucial issues were on the agenda that were of direct interest and relevance to MEL, given its unique position as the only marine laboratory in the United Nations system. Those included: implementation of the GPA; the chemicals-related conventions of the International Maritime Organization (IMO); and the future legally binding instrument on persistent organic pollutants (POPs).

11. After briefly describing the history and origins of IAEA-MEL, he explained that MESL itself had developed expertise in the investigation of heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, POPs and marine biocides and, inter alia, coordinated the Inter-agency

Programme on Marine Pollution (involving IAEA, UNEP, and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). MESL cooperated closely with MAP, the Black Sea Environment Programme and the Kuwait Action Plan, and had initiated cooperation with the Caspian Environment Programme. In addition, it was undertaking training courses, sponsored by MED POL, for the analysis of organic contaminants in marine sediments and biota. The IAEA-MEL thus had a tradition of working with the regions, and he welcomed the scope for initiating and renewing further cooperation that was provided by the current meeting.

12. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Jorge Illueca, Assistant Executive Director, Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP, and adopted the agenda contained in annex 1 to the present report.

B. Attendance

13. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following organizations:

(a) Regional seas conventions and action plans: Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission); Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP); Caspian Environment Programme (CEP); Commission of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Commission); Coordinating Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP); Interim Secretariat of the Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP); Northeast Pacific Regional Seas Programme; Permanent Commission of the South East Pacific (CPPS) as the secretariat of the Lima Convention and the Southeast Pacific Action Plan; Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) International Secretariat; Regional Coordinating Unit for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU); Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA); Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) of the Kuwait Convention region; Regional Coordinating Unit for the East Asian Seas (EAS/RCU); Regional Coordinating Unit for the West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF/RCU); Regional Coordinating Unit of the Eastern African Region (EAF/RCU); the South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP); and the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP);

(b) Global and international agreements: Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA); International Maritime Organization (IMO) marine pollution conventions; Secretariat of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS); Secretariat of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals (MMAP); Secretariat of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade.

(c) Intergovernmental organizations: Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), United Nations; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); International Maritime Organization (IMO); Marine Environment Laboratory of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA);

(d) Non-Governmental Organizations: World Conservation Union (IUCN); Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS).

14. The list of participants is provided in annex 2 to the present report.

II. FOLLOW-UP TO THE SECOND GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS (THE HAGUE, 5-8 JULY, 1999)

15. Introducing the item, the Chair drew attention to document UNEP (DEC)/RS 3.1.0, entitled "UNEP Water Policy and Strategy: Progress Report on Component 2: Managing Global Water Resources: Regional Seas, 1 January - 31 December 2000", and document UNEP (DEC)/RS 3.1.1, entitled "Status of implementation of decisions of the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans: The Hague, 5-8 July 1999". He explained that inputs from the current meeting concerning the issues raised in those two documents would be used as a guide in the preparation of recommendations to the UNEP Governing Council at its twenty-first session, in February 2001. The Chair also gave a brief presentation on the Regional Seas Website of UNEP (www.unep.ch/seas/), as well as the new UNEP conventions website (www.unep.ch/conventions/) in which regional seas programmes featured prominently.

16. Several representatives made oral corrections to the substance of document UNEP (DEC)/RS 3.1.0, which were subsequently submitted to the Chair.

Recommendation

17. The meeting recommended that, for purposes of follow-up, the recommendations of the third global meeting should be added to document UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.1.1, so as to produce a rollover report on the status of implementation of the decisions of the Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans.

Financial concerns

18. On the subject of resources, the Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions said that the available biennial budget for regional seas programmes had declined drastically from a level of some $10 million to $12 million per biennium during the first half of the 1990s, to a current level less than $3 million. Governments continued

to task UNEP with extra mandates, but failed to match their demands with appropriate contributions to its budget and devoted resources to other areas, such as convention trust funds or GEF.

19. Many representatives, stressing the importance of past UNEP support for their activities, regretted the decline in available funds and the cutbacks in activities that had resulted. They considered that a clear message needed to be sent to the Governing Council of UNEP to the effect that UNEP needed to be given resources commensurate with the task of adequately implementing the regional seas programmes and to give them the attention they deserved.

20. Some representatives, highlighting the importance of adequate preparation of projects to be submitted to GEF, considered that UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions needed to develop the expertise required for that activity. It needed to set up a small team with the specialist task of identifying suitable projects and subsequently preparing project proposals in a way that would make them acceptable for GEF funding.

21. It was noted, however, that not all projects dealing with marine problems were eligible for GEF funding, as GEF disbursed funds to cover incremental costs. Some representatives said that projects had to reflect the wishes of governments, not donors. The view was expressed that, since funding questions had assumed such importance, it was also necessary to create a post within UNEP for an expert to work on resource mobilization for the regional seas programmes. One representative held that the regional seas programmes could act as the coordinator between agencies in the implementation of GEF projects. Another said that active cooperation was needed between the GPA and GEF, and that could best be coordinated by UNEP.

Recommendations

22. In light of the fact that representatives had expressed some concern over their relationship with GEF and its operational methods, the meeting recommended:

(a) That a meeting should be organized between the regional seas programmes and GEF. Prior to that meeting, it was necessary to hold a coordinating meeting of the regional seas programmes to prepare a common position;

(b) That UNEP should bring to the attention of the next meeting of the Governing Council the concern of the Third Global Meeting over the declining support being allocated to the Regional Seas Programmes, despite the expressed recognition of past Governing Councils that the revitalization of the regional seas conventions and action plans is a UNEP priority;

(c) That UNEP should consider the establishment of a post in the Division of Environmental Conventions dedicated to mobilization of resources in

support of regional seas programmes, taking into account the wide range of funding sources available, including, but not limited to, the GEF, bilateral and multilateral donors, private industry and non-governmental organizations.

III. THE OPEN-ENDED INFORMAL CONSULTATIVE PROCESS ON OCEANS AND LAW OF THE SEA (UNICPOLOS)

23. In the absence of a representative from the United Nations Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS), which serves as secretariat for the new UN Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, a briefing on the background and first meeting of the consultative process was presented by Ms. Anne Rogers of the Division of Sustainable Development, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA).

24. The idea of a UN consultative process on oceans, to provide an integrated review including economic, social, environmental and legal dimensions of developments affecting oceans and seas, had been proposed by the Seventh Session of the Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) in April 1999. The UN General Assembly subsequently established in its resolution 54/33 of November 1999, the consultative process on oceans to meet for one week annually in New York, with the participation of all UN member States and relevant international and regional organizations and agencies. Its first meeting was held from 30 May – 2 June 2000 and addressed two main topics: responsible fisheries and illegal, unreported and unregulated fisheries (IUU); and economic and social impacts of marine pollution, especially in coastal areas. In addition, there was a one-half day dialogue with members of the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas (SOCA) on increasing coordination in oceans affairs. The report of the meeting, presented as recommendations of its two co-chairmen, is available on the DOALOS website: http://www.un.org/depts/ola/doalos.

25. The results of the first meeting of the consultative process were considered by the UN General Assembly at its 55th Session, which adopted resolution a/55/L.10 on "Oceans and the Law of the Sea" on 30 October 2000. This resolution, inter alia, decided that the second meeting should be held in New York from 7-11 May 2001, with two main areas of focus: marine science and the development and transfer of marine technology, including capacity building; and coordination and cooperation in combating piracy and armed robbery at sea. The resolution also calls for strengthening regional cooperation in several specific areas, including fisheries management organizations and arrangements, integrated management and sustainable development of coastal and marine areas, capacity building, IUU fisheries, and piracy and armed robbery at sea.

26. In the ensuing discussion, questions were raised as to what concrete results might result from the UN process that can help the regional seas programmes and in what ways the regional seas conventions and action plans can provide inputs to the future meetings.

It was suggested that the ACC/SOCA can play a role in promoting regional issues, and it was noted with satisfaction that the joint UNEP/FAO paper on the ecosystem-based management of fisheries, presented to the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, was a direct result of the UN informal consultative process.

27. In reply to a question from IUCN about potential regional inputs to the ten year review of UNCED (Rio + 10), to take place in 2002, the representative of UN/DESA provided some information on proposed intergovernmental and interagency preparatory activities, including at the regional and subregional levels. It has been suggested that regional preparatory meetings will be organized by the UN Regional Commissions and UNEP, in consultation with DESA, and take place in the period from March to November 2001. The results of these meetings would be considered by CSD-10, acting as the preparatory committee for the 10-year review (which is likely to be called the World Summit on Sustainable Development). In addition, it is also proposed to convene regional Agenda 21 round tables involving prominent experts from each region and representatives from civil society. It has been agreed at an organizational meeting held by DESA in June 2000 that UNEP and the Regional Commissions will undertake steps to raise awareness regarding the 2002 process within the respective regions.

Recommendations

28. In view of the potential benefits for enhancing awareness and support of the work of the regional seas programmes in important forthcoming global forums on oceans, the meeting recommended:

(a) That regional seas programmes participate in future meetings of the UN Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and Law of the Sea (May 2001) and provide inputs, as appropriate, to its background documentation, including reports to be provided by the ACC/SOCA and the UN/DOALOS;

(b) That the regional seas programmes play an active role in the regional and subregional preparatory activities being organized for the 2000 review of UNCED; and

(c) That the UNEP Secretariat and Governing Council be urged to promote a more active involvement of the regional seas conventions and action plans in these important intergovernmental processes and in their follow-up.

IV. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON CRITICAL PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FACING REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

29. The Roundtable Discussion on Critical Problems and Issues Facing Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans was chaired by the Executive Director of UNEP. In the course of an initial tour de table, the representatives of the regional seas conventions and action plans briefly outlined the main problems, constraints and challenges faced in their endeavours to implement their mandate, and possible ways to overcome those factors. A summary of the points they raised is contained in annex 3 to the present report. Financial constraints hindering the implementation of the conventions and action plans was the most commonly raised issue. Among the most frequently raised concerns were the following: inadequate exchange of information; the need for increased participation of civil society and the private sector; compliance and enforcement; marine pollution prevention and response; and improved monitoring. The representatives of intergovernmental organizations and of environmental convention secretariats were subsequently invited to describe the problems and constraints they faced, and to expatiate on how their activities related to those of the regional seas conventions and action plans.

30. The representative of IAEA-MEL highlighted the problems he faced in the funding of personnel; in communications with other agencies and with countries; and in strategic planning, since the dependence on sponsors made it difficult to set research priorities. There was a need to promote reference methods and pragmatic techniques that worked for developing countries; a need for quality assurance; and a need for self-evaluation of projects and of monitoring to check that activities were in fact what was required.

31. The Executive Secretary of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade drew attention to the awareness-raising programme, implemented with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), to teach countries how to manage their own chemicals and pesticides through country-based projects. Activities by the global conventions were a complimentary counterpart to help countries to implement the regional seas programmes and action plans.

32. The representative of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), recalling that IMO is the regulatory body for maritime safety and marine pollution prevention and response, stressed that regional cooperation was important in contributing to the implementation of IMO conventions, as was the case with marine pollution response, for example. Other areas where synergies could be developed included waste management, problems of ballast water, and pollution prevention. Stressing the importance of private sector involvement, he said that IMO was itself attempting to improve cooperation with the oil and shipping industries. To pursue cooperation at the regional level, IMO followed a policy consisting of cooperation with regional secretariats, including the signing memorandums of understanding. While there were constraints that prevented full coordination at the national and regional levels, he stressed the need for further

cooperation to improve the situation. New regional initiatives existed, and IMO wished to be properly involved in those issues.

33. The Secretary General of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) considered that training could best be carried out at the national/regional level, using existing structures, such as the regional seas conventions and programmes. Of concern to CITES was the programme of the Small Island Developing States (SIDS), especially concerning proposals for exploitation of turtle species. In addition, the situation of the sturgeons of the Caspian Sea had become serious, and was compounded by the problem of poaching and lack of enforcement of caviar quotas in the range States of the species. At the Caspian regional level, CITES, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and the Convention on Biological Diversity were all involved in efforts to protect the species.

34. The representative of CMS said that, because CMS operated through regional agreements, the potential for cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans was enormous, particularly at the institutional level. Because CMS did not always enjoy full country coverage within a region, the regional seas conventions and action plans could also facilitate the Convention's contacts to others within a specific region. Moreover, CMS had the technical expertise to develop agreements and could provide inputs to the regional seas programmes at the technical level. The case of ACCOBAMS was a good example where an agreement under CMS could already be implemented through the existing mechanisms of MAP and the Bucharest Convention. It was thus a model for similar initiatives for other regions. In addition, such activities would help avoid any duplication of efforts or competition.

35. In the course of the discussion on the agenda item, the following points were raised: the question of whether harmonization of monitoring and/or reporting among regions should constitute a priority activity; the problem of communications within and among the regional seas conventions and action plans; the important role of new institutions; the question of how to create synergies between the environmental conventions and the regional seas programmes and action plans, and avoid duplication of work; the need for a regional approach to common problems, such as POPs and heavy metals, and for the identification of hot-spots; the question of a trade-off with stakeholders, such as oil and gas-drilling concerns, whereby a stable investment climate could be guaranteed in return for environmental protection; the need to refine environmental impact assessment procedures; the need for concrete programmes to translate national action plans into business plans to which the private sector could relate, perhaps for financing; how to integrate socioeconomic and environmental repercussions into the activities of financial institutions; the importance of protocols as channels of contact with the environmental conventions; the refusal of international financial institutions to allow any ring-fencing of funds for environmental purposes, thus precluding environmental levies on private stakeholders; the question of what services the regional seas programmes and action plans provide to stakeholders, and who must pay for them and in what way; the question of what main indicators could be identified for the successful leveraging of finances; and the unresolved problem surrounding the

GEF replenishment, which had a resulted in a drastic curtailing of badly needed and anticipated resources for the secretariat of the Black Sea Convention.

Recommendations

36. The meeting recommended that representatives of the shipping industry, the chemical industry and the tourism industry be invited to participate in the Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans to address the issue of closer collaboration in the regional seas programmes, including the financing of activities.

Based on the elements of the discussions under this agenda item, and taking into account the discussion under other agenda items, the meeting requested the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions to prepare a document, for consideration by the Governing Council at its twenty-first session, on strengthening the work of UNEP in the continued vitalization of the regional seas programmes.

1. Innovative financing options for regional seas conventions and action plans

37. The Chair introduced document UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.3.0, "Financing Regional Seas Conventions: Paying for a Regional Public Good", which outlined framework ideas for the generation of financial resources, based on the premise that 80 to 90 per cent of the funds raised at the national level would go to support the national components of the regional seas conventions and action plans. He recalled that the Committee of Permanent Representatives of UNEP had asked UNEP to prepare a strategy to help the regional seas conventions and action plans to mobilize resources.

38. One representative considered that the paper could be one input, together with others, to the upcoming examination of initiatives for funding the GPA. Others considered the paper to be a valuable example of the kind of thing secretariats should be attempting.

39. Another representative stressed the importance of distinguishing between the financing of the implementation of the regional seas programmes and action plans and the financing of the machinery to promote the latter. If national economic institutions did not work effectively in, for example, tax collecting, then economic incentives were useless. Unless finance could be put in place for the core machinery with which to lobby for the aims of the programmes or action plans, those programmes could not increase the capacity of a country to provide support for itself. Another representative considered that the link between funding for projects and funding for a secretariat needed to be clarified, perhaps in a paper setting out the elements of success that could be drawn upon by others. Yet another representative said that, if a programme had nothing to begin with, it had no means of further leveraging resources.

40. Several representatives said that, in order to ensure that countries contributed to the regional seas conventions and action plans, it was vital to ensure that the programme coordinators did what the countries themselves wanted, and did not pursue mandates or priorities set elsewhere. In that connection, said one representative, it was important to have an idea of precisely what the countries themselves wanted, and not be donor-driven. Another representative held the view that, by carrying out projects in which donors were interested, donor confidence increased and the donor base could be expanded. One representative pointed to the importance of political commitment to the regional seas conventions and action plans and to the significance of a mechanism to participate in the international-level environmental forums for the leveraging of financial resources. It was stressed that recognized ownership of the action plan itself was the key to obtaining the commitment of the members.

41. A number of representatives stressed the crucial role of the coordinators in lobbying to obtain funding for their respective programmes. The secretariats needed strong leadership to mobilize resources, obtain the necessary political commitment from governments and operationalize the action plans. No situation was entirely without hope. Even apparently unusual and highly innovative schemes for fund-raising could be tried, as had been evidenced by the success of the "POPs Club", which had been used to raise funds for the negotiating process for the POPs convention. It was noted that very few regional seas conventions and action plans had a financial strategy, and those that did were the successful ones. Moreover, experience had shown that those regional programmes with a strong legal framework managed to do the most to protect the environment.

42. One representative believed that, since cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans would facilitate the implementation of global conventions, those conventions needed to contribute some form of mutual support in return for the increased responsibility assumed. Another observed that, if one activity were carried out effectively with a global convention, it would enable governments to understand and evaluate what the regional seas conventions and action plans could actually do.

43. Some representatives, noting that each regional seas programme or action plan was in a different situation, questioned the wisdom of trying to determine a common approach to all financial questions.

Recommendations

44. The meeting recommended:

(a) That a small informal working group be set up with a mandate to work on the preparation of a strategic approach to financing regional seas programmes, including the consideration of document UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.3.0 on financing regional seas conventions: paying for a regional public good. The group should comprise the secretariats of the Cartagena, Barcelona, and Nairobi

Conventions, the East Asian Seas Action Plan and the GPA, and be coordinated by the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions;

(b) That UNEP use the above exercise to prepare an overarching strategy for the mobilization of resources for regional seas programmes for the consideration of its Committee of Permanent Representatives and the intergovernmental meetings of concerned regional seas programmes. Such a strategy will distinguish between funding mechanisms and sources for (i) the coordination and management of a regional seas programme and (ii) the implementation of its Action Plans. The strategy should consider various funding sources, including the GEF, overseas development assistance (ODA), multilateral donors and innovative funding mechanisms at the national and regional levels, including the participation of private industry and local authorities. The overarching strategy would need to be further refined to meet the specific needs of concerned regional seas programmes.

(c) That UNEP should raise with GEF its concerns about the effects of the cutback of GEF resources to the International Waters projects.

2. Exploring new options for horizontal cooperation among regional seas conventions and action plans

45. There was broad recognition of the advantages of the twinning arrangements between the Baltic Marine Environment Commission and UNEP as the secretariat of the Nairobi Convention and between PERSGA (Jeddah Convention) and the Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (Kuwait Convention), as well as the Memorandum of Understanding for closer cooperation among PERSGA, ROPME, the Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment (CAMRE) and UNEP. Several representatives pointed to the need to promote the "tripleting" of regional seas conventions and action plans on issues of common concern. Capacity building was viewed as a priority.

Recommendation

46. The meeting requested:

(a) That UNEP prepare follow-up and explore the possibility of establishment of a network for capacity-building, linking the capacity-building activities undertaken throughout the regional seas programmes;

(b) That further work should be facilitated by UNEP in the negotiation and implementation of twinning arrangements between conventions. To that end, the meeting congratulates the OSPAR and Abidjan Conventions for progress in their on-going discussions of this matter;

(c) That UNEP assist in facilitating horizontal cooperation among regional seas programmes in areas of common concern such as Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and emergency response to oil spills and other related accidents.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES (GPA)

1. Status report on implementation of the GPA

47. The Coordinator of the Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA), Ms Veerle Vandeweerd, gave a presentation on the GPA, describing the development and aims of the GPA, its core, and its institutional framework. She pointed out the three main thrusts of the activities of the Coordination Office (assessment/analysis for action; mobilizing action at the local, national, regional and global levels; review and advancement of the implementation of the GPA) and described in detail the areas of focus through which those activities were carried out. In addition, in the first part of her presentation, she gave a progress report on the achievements of the GPA from August 1999 to October 2000, the physical and administrative establishment of the Coordination Office at The Hague, and the efforts aimed at broadening the donor base and raising funds.

48. She particularly highlighted the development of the GPA Strategic Action Plan (SAP) on Municipal Wastewater up to 2000, aimed at supporting States in addressing the human and coastal ecosystem health problems resulting from municipal wastewater that had been inadequately treated or disposed of. She listed the cooperation partners in the SAP; its assessment, management and coordination components; and its functions and management outputs. She also explained the aims and characteristics of the GPA Clearing-house Mechanism.

49. Answering a question on the GPA linkage with other global conventions in the context of upland and lowland interaction and its effects on coastal zones, the Coordinator pointed out that the GPA paid attention to the activities of other conventions and constantly strove to avoid any duplication of activity. In that connection, it was observed that a single action for coastal zone protection could simultaneously meet the requirements of several different conventions. One representative pointed to the close cooperation with the GPA on the subject of POPs and heavy metals.

50. The Director of the UNEP Regional Office for Europe (ROE) recalled that two documents had been made available at the Second Global Meeting, the Model Law on the Sustainable Development of Coastal Zones, and a Code of Conduct for Coastal Zones, both developed under the auspices of the Council of Europe. At that meeting there had been a request that they be scrutinized by the secretariats of the regional seas programmes

for their usefulness and that ROE be given comments and suggestions. As none had been forthcoming, he wished to reiterate the request at the current meeting. The Coordinator of GPA agreed to make the documents available through the clearing-house mechanism.

51. In reply to a query on how the GPA harmonized the geographical differences between the regional seas regions and the GPA regions, the Coordinator explained that GPA worked closely with the regional offices as well as with the secretariats of the regional seas programmes to use their different abilities and constituencies. The regional offices, for example, often had important links to Ministries of the Environment. In that context, the Director of ROE pointed to the role of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) in managing regional conventions related to marine pollution and underlined the need to involve ECE in the work of GPA.

52. The representative of MAP praised the positive role of GPA in the Mediterranean area, particularly with regard to the protocol on land-based sources of pollution, where MAP had redirected its activities in line with GPA. Indeed, MAP activities took into account the GPA approach, especially the 1997 Strategic Action Plan.

53. On the question of how GPA could support for the implementation of a regional seas work programme, the Coordinator explained that GPA could help regional seas conventions and action plans in joint fund-raising endeavours, both from the private sector and when anticipated contributions to GPA funding were in place. GPA could also help regions to identify their priorities. Concerning mobilization of resources, GPA had raised funds for action plans, for the clearing-house mechanism, from UNEP, from countries and was currently seeking longer-term support from donor countries and institutions for larger-scale projects.

54. It was noted that, while so-called "soft" funds could be obtained for preparation of plans, studies, etc., the mobilizing of "hard" money for infrastructure projects was more problematic. One representative said the regions needed to be also proactive in mobilizing funding, since it was not realistic to expect 100 per cent of the funding for sewage treatment to be provided by donor institutions. The importance of identifying successful demonstration projects was underlined as examples to bring together the different interested parties. The Coordinator pointed out that GPA aimed to be very pragmatic, to bring donors and financial institutions to meetings, to demonstrate best possible practices and to explore new approaches to financing.

55. One representative, while expressing strong support for GPA and the direction in which it was moving, wondered whether POPs deserved the amount of attention accorded to them and whether the GPA overemphasized the importance of the clearing-house mechanism as a tool for problem-solving. In the mobilization of resources, he believed that GPA had a role as an "honest broker", bringing together those who needed finance and those provided it. It could also help countries to formulate their requests to international financial institutions appropriately.

56. Noting that the construction of water treatment plants required full cost recovery from clients, one representative observed that plants needed to be tailored to the capacities for capital investment and low-cost maintenance in the areas in which they were to be located. There was little point in constructing high-technology, tertiary treatment plants if countries lacked the resources for proper maintenance and operation.

2. 2001 GPA Intergovernmental Review process and meeting

57. The Coordinator of the GPA Coordination Office, turning to the First Intergovernmental Review of the Implementation of the GPA, to be hosted by the Government of Canada in 2001, outlined its purpose, thematic focus, structure, preparatory process and expected outcomes. The latter included a Ministerial/High-level Declaration; a work programme for the period 2002 to 2006 (local, national, regional, global); endorsement of the GPA Municipal Wastewater Guidelines; provision of examples of sustainable financing and partnerships; and sharing of experiences and expertise. She sought guidance on how the regional seas conventions and action plans could have an input into the preparatory process and the outputs of the Intergovernmental Review. Moreover, since it was planned to devote one day of the Intergovernmental Review to a Regional Seas Day, she sought concrete suggestions from participants on how that part of the Review should be structured, in line with the aims and priorities of the regional seas conventions and action plans themselves.

3. Role of the regional seas conventions and action plans in the 2001 GPA Intergovernmental Review process and meeting

58. In the course of the discussion on the subitem, the following points were raised: in the activities of regional seas conventions and action plans, priority should be accorded to waste management and sewage treatment; how could the commitment of the private sector and non-governmental organizations be also taken into account at the review meeting; there was a need to identify how to implement concrete activities in support of protocols on land-based sources of pollution and to involve the international financial community; the high-level declaration was important in reinforcing what activities needed to be undertaken; as the key actors, the municipalities needed to be involved in activities concerning wastewater; the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans needed to form partnerships with the GPA to work together; some secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans wished to come up with a common regional position on activities at the regional level in preparation for the meeting; there was a need for regional seas conventions and action plans to identify their problems, priorities and barriers to action, so that that could be taken into account in the formulation of the 2002-2006 work plan; countries should prepare their national plans in an innovative way, so as not to lose the momentum while awaiting funding; tourism should be addressed as a major and growing sector that was linked to issues of sewage and shoreline modification, bearing in mind that the International Year of Ecotourism will take place in 2002; the Project Preparation Committee (PPC) should be approached

by GPA as a funding partner; the Baltic Environment Programme could contribute to the meeting by sharing experience on the successful implementation of a municipal sewage treatment project; there was a need to examine the problems posed by agriculture and eutrophication; in wastewater treatment, it was necessary to apply standards and guidelines appropriate to the area step-wise, and not necessarily strive to immediately implement the strict standards of the EC; there was a need to address the issue of sludge disposal and its cost, particularly for small island States; a subsidiary body for scientific, technical and technological advice should be set up to discuss pollution from land-based sources and make recommendations to a second high-level meeting; there was a need to take societal factors into account, for example some governments faced difficulties in the levying of charges for water; capacity-building was needed to educate public authorities on wastewater issues and advise them, for example, in the formulation of contracts with waste companies; plans and projects needed to incorporate milestones, so that achievements could be monitored; since prevention was cheaper than remediation, it was necessary to prevent extra pressure being placed on ecosystems by regulating developments and factoring into them the costs of water supply and disposal.

Recommendations

59. The meeting recommended:

(a) The secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans, in consultation with their member countries, will work together, as regional focal points, with the GPA Coordination Office on the regional preparatory process for the first intergovernmental review meeting on implementation of the GPA (Montreal, November 2001), including activities dealing with the (i) identification of regional problems, priorities and barriers to action (to be incorporated in the regional workprogrammes 2002-2006 related to land-based activities, which will be considered at the review meeting); (ii) preparation of the GPA ministerial/high-level declaration; (iii) reporting on progress in implementing the GPA; and (iv) preparation of the one day session on the regional seas programme at such meeting. The modalities for this collaboration were or are being discussed and agreed upon by the GPA Coordination Office and each secretariat;

(b) The role of the GPA secretariat as a "broker", bringing together potential recipients and potential donors of assistance is considered important. The GPA secretariat and those secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans that wish to do so, should work together in joint fund-raising activities for implementing the GPA. The GPA secretariat could also assist interested countries/regions in preparing relevant project proposals for funding;

(c) The regional seas conventions and action plans should consider municipal wastewater, as appropriate, a priority in preparing their workprogrammes;

(d) The regional seas conventions and action plans and the GPA Coordination Office should, as appropriate, address tourism as a major economic activity linked to, among others, sewage and physical alteration and destruction of habitats;[1] and

(e) The regional seas conventions and action plans and the GPA Coordination Office should, as appropriate, address agriculture and its effects on the coastal and marine environment, including eutrophication and pesticides reaching the ocean.

VI. ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING OF OCEANS

1. Status of implementation of the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)

60. In his presentation, the new Coordinator of the GIWA project, Mr. Dag Daler, described its background; the organization into 66 subregions; the goals of the project; the elements of its assessment methodology; the 22 issues identified, that were grouped into five areas of concern; the causal chain analysis; the progress of GIWA; and the schedule of upcoming events.

61. He explained that, as follow-up to the phased work plan for the regional seas involvement in the GIWA project, which had been prepared at the Second Global Meeting, GIWA had undergone a reorganization and had adopted a new schedule. He agreed that GIWA should work closely with the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans, as the custodians of the management plans for the marine and coastal areas, rather than solely with the UNEP regional offices, which often lacked the necessary expertise. GIWA intended to enter into contracts with all parties, some through GEF, others using different funding methods. The first contracts had been signed and others would follow once the terms of reference had been clarified. He was confident that the planned timeframe for signing contracts with focal points of the regional seas conventions and action plans would be followed. On the question of GIWA coordination with other United Nations conventions and organizations, he pointed out that GIWA's terms of reference meant it had no role to play in influencing the latter. GIWA simply took their results and data and coordinated them with ongoing projects. The representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity said that the secretariat of the Convention had already submitted its comments on the GIWA assessment.

62. One representative, pointing to the GIWA trial carried out in Thailand, considered that GIWA would provide a valuable assessment of the problems associated with waters.

---

[1] For the 2002 International Year of Ecotourism, the World Tourism Organization (WTO) and UNEP will be the lead agencies. The events of this year will provide regional seas programmes with the opportunity to demonstrate the work that they are doing in the field of tourism. The World Summit on Ecotourism will be held in Québec, Canada from 19-22 May 2002.

He stressed that its aim was not to write project proposals for GEF, but rather to establish prioritization at the global level. The representative of SPREP said that a proposed contract from GIWA had already been received from GIWA and it had been returned with some questions. Other representatives of regional seas programmes questioned the practicality of the GIWA time schedule, such as the signing of all contracts by the end of December of this year.

Recommendation

63. The meeting recommended that the GIWA office be encouraged to engage the regional seas programmes as soon as possible in the implementation of the programme of work concerning GIWA adopted at the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans. Concrete results in the implementation of this programme of work need to be presented by GIWA to the Fourth Global Meeting.

2. Presentation by UNESCO on the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) and strengthening interactions between regional seas conventions and action plans

64. In his presentation, Mr. Colin Summerhayes, Director of the GOOS Project Office, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, explained how interactions between GOOS and the GOOS products and services could be strengthened. GOOS could provide a greatly enhanced capacity for understanding and forecasting ocean properties, behaviour and resources on time-scales that permitted relevant and effective management decision-making. It was a new tool to enhance the information base for decision-making under the regional seas conventions and action plans. He described the operational elements of GOOS; its holistic approach; the ongoing data-gathering and distribution activities; and the future challenge to provide environmental forecasts to underpin the management of coasts and coastal seas. He highlighted the caveat that GOOS must be user-driven, providing products and services to meet the needs of a wide range of users and customers. He presented the elements of the GOOS Initial Observing System (IOS); the GOOS Health of the Ocean Module (HOTO); and the regional GOOS. He pointed to the applicability of GOOS data to the implementation of the GPA. In addition, he observed that the experience of the MESL could be applied in the application of GOOS.

65. On the issue of coastal GOOS, as a tool for coastal zone management, he explained the three subsystems, the six main observing elements (many of which were already in place), and pointed to the problem of how to obtain the information on a common set of key (core) variables and how to train personnel to use the information. He listed the current 17 core variables, noting that UNEP needed to tell GOOS what further variables needed to be added, and described the three main activities and the key pilot projects. Concerning the GOOS products and services, he explained that provisions for a number of the environmental indicators were not yet in place and that it was important for UNEP to play its part in the development of the coastal component of GOOS. While UNEP, as a co-owner of GOOS, was currently doing little to influence what GOOS did,

that could change. UNEP needed to decide on the level of its cooperation with GOOS and that required a clear idea of the requirements of the regional seas conventions and action plans. Noting the possibility of including MESL as a component of GOOS, he pointed to possible capacity-building activities with UNEP. In conclusion, he expressed the view that the possibilities of UNEP/GOOS cooperation should be brought to the attention of the UNEP governing bodies. A memorandum of understanding had already been signed with the Convention on Biological Diversity, and UNEP should explore the possibility of also using such an instrument in its cooperation with GOOS.

66. In reply to questions, he confirmed that a GOOS meta-database could be made available, that GOOS would be discussing the issue of non-point sources of pollution in the coming fortnight, and that recruitment of an officer to staff the IOC-CARIBE office was underway. Concerning the observing of the El Niño system, he pointed to the fact that GOOS, as a component of IOC, was already involved in observation work, but that efforts were being made to increase that involvement. Concerning how to integrate the work of the MAP regional activity centre for remote sensing, he stressed that it was important not to view GOOS as centralized. Regional GOOS could adopt the data from the MAP centre. It was necessary to make use of what already existed. Ultimately, GOOS would be implemented regionally and nationally. It was also important for regional centres to take responsibility for training.

67. One representative considered that the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans should consider what benefits they could bring to GOOS in the form of data, which they would ultimately use themselves. They were more relevant than the IOC focal points, who were not the end-users of the data. Strong links with GOOS were needed to pursue the matter. In addition, there was a need to investigate the possible ways in which GOOS, which provided important data to fisheries bodies, could act as a link to enhance cooperation between such bodies and the regional seas conventions and action plans.

Recommendation

68. The meeting recommended:

(a) That the new Chief of the Regional Seas Branch of the Division of Environmental Conventions work closely with the GOOS Project Office to ensure that the concerns of the regional seas programmes are taken into account in the management and implementation of GOOS. To that end, special attention will be given to the design, management and operationalization of the Coastal GOOS, which should contribute significantly to meeting the scientific and technical needs of regional seas conventions and action plans. As a first step the Chief of the Regional Seas Branch and the Director of the GOOS Project Office will elaborate the elements for a cooperative arrangement between the two to ensure that the needs of regional seas programmes are fully taken into account in the development, management and implementation of the Coastal GOOS in particular, as well

as the overall work of the Global Ocean Observing System. This recommendation is based on the recognition that the effectiveness of the Coastal GOOS will depend on the participation of the regional seas conventions and action plans;

(b) That IOC/UNESCO, through its GOOS programme, given the complimentary scientific work that it is undertaking, should be integrated into the UNEP/FAO initiative on the ecosystem-based management of fisheries, further discussed under agenda item 7.6;

(c) That the importance of the Coastal GOOS in support of the Regional Seas Programmes should be brought to the attention of the upcoming meeting of the Governing Council of UNEP, including the need to implement supportive capacity-building activities in regional seas programmes as required

3. Presentation by the IAEA Marine Environment Laboratory on marine environmental pollution and analysis

69. Mr. Stephen de Mora, Head of the Marine Environment Studies Laboratory of IAEA-MEL, described the mission of MESL and its experience in marine analytical chemistry, marine pollution monitoring and assessment and in chemical oceanography and marine biogeochemistry. He described its work within IAEA; the F-3 subprogramme of activities; comparison exercises; analysis of trace metals; data reporting and intercomparison exercises; production of reference materials; capacity-building activities and education and training in analytical techniques; the monitoring of marine contaminants; some specific activities with the MED POL programme, the Black Sea Environment Programme and the ROPME seas area; the biogeochemical cycle of mercury; new partners and priorities; and ongoing support to the United Nations. In connection with support to the regional seas conventions and action plans, he described the techniques developed in marine analytical chemistry; the formulation of reference methods and guidelines; intercomparison exercises; education; capacity building; monitoring programmes; and research activities.

70. In answer to a question on the kind of specific services MESL could provide to regional seas conventions and action plans, he said that those were dependent on the requirements, the priorities and the level of maturity of the particular programme, although a service such as capacity-building through training was always in demand due to staff turnover in the programmes themselves. Assistance could be provided in trend monitoring, which was becoming increasingly important and which required a monitoring network which could not only provide comparable data, but which was also reliable over time. Good regional quality assurance was required, and the best way to set up a network was for MESL to visit a region and evaluate the infrastructure and personnel. In addition, MESL could be tasked, as was the case for the Caspian region, with carrying out an initial survey of contaminants in a region.

71. There were some areas, such as reference methods and updating of procedures, which could not be costed to any particular region and which needed additional funds across the board from UNEP. The laboratory needed a new staff post for an engineer. Somehow, additional resources had to be obtained from UNEP.

Recommendations

72. The meeting recommended that the regional seas programmes should make use of the services of the Marine Environment Studies Laboratory (MESL) of IAEA in support of its marine pollution monitoring and assessment programmes. Individual regional seas programmes were encouraged to take opportunity of this meeting to further discuss with MESL possible collaboration.

73. UNEP was requested, within its available resources, to work with MESL in supporting sampling and monitoring activities in developing countries that are member States of regional seas programmes.

4. Presentation by UNEP-WCMC on biodiversity data and information management for regional seas programmes

74. The Director of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), Mr. Mark Collins, presented background information on WCMC and explained that, now that the Centre was fully integrated into UNEP, it was to be hoped that it would work more closely with the UNEP components, particularly the regional seas conventions and action plans, since it offered an approach to build capacities for information management for coastal zone and marine areas. He looked forward to learning how WCMC could link up with the regional seas conventions and action plans and explore ways of cooperating over and above the existing programmes in which WCMC was involved.

75. Mr. Edmund Green, Head of the Marine and Coastal Programme, WCMC, presented the four main areas of WCMC activity in the marine environment: addressing data gaps; original research; science; and the regional seas conventions and action plans. Concerning support for the latter, he described the biological diversity data and analyses held by WCMC; the regional products; the traditional reports and maps; and the new Internet Map Server (IMS) products. IMS, he explained, was fundamentally a Web-based GIS system, which was quick and efficient. It was easy to access round the clock; required little technical knowledge of GIS; required no maintenance by users; provided data for the whole world in limitless detail; and could be supplemented by non-environmental data. As a pilot project, a prototype map server had been set up for four areas (Baltic Sea, East African Sea, Mediterranean Sea, and Caribbean Sea) which represented a technical skeleton for access to WCMC data. In addition, data from the regions could be received through the IMS regional systems. He sought suggestions on how the system could be adapted to the work of the regional seas conventions and action plans, how useful it could be for the exchange of information, and on the directions in which it should be developed.

76. There was general agreement on the need for cooperation between the regional seas conventions and action plans and WCMC and on the value of its products. One representative observed that the WCMC materials would be a valuable aid in selling the work of the regional seas conventions and action plans. Another stressed the importance of WCMC work on seagrass beds and the need for cooperation to set up a seagrass awareness campaign. Yet another described the use he had already made of the WCMC database.

77. In answer to queries, Mr. Green explained that WCMC data came from many hundreds of sources, whose reliability was classified according to a ranking system, depending on whether they had been peer reviewed. The oil industry had originally funded the collation of data for oil spill scenarios, and those data would also prove useful to the regions in large-scale contingency planning. Concerning costs of services, he explained that, now that the institutional arrangements had been put in place, access to WCMC data was simplified, though it was not free and its cost depended on what was required. He underlined the fact that WCMC's close association with the private sector would help to provide a link to potential sources of funding for regional seas conventions and action plans.

Recommendation

78. The meeting took note of the possibilities of cooperation with WCMC and agreed that the secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans would carry out their own appropriate follow-up.

VII. STRENGTHENING LINKAGES BETWEEN THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS AND THE CHEMICALS-RELATED CONVENTIONS

1. The IMO conventions

79. In his presentation, Mr. Jean-Claude Sainlos, Senior Deputy Director, Marine Environment Division, IMO, drew attention to document UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.6.0, which gave a comprehensive report on IMO policy regarding protection of the marine environment. He described the regulatory functions of IMO, with particular emphasis on major recent developments such as port reception facilities for ships, the use of tributyl tin (TBT) in anti-fouling paints for ships and the transport of alien species in ships' ballast water, which were of relevance to the regional seas programmes. He also reported on the technical cooperation programme to assist in the implementation of IMO conventions and on the latest activities within the regions with regard to the International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response, and Co-operation (OPRC), MARPOL and the London Dumping Convention. In conclusion, he gave an update on global activities and on activities related to the London Convention. He proposed that

UNEP and IMO consider organizing a forum of the regional seas conventions and action plans on the subject of preparedness and response to accidental marine pollution. He believed there was a lot to gain from the sharing of experiences of Regional Activity Centres (RACs) like MAP's Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean (REMPEC) and the regional seas secretariats.

80. A number of representatives expressed appreciation for the activities undertaken through cooperation with IMO so far, and wished to see an increase in such activities and synergies between IMO and the regional seas conventions and action plans. They also desired additional information and an exchange of experiences to how best to apply IMO activities to their regions. The view was expressed that, once governments saw the fruits of such cooperative work, such as the establishment of a Regional Activity Centre (RAC), they would be encouraged to increase their own cooperation and perhaps make funding available for other activities.

81. It was considered that the cooperation with IMO should not just be limited to the field of pollution response, but should be expanded, perhaps to include the issue of prevention of pollution from ships. In addition, UNEP needed to have a high-level input into IMO activities at the global level to discuss all aspects of the environment. One representative questioned the wisdom of compartmentalizing all the different types of marine pollution, and considered that it would be good if REMPEC were to be made the responsible body for all such pollution in the Mediterranean, for example. There needed to be a more coherent approach to all aspects of marine pollution. It was, however, noted that the Mediterranean countries themselves were free to adopt a common position themselves and expand the scope of their response protocol to encompass preventive measures. It was proposed that the MAP secretariat could prepare a paper on the broad issues of political and legal responsibility involved, perhaps providing case studies.

82. It was observed that, as there were plans to review and enlarge the scope of the two protocols on marine pollution under the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions, it was desirable for IMO to work with the GPA to see if it would be possible to have only one protocol on land-based sources of pollution, rather than a piecemeal revision of the existing protocols.

83. Regarding implementation of MARPOL, it was considered that there is a need to assess how the provisions of MARPOL were being fulfilled. On the subject of possible UNEP involvement in the ecological aspects of the problem of invasive exotic species, Mr. Sainlos stressed that, as the problem was related to ships, projects to deal with the problem had originally been an IMO initiative and fell under its mandate.

84. One representative questioned the value of a protocol on exotic species when there were other priorities, since a number of countries were unable to identify what species in their areas were in fact exotic. He also doubted the value of IMO's planned activities concerning wrecks.

85. In answer to one representative, who wondered at the delay in approval of port reception facilities in his region, funded by the private sector, Mr. Sainlos recalled that this is a responsibility of the concerned governments.

Recommendations

86. The meeting recommended:

(a) That a joint IMO/UNEP forum on emergency response to marine pollution should be considered with a view to exchange experiences and to discuss issues of common interest among the regional seas conventions and action plans, with the participation of the RCUs of regional seas programmes and their respective regional activity centers (RACs) such as REMPEC. IMO and the UNEP Regional Seas Branch of the Division of Environmental Conventions should cooperate in preparing such a forum, in consultation with the RCUs of the regional seas conventions and action plans;

(b) In contiguous areas, such as the Mediterranean and ROPME regions, it was worth examining the possibility of close cooperation in the implementation of emergency response programmes.

2. The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

87. Mr. Pierre Portas, Senior Legal Officer of the Basel Convention, described the aims and operational elements of the Convention; its cooperation mechanisms; and the possible avenues of cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans, particularly concerning the dismantling of ships and the environmentally sound management of waste oils. He believed that the global conventions needed to be implemented at the regional level, but the commitment at that level was sometimes lacking. In addition, it was necessary to identify the needs at that level and to assess where synergies could operate. For example, a joint approach to donors could help to overcome the problems created by the multiplicity of actors that sought financing. Capacity building was a critical area for establishing links between the Basel Convention and the regional seas conventions and action plans, perhaps through provision of training courses in the regions. Joint project implementation to streamline or develop adequate national legislation and regulations was another possible area of cooperation. Instead of having such activities implemented on an ad hoc basis, it might be useful to consider establishing a framework or platform to sustain such cooperation. In the final analysis, the effective implementation of the Basel Convention relied heavily on the capacities of the regional and subregional organizations.

88. A number of representatives expressed an interest in increasing their cooperative activities with the Basel Convention, but were unsure how to initiate or operationalize such cooperation. It was suggested that joint activities in areas of common concern

should be identified. One representative noted that some members of his region had preferred to develop their own regional convention on hazardous waste, with more manageable objectives. Other representatives wondered how cooperative activities with the Basel Convention could be pursued by those African countries that had ratified the Bamako convention. It was noted that, if regulations governing transboundary movements of hazardous wastes were to be harmonized, the regional seas conventions and action plans need to cooperate with the Basel Convention in formulating regional protocols on the subject.

89. Mr. Portas acknowledged that the Basel Convention had in recent years lost potential partners, but he stressed that it was critical to build or rebuild the links and relationships. It was necessary to look at instruments to facilitate cooperation, such as memorandums of understanding and letters of agreement. Joint activities in areas of common concern should be identified. He agreed to prepare a paper on the subject of how to initiate more intensive cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans.

Recommendations

90. The meeting recommended that the Basel Convention Secretariat and the Regional Seas Programmes should reinitiate efforts for collaborating together on the issue of transboundary movement of hazardous wastes, including the work of the Basel Convention's regional centres for training. To that end, interested regional seas programmes and the Basel Convention Secretariat will consider the negotiation and implementation of Memoranda of Understanding.

91. The meeting expressed its appreciation and gratitude to the offer of the representative of the Basel Convention Secretariat to assist regional sea programmes in the development of protocols on transboundary movement of hazardous wastes.

3. The Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade

4. Development of an international legally binding instrument on persistent organic pollutants (POPs)

92. In his presentation, Mr. J. Willis, Director, UNEP Chemicals, and Executive Secretary of the Rotterdam Convention, first gave a detailed overview of the UNEP Chemicals Programme, describing its catalytic role in treaty negotiation; its capacity-building activities for awareness-raising, training, and regional and country-based projects; assessment work; information products; and its coordination and cooperation activities. In conclusion, he pointed to a large number of opportunities for collaboration in activities at the regional/subregional level. Noting that the Programme cooperated widely with the World Bank in the use of GEF resources, he stressed that the

implementation of GEF projects did not have to go solely through UNEP. Moreover, donors were happy to take advantage of the fact that the World Bank charged two per cent in agency costs for capacity-building work.

93. Giving an overview of the Rotterdam Convention, he described its history and negotiation; the Diplomatic Conference; the resolution on interim arrangements; the outcome of the sixth and seventh sessions of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee; and the first session of the Interim Chemical Review Committee. He explained the procedure for which a chemical became a candidate for inclusion in the convention, but stressed that the procedure was not open for the general nomination of candidates.

94. Concerning the POPs negotiations, he set out the characteristics of POPs, the international initiatives, and the background, mandate and status of the negotiations. He listed the 12 POPs already identified for action, and noted that the list was likely to increase, once the POPs instrument had been adopted. He explained that the draft convention also included in an annex the specific criteria for assessment of the toxicity of individual POPs. Although no decision had yet been made on the choice of a financial mechanism for the instrument, GEF had expressed a willingness to assume the role. The cost of implementing POPs had been estimated by GEF at $150 million for an initial biennium, but actual clean-up of all existing POPs was probably financially unsustainable.

95. In reply to a question on how the increasing number of chemicals conventions could be coordinated, he underlined the difficulty of the task, which often depended on the relationship between the conventions and their geographical location. One answer lay in the establishment of memorandums of understanding for coordinating mechanisms, with follow-up activities. The Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) brought together some of the key organizations dealing with chemical safety and offered cooperation possibilities.

96. On the subject of disposal of obsolete pesticides, he drew attention to guidance documentation, available in the working languages of the United Nations, on identification and management of stocks and prevention of accumulation. UNEP-financed activities were currently helping countries to prepare inventories of stocks, but he believed that bilateral and not multilateral assistance was the answer. Although some companies pursued a policy of responsible stewardship of chemicals, and were prepared to take back and destroy obsolete stocks, it was not always easy to identify the producer. Some form of incentive means was needed to encourage wider use of a responsible care programme.

97. In response to a query on how cooperation could foster the use of Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) in a region, he pointed to the possibilities of collaboration within the PRTR coordination group of the IOMC. Bilateral financing of activities could also be facilitated, and it was sometimes the case that countries had an interest if funding activities to control chemical problems originating in a particular

region that needed assistance. In cases where ideas or models for chemicals-related activities in a region had been developed, it was important for them to contact UNEP Chemicals. While there was no guarantee of assistance, sometimes a matching donor could be found.

98. Attention was drawn to the importance of ensuring that all information on activities in the regions was posted on their websites, so that other regional seas conventions and action plans could make use of the experience gained.

99. On the subject of illegal trade in POPs, the Director, UNEP Chemicals, said that the issue involved institutional measures, training and availability of customs inspectors, and questions of infrastructure, national enforcement and compliance. Cooperation was underway with the World Customs organization (WCO) in the long and difficult process of formulating customs codes for identification of relevant chemicals. One representative offered to make available on the region's website the details of its regional strategy on hazardous substances.

100. One representative observed that the developing countries, which needed to address the issue of POPs and have stockpiles removed, lacked the capacities and resources to monitor POPs and were unable to formulate for GEF the incremental costs of stockpile removal. That was not just a problem for the developing countries. Very few countries in the world had the necessary laboratory capacities for POPs analysis. Moreover, analyses of POPs could be very costly, laboratories sometimes disagreed on the analytical techniques to be applied, and they showed variability in their findings. Because the traditional monitoring methods were proving so costly, countries and regions had to be clear about their precise requirements when specifying what kind of monitoring they wanted to be carried out. In some cases, policy was enacted while the background science was still in dispute. The POPs instrument, it was pointed out, was based on agreement that sufficient science was required to take a decision on a chemical.

Recommendation

101. The meeting recommended:

(a) That regional seas programmes and chemicals-related conventions work closely together in the implementation of capacity-building and information exchange activities for assisting countries in meeting their obligations under the Rotterdam Convention and the forthcoming convention on persistent organic pollutants (POPs);

(b) That the Regional Seas Programmes, the Rotterdam Convention and the forthcoming convention on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) collaborate on other mutually supportive activities, such as the development and application of harmonized customs codes.

102. The meeting requested the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions to prepare an inventory of the work in chemicals undertaken by the regional seas

While such cooperation was currently somewhat limited in extent, the secretariat of the Convention needed specific ideas and suggestions for cooperative activities. Moreover, it offered a forum to inform Parties of the aims and activities of the regional seas conventions and action plans. Participation in the expert meetings and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) would give the regional seas conventions and action plans an opportunity to play a role in the formulation of recommendations to the Conference of the Parties. The regional seas conventions and action plans can be an implementing tool for the Convention's work programme on coastal areas management. The governments of the regions also had an opportunity to submit the names of experts for inclusion on the Convention's roster of experts. Moreover, many activities of the regional seas conventions and action plans sought GEF funding, and GEF was the funding mechanism of the Convention and received its instructions through the Conference of the Parties.

107. In connection with the poor attendance of the secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans at meetings of the bodies under the Convention, attention was drawn to the problems some regions faced in financing attendance at such a multiplicity of meetings. However, such problems could be mitigated by having two or three designated representatives from regional seas conventions and action plans attend expert meetings or the meetings of the SBSTTA. The regional seas conventions and action plans should devise a mechanism, perhaps through UNEP or their governing bodies, to identify their priorities, as well as the representatives who should bring them to the SBSTTA and COP meetings. They needed to prepare a document, for submission to SBSTTA and the Conference of the Parties, setting out how they are and can contribute to the implementation of the Convention. The Executive Secretary offered the help of the secretariat in the preparation of documentation submitted to the meeting. Decision V/3 of the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to report to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties which will be held in April 2002, so that was the time-frame in which the regional seas programmes needed to act. It was also observed that an official communication by governments of a region could be addressed to the Conference of the Parties to draw attention to activities and concerns of a regional seas convention or action plan.

108. Further points raised in the discussion included: how to get concrete results in terms of implementation of regional seas programmes from cooperation with the Convention; the need for regional seas conventions and action plans to review their own work programmes in light of how they related and contributed to the implementation of the Convention and its Jakarta Mandate; the need for full information on the aims and activities of the Convention, and for liaison with its focal points; the provision of feedback from the regional seas conventions and action plans to the Convention; the need to demonstrate where regional activities also provided global benefits, so as to attract GEF and other funding; the possibility of the Convention secretariat reviewing regional seas programme projects for potential submission to GEF.

programmes as an information base for collaborating on mutually supportive activities with the Rotterdam Convention and the forthcoming convention on POPs.

VIII. STRENGTHENING LINKAGES BETWEEN REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS AND BIODIVERSITY-RELATED CONVENTIONS AND AGREEMENTS

103. Introducing the item, the Chair recalled that examination of the possibility of closer cooperation between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the Convention on Biological Diversity and CITES was a direct follow-up to two recommendations of the Second Global Meeting. He believed that the concrete expression of such collaboration between regional seas conventions and action plans and the multilateral environmental agreements was very critical. It was not sufficient to solely sign memorandums of understanding. While they offered a useful basis for cooperation, it was necessary to somehow involve the governing body of the convention in the issue of cooperating with the regional seas conventions and action plans in the implementation of the convention. The decisions of the Conference of Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity at its Fifth Meeting and the COP of CITES at its Eleventh Meeting calling for closer collaboration with the regional seas programmes were both the results of recommendations emanating from the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans.

1. Follow-up to the decision of COP V of CBD on joint programming of CBD and the regional seas conventions and action plans

104. Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, explained the background to decision V/3 of the Conference of the Parties, calling for cooperation with the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans in the development of joint work programmes for the implementation of the Jakarta Mandate. He described the history of the Convention; elements of its work programme, focusing on marine and coastal biodiversity; and areas of cooperation, particularly with GPA.

105. Mr. Peter Fippinger, Jakarta Mandate, Convention on Biological Diversity, gave a detailed presentation on the Jakarta Mandate; the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties; the Convention's programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity; possible areas of cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans, with emphasis on problems such as coral bleaching and alien invasive species; mechanisms for increasing such cooperation; and specific requests for information.

106. It was agreed that cooperation with the Convention on Biological Diversity provided an important forum to bring together governments and organizations to tackle many issues that were of direct concern to the regional seas conventions and action plans.

Recommendations

109. The meeting recommended that:

(a) The secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity should provide the following to the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans:

(i) List of SBSTTA documents relevant to the marine and coastal programme of work available through the clearing-house mechanism;
(ii) List of documents of the Conference of the Parties relevant to the marine and coastal programme of work available through the clearing-house mechanism;
(iii) List of the national focal points of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
(iv) List of the GEF focal points;
(v) List of the GEF-supported biodiversity projects;
(vi) List of the national reports received;
(vii) The decisions of the Conference of the Parties comprising the marine and coastal programme of work;
(viii) A sample of a Convention on Biological Diversity memorandum of understanding;

(b) The regional seas conventions and action plans should report to the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the implementation of the marine and coastal programme of work within the respective regions, which will subsequently be reported to SBSTTA and the Conference of the Parties;

(c) The regional seas conventions and action plans should seek to identify experts on marine and coastal biological diversity from the respective regions and encourage their nomination to the roster of experts of the Convention on Biological Diversity through the appropriate national focal points;

(d) The regional seas conventions and action plans, through their secretariats, should be represented at the relevant meetings of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(e) The secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity should, when appropriate, seek to participate at the global meetings of the regional seas conventions and action plans;

(f) The secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity should seek comment and contributions from the secretariats of the regional seas

conventions and coordinators of the action plans in the preparation of relevant documentation of the Convention on Biological Diversity;

(g) The regional seas conventions and action plans and the Convention on Biological Diversity should seek to identify common elements between the respective regional activities and the marine and coastal programme of work, with a view to harmonizing work plans, bearing in mind that one issue common to all regional seas programmes and the CBD is the application of the ecosystem approach to their programmes of work;

(h) The regional seas conventions and action plans, together with the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, should seek to encourage national reporting consistent with the guidelines approved by the Conference of the Parties, with a view to harmonizing reporting requirements of regional and global instruments.

(i) The regional seas conventions and action plans should seek the advice and technical comment of the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity on project proposals regarding biodiversity-related issues.

(j) The regional seas programmes should promote the ratification of the CBD and its protocol on biosafety in their regions.

2. The CITES Strategic Action Plan adopted by COP XI

110. The Secretary General of CITES, Mr. Willem Wijnstekers, made a presentation on potential collaboration between CITES and the regional seas programmes. In his opening words he made reference to the Strategic Action Plan and the paper on Synergies presented to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties of CITES, which contained proposals for cooperation between CITES and the regional seas programmes. A number of issues addressed by CITES such as sturgeons, corals, sea turtles and tourism souvenirs were of interest to several regional seas conventions and action plans. CITES would be interested in sponsoring dialogue on some of those critical problematic issues. He made reference to CITES activities such as the meeting being organized for Pacific island states and the Mexico workshop on the Hawksbill Turtle dialogue. He also proposed the establishment of focal points in regional seas programmes that could be co-financed by global conventions whose work is linked to three or four regional agreements. Such focal points could help in addressing shared enforcement efforts.

111. The representative of the Cartagena Convention expressed interest in establishing a cooperation arrangement with CITES. To that end, it would be desirable to identify areas of compatibility with CITES. Some representatives agreed that the regional seas programmes could be a vehicle for supporting the implementation of CITES. Another representative stated that he would like to work with CITES in the organization of the meeting of Pacific island states.

112. Several interventions were made concerning the issue of the Hawksbill Turtle in the Wider Caribbean region, underscoring the controversial nature of the subject, including the divergence in scientific information and the conflict between conservation and sustainable use. The importance of preparatory dialogue at the regional level to meetings of the Conference of Parties to CITES was stressed. The issue of global sharing of costs for protecting species at the national level was also discussed.

Recommendations

113. The meeting recommended that bilateral discussions would be held between CITES and the Regional Seas Programmes on the development of cooperative arrangements and that progress in this area would be reported at the Fourth Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans. One area of cooperation to receive attention would be the organization of regional dialogue on problematic issues of common concern.

114. The meeting also recommended that UNEP should facilitate the development of cooperative arrangements between CITES and the regional seas programmes.

115. The meeting requested that UNEP, through the Division of Environmental Conventions, to work with CITES in facilitating information to regional seas programmes on activities to be undertaken by CITES within their respective regions.

3. Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)

116. Mr. Marco Barbieri, Technical Officer, CMS, gave a presentation on the Convention, describing its background, aims, membership, institutional structure and operational tools. He drew particular attention to the role of CMS in the conservation of species of marine mammals, and pointed to the main regional Agreements to that end: the Agreement on the Conservation of Seals in the Wadden Sea; the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS); and the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS). He also said that memorandums of understanding concerning turtles had been promoted among range states for the Atlantic coast of Africa and the Indian Ocean.

117. Although CMS was a global convention, its implementation was basically regional, and it was possible for countries to cooperate in Agreements without being party to CMS. Moreover, CMS Agreements obtained GEF funding resources. The Convention could collaborate with the regional seas conventions and action plans by helping to formulate legally binding agreements or soft law tools and frameworks (i.e., non-legally binding) for the conservation of species. A good model for the synergies that could be created through CMS at the regional level was provided by ACCOBAMS, where negotiations were also underway to use existing structures within MAP and the

Black Sea regional seas programme as subregional coordinating centres for the agreement.

118. A number of representatives considered that CMS could provide help in identifying and catalysing funding for conservation projects in regional seas conventions and action plans, and sought further information on the best way to approach the Convention for cooperation. It was noted that, with the current proliferation of environmental conventions and agreements, countries often had problems in identifying which body best met their needs and how to go about initiating cooperation.

119. Several representatives stressed the role which CMS could play in the event of sudden die-back of species listed in its annexes as a result of natural or man-made catastrophes, such as the coordination of action to help the species recover and the leveraging of resources to that end. CMS could also have an important role in enforcing the removal or mitigation of barriers to migratory routes.

Recommendation

120. The meeting recommended:

(a) That regional seas conventions and action plans be provided with full information on the focal points of the conventions and agreements operating in their respective regions, to enable them to identify the actors that best met their needs;

(b) That regional seas conventions and action plans cooperate with CMS in the implementation of the UNEP Marine Mammals Action Plan and that CMS should strengthen its cooperation with MMAP.

(c) That CMS should involve the relevant regional seas convention/action plan at an early stage in developing and implementing CMS regional agreements affecting marine species, e.g. on turtles, albatrosses, sharks, whales and marine mammals. Opportunities for synergies should be identified and fully explored.

4. Marine Mammal Action Plan

121. An overview of the status of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) was presented by Mr. Robert Hepworth, Deputy Director, Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP. The Division of Environmental Conventions in collaboration with UNEP's Division of Early Warning and Assessment is serving as the secretariat of MMAP. Sixteen years have passed since the Marine Mammal Action Plan was established. In light of this fact, there is a need to review the MMAP and the work being undertaken by the regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans vis-a-vis this Plan.

122. In the ensuing discussion, issues pertaining to the possible need to retool this plan to increase its relevance and usefulness were discussed. A number of views on possible new structures, scope, activities, linkages and resources were proposed. The majority of the views expressed advocated a broader, modernized and better resourced MMAP. Mr. Hepworth assured the meeting that the options presented and discussed on the MMAP would be considered by UNEP in consultation with its partners.

123. A special report was presented to the meeting by Carole Eros on the IUCN Action Plan on Dugongs, which is partly financed by UNEP. Like other members of the Sirenia family, dugongs have a slow rate of reproduction and a specialized diet based on seagrass. Threats to this species include by-catch, marine pollution, boat-strikes, habitat destruction and severe storms (which damage sea grass). Most Dugongs were classified as critically endangered or endangered under the IUCN 2000 Redlist. Australian populations have recently been placed on CITES appendix I. Dugongs are also protected under the Convention on Migratory Species. The emerging action plan recommended a number of research and management measures, including aerial surveys, the protection of key dugong habitats, the reduction of by-catch and the control of pollution from land-based activities. Education, especially involving local communities, was also a key element of the plan. The plan is due to be published in 2001 and will be circulated to the RCUs of the regional seas conventions and action plans.

Recommendation

124. It was agreed that UNEP would continue the retooling of the Marine Mammal Action Plan in consultation with CMS. CITES, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the regional seas conventions and action plans and relevant partner organizations, including IUCN, and present a revised MMAP to the Fourth Global Meeting.

5. Potential cooperation between regional seas programmes and regional fisheries bodies (RFBs)

125. Mr. Benedict Satia, Chief, International Institutions and Liaison Service, FAO, presented the joint UNEP/FAO paper entitled "Ecosystem-based Management of Fisheries: Opportunities and Challenges for Coordination between Marine Regional Fisheries Bodies and Regional Seas Conventions", drawing attention to the document on the subject before the meeting (UNEP (DEC)/RS3.7.1), and invited comments from participants on how it could be refined to take more fully into account the issues of concern to the regional seas conventions and action plans, prior to its finalization. Mr. Stjepan Keckes, Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS), assisting in the presentation, called particular attention to annex V of the document (on activities of regional seas conventions and action plans of direct relevance to fishery resources) which needed to be updated in light of the discussions and the current meeting. He also pointed to the four main conclusions contained in the document.

126. The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, noting that the Conference of the Parties had adopted the ecosystems approach for the

implementation of the Convention, considered that the approach proposed in the document would be of great practical use. He offered to make available case studies on the ecosystems approach for RFBs. It was observed that case studies prepared by the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas could also be made available and would help identify areas where representative models could be applied.

127. A number of representatives reported on the activities of their organizations and their relationship, or lack thereof, with RFBs, and offered to provide FAO with further information to supplement the report. It was observed that, in the case of regions where no RFMO existed, and an ecosystems approach was required because of problems such as alien species or eutrophication, the ecosystems approach could be applied at the level of individual countries.

128. It was observed that the RFBs lacked information on external factors which influenced fisheries management and which could be provided by the regional seas conventions and action plans, for example, on land-based sources of pollution, habitat destruction, etc. Likewise, they could provide an input for the regional seas conventions and action plans. It was noted that, since there was a need to share experiences and also to follow up with other activities, it was desirable for RFBs to be able to attend meetings of the regional seas conventions and action plans.

Recommendations

129. Recognizing the potential benefits that could be derived from closer cooperation among the regional seas conventions and action plans and RFBs in the fields relevant to ecosystem-based management of fisheries, the meeting endorsed the actions recommended for the enhancement of this cooperation to:

(a) Formalize the observer status of the regional seas conventions and action plans at the meetings of the governing bodies of the RFBs and their technical subsidiary organs, and vice versa;

(b) Exchange data and information available at the level of RFBs and regional seas conventions and action plans that may be of mutual interest;

(c) Organize joint technical meetings on subjects of mutual interest; and

(d) Design and implement joint programmes between RFBs and regional seas conventions and action plans, taking fully into account the respective mandates, objectives and scope of the regional seas conventions and action plans and RFBs.

140. On the understanding that the paper was intended to be presented to the forthcoming meeting of RFBs organized by FAO in February 2001, the meeting also recommended that, before presenting the paper to that meeting, it should be amended taking into account the following comments and suggestions:

(a) Information on the status and activities of regional seas conventions and action plans should be updated and expanded, whenever necessary;

(b) The role of the EU in shaping the fisheries management policy of its member States should be highlighted;

(c) The advantages and mutual benefits that would derive from the association of the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) with the programmes carried out under the regional seas conventions and action plans and the RFBs should be recognized and elaborated;

(d) The enhanced cooperation among RFBs and regional seas conventions and action plans on issues relevant to ecosystem-based management of fisheries would be a considerable contribution towards the implementation of global conventions and programmes, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GPA, as well as to the 2001 Reykjavik Conference on Responsible Fisheries in the Ecosystem (Reykjavik, Iceland, 24-28 September 2001).

6. The International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN)

141. The Coordinator of the East Asian Seas RCU, Dr. Hugh Kirkman, briefed the meeting on the recent meeting of the International Coral Reef Initiative Coordination and Planning Committee (ICRI CPC) on 28 – 29 October, where he participated on behalf of the DEC. He especially highlighted the resolutions that were adopted by the ICRI CPC. These include, among others, resolutions on the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN), coral reef fisheries (including the role of FAO), and ICRAN. The complete list of ICRI resolutions is available from the DEC or directly from the ICRI Secretariat.

142. The Coordinator of the ICRAN project, Ms Agneta Nilsson, presented the UNEP project with UNESCO on the GCRMN. She explained that the GCRMN is a global network of governments, coral reef scientists, NGOs and local communities for monitoring and assessments of coral reefs. GCRMN promotes monitoring of both biophysical and socio-economic parameters with a focus on data needed for management. The network operates through a global coordinator based in the Australian Institute of Marine Science, regional coordinators and nodes established in consultation with the regional seas programmes, and national focal points. The network develops the Status of Coral Reefs of the World Reports every two years, with the most recent prepared in 2000. The GCRMN with UNEP support has also recently developed a socio-economic manual for coral reef management.

143. Ms Agneta Nilsson went on to present the International Coral Reef Action Network project, jointly initiated by UNEP and the World Fish Center (ICLARM). She explained that the ICRAN project is a catalytic effort that represents a unique

collaboration among global initiatives and on-the-ground action through the framework of the Regional Seas Programme. ICRAN partners include UNEP with the Regional Seas Programme, ICLARM, the World Resources Institute (WRI), the NGO Coral Reef Alliance (CORAL), the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) and the ICRI Secretariat. The United Nations Foundation (UNF) is providing funds to initiate the project. While the ICRAN Startup Phase is ongoing with pilot activities in the Wider Caribbean, Eastern Africa and East Asian Seas, the application for the four-year Action Phase (US$10 million) is being developed for submission to UNF/UNFIP in mid January. Several Regional Seas, including The Caribbean, Eastern Africa, SPREP and East Asian Seas, with the South Asian region to follow, as funds become available, are involved in developing the proposal for the Action Phase. It was noted that ICRAN represents an opportunity for the regional seas conventions and action plans to take a lead role in the management and conservation of coral reefs and associated ecosystems. Through promoting improved practices in Integrated Coastal Area Management and management of marine protected areas, ICRAN will not only benefit coral reefs, but also other important associated coastal ecosystems, for example mangroves and seagrass beds.

144. The Deputy Director of DEC, Mr. Robert Hepworth, announced new internal arrangements for coral reefs within UNEP: an upgraded Coral Reef Unit will be established on the 1st December under the Division of Environmental Conventions with strong lateral linkages to the Division of Early Warning and Assessment (DEWA). The new unit will be headed by Dr. Arthur Dahl (D1), who will work full time for the new Unit. A new P4 Programme Officer will urgently be recruited, and Ms. Agneta Nilsson will move from the DEWA to DEC to work in the Coral Reef Unit. UNEP-WCMC will continue to play a major role in coral reef related activities, including as the host of the ICRAN Coordinating Unit.

145. The new arrangements were very well received by the meeting. The representative of IUCN, Mr. John Waugh, expressed his appreciation of UNEP's initiative to establish a Coral Reef Unit within DEC and the representative of UNEP-WCMC welcomed the arrangements on behalf of the ICRAN partners. The meeting, especially the representatives of SACEP and ROPME, also welcomed the strengthened linkages between ICRAN and the Division of Environmental Conventions.

Recommendations:

146. The Meeting recommended:

(a) That UNEP proceed to establish the Coral Reef Unit in DEC as planned, thereby strengthening the linkages between the Regional Seas and ICRAN.

(b) That closer linkages are established between the ICRAN project and the Convention on Biological Diversity, especially its Jakarta Mandate. The representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity stated his interest in working closely with UNEP on this issue.

(c) That the cooperation with Regional Seas should not be limited to the regions currently involved in ICRAN, but should be expanded to involve additional regions. To that end, it was proposed that the new Coral Reef Unit takes an active role in working with relevant regions to develop funding proposals and seek additional funding for coral reef related activities, especially ICRAN.

IX. OTHER MATTERS

147. In the course of discussions on the margins of the meeting, a number of points were raised relating to two main issues: the situation of sturgeon species in the Caspian region; and the strengthening of the regional seas conventions and action plans in Sub-Saharan Africa. The meeting agreed that the results of these discussions should be provided in annexes 4 and 5 to the present report. It was also agreed that the report of the GPA, CBD and Regional Seas consultation meeting on proposed cooperation, held on the margins of the Third Global Meeting on 11 November, should also be annexed to the present report (see annex 6).

148. On the future structure of the Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, two representatives of regional seas secretariats, while feeling that the present meeting had been relevant and constructive, also felt that the agenda had been too overloaded. Not enough time had been allocated for bilaterals between secretariats, which have become one of the more important aspects of these meetings. Some of the presentations were too open-ended. It was recommended that a distinction should be made in the agenda between items for (a) discussion requiring recommendations and (b) information. The papers for discussions items requiring recommendations should include suggested actions prepared by the secretariat or the relevant organization.

149. Seven regional seas secretariats and three international organizations felt that the meeting had been very useful and successful and that the agenda had not been overloaded. While it was true that the agenda was heavy, it was acknowledged that the Global Meetings provided a rare opportunity for regional seas conventions and action plans, relevant global environmental conventions and partner international organizations to come together to discuss issues of common concern, producing agreements that otherwise would take considerably longer to negotiate. For that reason, it should be expected that these meetings will be intensive and demanding. Some felt that instead of shortening the agenda, it was more desirable to shorten the presentation of the agenda items to no more than 15 minutes, thus allowing more time for discussion and consideration of recommendations. Several representatives of regional seas programmes emphasized the importance of the Global Meetings for exchanging information and experiences. One representative recommended that one-half day be dedicated in future meetings to the discussion of the management of regional seas programmes, including the sharing of experiences on resource mobilization and the development of mutually

supportive activities with global environmental conventions. Others felt that more time should be dedicated to furthering the discussions on horizontal cooperation between regional seas programmes.

150. The chairman thanked the participants for their suggestions, which will be taken into account by the secretariat in the organization of the next Global Meeting.

151. The meeting gratefully accepted the offer of the Director of the East Asian Seas RCU to host the next meeting, which, it was agreed, would be held in November 2001, in the offices of the East Asian Seas RCU in Bangkok.

X. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

152. The present report was adopted on the basis of the draft that had been prepared by the secretariat, taking into account written corrections provided in writing by the participants and on the understanding that the finalization of the report would be entrusted to the secretariat.

XI. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

153. In their closing remarks, representatives reaffirmed the value and importance of the Global Meetings of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans for information exchange, sharing of experiences, and coordinating activities in areas of common concern. Several expressed their satisfaction with the results of the present meeting and the importance of the Global Meetings in support of their programmes of work. Several expressed satisfaction with the work of UNEP in the further vitalization of the regional seas programmes.

154. Before closing, the chair once again thanked the Government of Monaco and the International Atomic Energy Association for their support to the meeting. The chair also thanked all those present for their valuable contributions and to the staff of the secretariat for their excellent work in the preparation and organization of the meeting. Following that statement, he declared the meeting closed at 6 p.m. on Friday, 10 November 2000.

Annex 1

Agenda of the Meeting

1. Opening of the meeting

   (a) Introductory Statement by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

   (b) Statement by the Representative of the Government of the Principality of Monaco

   (c) Statement by the Representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

2. Follow-up to the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (The Hague, 5-8 July 1999)

3. The Open-Ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and Law of the Sea (UNICPOLOS)

4. Round table discussion on critical problems and issues facing regional seas conventions and action plans

   (a) Innovative financing options for Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

   (b) Exploring new options for horizontal cooperation among regional seas conventions and action plans

5. Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)

   (a) Status report on implementation of the GPA

   (b) 2001 GPA Intergovermental Review Process and Meeting

   (c) Role of the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans in the 2001 GPA Intergovernmental Process and Meeting.

6. Assessment and Monitoring of Oceans

   (a) Status of implementation of the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA);

   (b) Presentation by UNESCO on GOOS and strengthening interactions between Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans;

(c) Presentation by the IAEA Marine Environment Laboratory on Marine Pollution Monitoring and Analysis;

(d) Presentation by UNEP-WCMC on Biodiversity Data and Information Management for Regional Seas Programmes;

7. Strengthening linkages between Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans and Chemicals-related Conventions.

(a) The IMO Conventions

(b) The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

(c) The Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade

(d) Development of an international legally binding instrument on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

8. Strengthening linkages between Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans and Biodiversity-related Conventions and Agreements.

(a) Follow-up to the decision of COP V of CBD on joint programming of CBD and the regional seas conventions and action plans

(b) The CITES Strategic Action Plan adopted by COP XI

(c) Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)

(d) Marine Mammals workshop: brainstorming session with representatives of the Regional Seas Programmes and Action Plans, biodiversity-related conventions and invited experts to: a-. review UNEP's Marine Mammals Action Plan and the work being undertaken by global and regional conventions in relation to these species and their ecosystems; b-. identify partners for future international work on the conservation and sustainable use of marine/aquatic mammals and c-. draw up a framework for a major new publication on the status of marine/aquatic mammals.

(e) Potential cooperation between Regional Seas Programmes (RSPs) and Regional Fisheries Bodies (RFBs).

(f) Session on Coral Reef ecosystems with Regional Seas Programmes and biodiversity-related conventions (CBD, CITES, CMS) and invited experts:

(i) The International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) as the internationally agreed framework for coral reef protection;

(ii) Status report on the implementation of the ICRI Framework for Action, the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) and the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN);

(iii) c. Potential future cooperation and strengthened linkages with Regional Seas and biodiversity related conventions; funding arrangements; interregional exchange.

9. Adoption of the report of the meeting

10. Closure of the meeting

Annex 2

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Regional Seas Programmes

1. Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Seas Against Pollution (Barcelona Convention)

Lucien Chabason
Coordinator
Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan -Barcelona Convention (MAP/RCU)
48 Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 35 Athens, Greece
Tel: 30 1 7273100
Fax: 30 1 7253196/7
Email: chabason@unepmap.gr

Francesco Saverio Civili
Senior Environmental Affairs Officer
MED POL Coordinator
48 Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 35 Athens, Greece
Tel: 30 1 7273106
Fax: 30 1 7253196/7
Email: fscivili@unepmap.gr

2. Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (Abidjan Convention)

Madame Nassere Kaba
Acting Coordinator
Regional Coordinating Unit for West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF/RCU)
Abidjan Convention, c/o The Dept. of Environment
Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest
20 BP 650 Abidjan 20\Cote d'Ivoire
Tel: 225 20 211183/20 21 06 23

Fax: 225 20 21 0495
Email: biodiv@africaonline.co.ci

3. Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention)

Dixon Waruinge
Programme Officer
Joint Umbrella Mechanism for the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi Kenya
Tel: 254 2 622025
Fax: 254 2 624300
Email: dixon.waruinge@unep.org

Rolph Payet
Interim Coordinator
Nairobi Convention
Regional Coordinating Unit for Eastern African Action Plan (EAF/RCU)
P. O. Box 487, Victoria
Mahe, Seychelles
Tel: 248 22 4644/248 722915 (mobile)
Fax: 248 322945/248 224500
Email: uneprcu@seychelles.net

4. Kuwait Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution

Hassan Mohammadi
Acting Coordinator
Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME)
P. O. Box 26388, 13124 Safat
State of Kuwait
Tel: 965 5312140-3 - 5335241
Fax: 965 5335243, 5324172
Email: ropmek@qulitynet.net or ropme@kuwait.net

5. Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden Environment (Jeddah Convention)

Mohamed Abdel-Rahman Fawzi
Deputy Secretary General
Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Region (PERSGA)

P. O. Box 53662, Jeddah 21583
Saudi Arabia
Tel/Fax: 966 2 651 4472
Tel: 966 2 652 1986
Email: persga@persga.org

6. South Asian Seas Environment Programme (SACEP)

Ananda Raj Joshi
Director-General
South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)
No. 10 Anderson Road, Off Dickman's Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 941 589787/589376
Fax: 941 589 369
Email: aj_sacep@eureka.lk

Prasantha Dias Abeyegunawardene
Deputy Director Programmes
South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP)
No. 10 Anderson Road, Off Dickman's Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 941 596 442
Fax: 941 589 369
Email: pd_sacep@eureka.lk

7. East Asian Seas Action Plan

Hugh Kirkman
Coordinator
East Asia Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (EAS/RCU)
UN Building, 9th Floor, Block A
Rajdamnern-Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: 66 2 288 1889/1860/8008/8007
Fax: 66 2 281 2428
Email: Kirkman.unescap@un.org
Web:URL:www.roap.unep.org/easrcu/index.htm

8. North-West Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP)

Ellik Adler
Interim Coordinator
Chief, Regional Seas Branch
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme

P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 2 624544
Fax: 254 2 624300
Email: Ellik.Adler@unep.org

Masamitsu Oritani
Director
Special Monitoring and Coastal Environmental Assessment
Regional Activity Centre
NOWPAP, Toyama City
Tel: 81 76 445 1571
Fax: 81 76 445 1581
Email: oritani@npec.or.jp

Koji Shimada
Member of the RAC Delegation (Observer)
Office of Marine Environment and Waste Management
Planning Division
Environment Agency of Japan
Japan
Tel: 81 3 5521 8311
Fax: 81 3 3593 1438
Email: KOJI_SHIMADA@eanet.go.jp

9. Convention for the Conservation and Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region (Noumea Convention)

Tamarii Tutangata
Director, South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
P. O. Box 240, Apia,
Western Samoa
Tel: 685 21 929
Fax: 685 20 231
Email: sprep@samoa.net
Email for his P.A. apiseta@sprep.org.ws

10. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific (Lima Convention)

Ulises Munaylla Alarcon
Comision Permanente del Pacifico Sur (CPPS)
Coruna 2061 y Whymper
Quito, Equador
Tel: 593 2 234 331/5/6
Fax: 595 2 234 374
Email: cpps@ecuanex.net.ec OR

ulisesmunaylla@andinanet.net

11. Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean (Cartagena Convention)

Nelson Andrade Colmenares
Coordinator, Caribbean Environment Programme
Regional Co-ordinating Unit (CAR/RCU)
(Cartagena Convention)
14.20 Port Royal Street
Kingston, Jamaica
Tel: 1 876 922 9267/8/9
Fax 1 876 922 9292
Email: uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com or nac.unprcuja@cwjamaica.com

12. Convention for the Protection of the Black Seas against Pollution (Bucharest Convention)

Ms. Sema Acar
Coordinator
Black Sea Environmental Programme
Dolmabahce Sarayi
II.Harekat Kosku 80680 Besiktas
Istanbul, Turkey
Tel: 90 212 227 9927/8/9
Fax 90 212 227 9933
Email: semaacar@blacksea-environment.org

13. Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention)

Mieczyslaw S. Ostojski
Executive Secretary
Helsinki Commission
Katajanokanlaituri 6B
001600 Helsinki Finland
Tel: 358 9 6220 2233
Fax: 358 9 6220 2239
Email: mostojski@helcom.fi

Anne Christine Brusendorff
Helsinki Commission
Katajanokanlaituri 6B
001600 Helsinki Finland
Tel: 358 9 6220 2228
Fax: 358 9 6220 2239

Email: Anne.Christine@helcom.fi

14. Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Pacific (OSPAR Convention)

Ben van de Wetering
Executive Secretary
Commission of the Convention for the Protection of
The Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR)
New Court, 48 Carey Street
London WC2A 2JQ
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 20 7430 5200
Fax: 44 20 7430 5225
Email: secretariat@ospar.org
Website: www.ospar.org

15. Programme for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)

Ms. Soffia Gudmundsdottir
Executive Secretary, PAME International Secretariat
Hafnarstraeti 97, 600 Akureyri, Iceland
Tel: +354 461 1355/3350
Fax: +354 462 3390
Email: pame@ni.is,soffiag@ni.is

Mr. Thomas Laughlin
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Office of International Affairs
U.S. Department of Commerce
Washington D.C. 20230
USA
Tel: 1 202 482 6196
Fax: 1 202 482 4307
Email: tlaughlin@hdq.noaa.gov

Jim Osborne
Chief, Marine Environment
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Canada KIA0H3
Tel: 819 953 2265
Fax: 819 953 0913
Email: Jim.Osborne@ec.gc.ca

Fredrika Moser
U.S. Department of State
Office of Ocean Affairs
Washington D.C. 20520
USA
Tel: 202 647 3880
Fax: 202 647 9099
Email: moserfc@state.gov

16. Caspian Environment Programme (CEP)

Tim Turner
Programme Coordinator
Room, 108, 3rd Entrance
Government House
40 Uzier Hadjibeyov Street
Baku-370016 Azerbaijan
Tel: 994 12 971785/938003
Fax: 994 12 971786
Email: tturner@caspian.in-baku.com

17. North-East Pacific Regional Seas Programme (NEP)

Mr. Oscar Ramirez
NEP Bureau Member
Instituto Nacional de la Pesca
National Fisheries Institute
Pitagoras 1320 3er Piso, Col. Santa Cruz Atoyac
Mexico City 03310
Tel: 52 5 6881548, 422 3056
Fax: 52 5 6880605
Email: oramirez@inp.semarnap.gob.mx/mandragora00@hotmail.com

Global Environmental Conventions and Related International Agreements

18. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBS)

Hamdallah Zedan
Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
393 St. Jacques Street, Office 300
Montreal Quebec Canada H2Y 1N9
Tel: 1 514 288 2220 Direct line 1 514 287 7002
Fax: 1 514 288 6588 or 1 514 288 0917
Email: Hamdallah.zedan@biodiv.org

Peter Fippinger
Jakarta Mandate
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
393 St. Jacques Street, Office 300
Montreal, Quebec Canada H2Y 1N9
Tel: 1 514 288 2220 Direct line - 1 514 287 7036
Fax: 1 514 288 6588 or 1 514 288 0917
Email: peter.fippinger@biodiv.org

19. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES)

Willem Wijnstekers
Secretary General
Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna & Flora (CITES)
15 chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8139/40
Fax: 41 22 797 3417
Email: Willem.wijnstekers@unep.ch

20. Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)

Marco Barbieri
Technical Officer
Secretariat to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)
United Nations Premises in Bonn, Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
D-53175 Bonn, Germany
Tel: 49 228 815 2401/02
Fax: 49 228 815 2449
Email: mbarbieri@cms.unep.de

Marie Christine Van Klaveren
Interim Executive Secretary

Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS)
16, boulevard de Suisse
MC-98000 Monaco
Tel: 377 93 15 80 10
Fax: 377 93 5095 91
Email: mcvanklaveren@gouv.mc

21. Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade

Jim Willis
Director
Chemicals Unit
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
11-13 chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 Chatelaine
Geneva 10 Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8183
Fax: 41 22 797 3460
Email: jwillis@unep.ch

22. Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal

Pierre Portas
Senior Programme Officer
Secretariat of the Basel Convention (SBC)
International Environment House
15 chemin des anemones, 1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8217
Fax: 41 22 797 3454
Email: pierre.portas@unep.ch

23. IMO Marine Pollution Conventions

Jean-Claude Sainlos
Senior Deputy Director
Marine Environment Division
International Maritime Organization (IMO)
4 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7SR
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 (0) 207 587 3142
Fax: 44 (0) 207 587 3210

Email: Jcsainalos@imo.org

24. Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Sources of Pollution (GPA)

Veerle Vandeweerd
Coordinator
Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA)
P. O. Box 16227, 2500 BE
The Hague The Netherlands
Tel: 31 70 311 4460
Fax: 31 70 345 6648
Email: v.vandeweerd@unep.nl

Omar Vidal
Deputy Coordinator
Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action
for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA)
P. O. Box 16227, 2500 BE
The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: 31 70 311 4464
Fax: 31 70 345 6648
Email: o.vidal@unep.nl

25. Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP)

Carole Eros
Programme officer
Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
460-555 West Hastings St.
Vancouver BC
V6B 5G3, Canada
Tel: 604 666 2009
Fax: 604 666 2326
Email: ErosC@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca

IUCN THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION

International Organizations

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Stephen J. de Mora
Head, Marine Environment Laboratory (MEL)

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
4 Quai Antoine 1 er, B.P. No. 800 MC-98012
Principality of Monaco
Tel: 377 97 97 72 36
Fax: 377 97 97 72 76
Email: S.de_Mora@iaea.org

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Benedict Satia
Chief, International Institutions and Liaison Service
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Via delle Terme di Carcalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 570 52847
Fax: 39 06 570 56500
Email: benedict.satia@fao.org

Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Colin Summerhayes
Director
Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) Project Office,
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) UNESCO
1, rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15
France
Tel: 33 1 45 68 40 42
Fax: 33 1 45 68 58 13
Email: c.summerhayes@unesco.org

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN/DESA)

Anne H. Rogers
Chief, Oceans and Land Unit
Water, Natural Resources and Small Islands Branch
Division for Sustainable Development
Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations
United Nations Plaza, Room DC2-2274
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: 1 212 963 2476
Fax: 1 212 963 1795
Email: rogersa@un.org
http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Klaus Töpfer
Executive Director
United Nations Environment Programme
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: 254 2 624001
Fax: 254 2
Email: Klaus.Toepfer@unep.org

Jorge E. Illueca
Assistant Executive Director
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Division of Environmental Conventions
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: 254 2 3494/4011
Fax: 254 2 624300
Email: jorge.illueca@unep.org

Timothy Foresman
Director
Division of Environmental Information, Assessment & Early Warning (DEIAEW)
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Tel: 254 2 623231
Fax: 254 2 623943
Email. Tim.foresman@unep.org

Frits Schlingemann
Director
Regional Office for Europe (ROE)
15 chemin des Anémones, 1219 Chatelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8276
Fax: 41 22 917 8024
Email: frits.Schlingemann@unep.ch

Mr. Mahmood Abdulraheem
Director
Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA)

P.O. Box 10880
Manama, Bahrain
Telephone: (973) 826600
Telefax: (973) 825110 or (973) 825111 (Direct)
Email: uneprowa@batelco.com.bh
myunrowa@batelco.com.bh
Direct Tel: 825299 (MA)
825 288 (HH)
Mobile: 973 945 2677 (MA), 973 944 3225 (HH)

Robert Hepworth
Deputy Director
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P. O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: 254 2 3494/4011
Fax: 254 2 624300
Email: Robert.Hepworth@unep.org

Laura Meszaros
Programme Officer
Division Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552
Tel: 254 2 623432
Fax: 254 2 624300
Email:Laura.Meszaros@unep.org

Agneta Nilsson
Programme Officer
Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW)
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Tel: 254 2 62 2309
Fax: 254 2 623944
Email: Agneta.Nilsson@unep.org

Mark Collins
Director
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)
219 Huntingdon Road

Cambridge CB3 ODL
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 1223 277314
Fax: 44 1223 277136
Email: mark.collins@unep-wcmc.org

Edmund Green
Head, Marine and Coastal programme
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge, CB3 ODL
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 1223 277314
Fax: 44 1223 277136
Email: Ed.Green@unep-wcmc.org

Dag Daler
Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)
United Nations Environment Programme
SE – 39182 Kalmar
Sweden
Tel: 46 480 447 350
Fax: 46 480 447 355
Email: info@giwa.net

Non-Governmental Organizations

IUCN – The World Conservation Union

John Waugh
Marine Programme Coordinator
IUCN - The World Conservation Union
c/o Washington Office
1630 Connecticut Avenue NW #300
Washington D.C. 20008 USA
Tel: 1 202 518 2057
Fax: 1 202 478 0051
Email:jwaugh@iucns.org

Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS)

Stjepan Keckes
Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (A.C.O.P.S.)
Head Office
11, Dartmouth Street
London SWIH 9BN

Tel: 44 171 799 3033
Fax: 44 171 799 2933
Email: Skeckes@compuserve.com

Government of Monaco

Bernard Fautrier
Ministre charge de la cooperacion internationale
Pour l'environnement et le development
Villa Girasole
16 boulevard de Suisse
MC 98000, Monaco
Tel: 377 93 15 89 29
Fax: 377 93 50 95 91
Email: bfautrier@gouv.mc

Patrick Van Klaveren
Conseiller technique aupres du Ministre Plenipotentiare
Charge de la cooperation internationale
Pour l'environnement et le developpement
Villa Girasole
16, BD de Suisse
MC 98000 Monaco
Tel: 377 93 15 81 48
Fax: 377 93 50 95 91
Email: pvanlaveren@gouv.mc

Annex 3

CRITICAL PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FACING REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

1. **East Asian Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU), the secretariat of the Coordinating Body on the Seas of East Asia (COBSEA):**

   (a) a need for a higher level of cooperation between countries at the regional level and for greater cooperation between government departments;
   (b) a need for full financing from member countries;
   (c) a need for those undertaking activities in the marine environment to inform the RCU.

2. **Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP):**

   (a) issues of prevention of pollution from ships and maritime safety were increasingly causing concern in the region, and the need to further strengthen and expand cooperation with IMO in the field was highlighted:
   (b) the need to obtain reliable data on marine pollution trends and on compliance with existing legislation was stressed;
   (c) a deeper involvement of national authorities in marine pollution monitoring activities was considered essential, as well as the full use of their results for appropriate coastal zone management;
   (d) the lack of proper coastal zone planning and management was considered a serious threat to coastal ecosystems;
   (e) concerning the implementation of the GPA, while funding was available from a number of sources for basic activities, the funding of larger investments for long-term pollution control was considered critical.

3. **Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP):**

   (a) a decision was needed on the location of the RCU.

4. **Commission of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Commission):**

   No critical issues were indicated.

5. **Protection Arctic Marine Environment (PAME):**

   (a) a need to link issues to civil society and to involve the private sector;

(b) a need to involve Heads of State to a greater degree in the solving of problems and to gain greater government commitment;
(c) a need to establish a technical committee of the regional seas programmes and action plans for technology transfer, e.g. to deal with marine pollution issues;
(d) a need for environmental enforcement to be devolved to local government organizations.

6. **Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA):**

(a) the need to designate the Red Sea as a special area, especially with regard to waste from shipping;
(b) the need for increased regional monitoring of coral reefs and sensitive ecosystems;
(c) the need for sustainable financial arrangements, possibly through the establishment of government/private industry partnerships or the establishment of a special fund.

7. **Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) of the Kuwait Convention:**

(a) the need for the development of a river basin management programme for Shatt Al Arab and its entire basin in cooperation with GIWA, UNEP, CBD and other concerned international organizations, with particular reference to the destruction of the marshlands of Mesopotamia.
(b) the control of marine pollution from offshore operations of oil and gas, particularly pollution caused by produced water, in cooperation with concerned international organizations;
(c) control of municipal sewage, industrial effluents (e.g., from petroleum refineries and the petrochemical industry), dredging and land reclamation, in cooperation with GPA, CBD, WHO and other concerned organizations;
(d) establishment of reception facilities to meet the requirements of Annexes I and V of MARPOL 73/78 to declare the ROPME region as a "Special Area" by IMO;
(e) conservation of coral reefs, in cooperation with UNEP, concerned international initiatives and donor programmes;
(f) study of invasive alien species, in cooperation with UNEP, CBD, IMO, IOC and other concerned organizations;
(g) monitoring of marine mortality phenomena, in cooperation with FAO, the Marine Mammals Action Plan, UNEP and other concerned organizations.

8. **South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP):**

(a) the need for an exchange of information network among regional seas programmes via e-mail/internet;
(b) the need for training and capacity-building;
(c) the need for a database network;

(d) the need for financial support for already identified projects in such fields as coastal zone management, national and regional oil spill contingency planning, sea-level rise, capacity-building, training and land-based activities.

9. South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP):

(a) possibility of going beyond twinning arrangements for conventions and programmes to "tripling" arrangements, enabling the possibility to link up with other island regions, e.g., Latin America and the Caribbean;
(b) inadequate funding;
(c) in the provision of advisory services, more input from members required, as well as input from international and national non-governmental organizations.

10. RCU of the East African Region (EAS/RCU):

(a) greater support needed to build up a stronger secretariat;
(b) a one-stop shop for information needed;
(c) better contact needed with all focal points of the EAS and of the West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF).

11. RCU of the Abidjan Convention and West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF/RCU):

(a) need for financial contributions from the countries of the region;
(b) lack of communications capacities at the regional level and between the RCU and the Steering Committee for better dissemination of information;
(c) need for catalytic support for establishing a working communications network between the RCU and member States, as well as among member States;
(d) need for stronger government commitment.

12. EAS/WACAF Joint Umbrella Mechanism:

(a) need for financial resources;
(b) the great difference in the economic capacities of the different members means that the poorer stakeholders could lose confidence in their convention;
(c) need for strong UNEP support;
(d) the Joint Umbrella Mechanism should become self-sufficient;
(e) for EAS, projects need to be better aligned with the aims of the Convention;
(f) in light of new developments, new provisions are needed in the Conventions.

13. Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission):

(a) the need to discuss a new role for the private sector and non-governmental organizations;
(b) the need for international financing institutions to reconsider the concept of guarantees given by municipalities;

(c) the need to upgrade the monitoring programme;
(d) the problems posed by agriculture;
(e) the need for strong political support from governments and coordination of actions within the national governments.

14. RCU for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU):

(a) the need to involve the private sector (e.g. tourism, industry, oil) and explain to members of that sector precisely what the programme does;
(b) the need for better coordination with the global environmental conventions for the implementation of actions at the regional level and as follow up to memorandums of understanding;
(c) the need for a better mechanism for coordination with UNEP headquarters and with GEF for management support in project implementation;
(d) the need to examine how best to sell and promote the programme's activities to governments;
(e) the need to go beyond the usual funding sources in the leveraging of financial resources.

15. Caspian Environment Programme:

(a) the need for the programme to be given the status of a convention, cognisant of the fact that UNEP was working hard to that end and that there was the outstanding issue of the legal status of the Caspian Sea;
(b) the need for countries' commitment;
(c) the need to educate governments as to the benefits and values of environmental improvements;
(d) the need for donor commitment, instead of provision of short-term finance tranches, which subsequently end abruptly, with a concomitant effect on country commitment;
(e) the need for a realistic approach and an understanding that some problems can only be solved in the long term, requiring a long-term commitment from countries.

16. Black Sea Environment Programme (Bucharest Convention)

(a) ecosystem degradation from eutrophication and the over exploitation of marine and coastal resources;
(b) inadequate sewage collection and treatment;
(c) industrial hot spots;
(d) lack of port reception facilities and high risks of accidental pollution;
(e) future financial requirements.

17. Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS):

(a) the need for financial resources;

(b) unsuitable mariculture, leading to declining shrimp production;
(c) introduction of exotic species through ship ballast;
(d) climate change and the effects of El Niño on the coastal zone;
(e) lack of resources for sewage treatment.

Annex 4

CONSULTATION HELD IN MONACO ON THE STURGEON
(9 October 2000)

1. An evening consultation was organized with key players already present in Monaco at the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans to discuss the general situation of the sturgeon in the Caspian Sea. Representatives were invited from the Caspian Environment Programme, the Bucharest Convention RCU, UNEP/WCMC, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), CITES and the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). The latter two have asked UNEP to take the lead on sturgeon as a "horizontal" issue affecting migratory endangered species.

2. Major conservation, political and "symbolic" implications of the issue:

(a) Sturgeon is shaping up as a test-case for international action to control gross over-exploitation of fisheries, and as a specific test for CITES in the marine area.

(b) CITES listed all the main caviar-producing species of sturgeon in Appendix II in 1997. The objective was - and still is - to encourage sustainable trade in a multi-million dollar wildlife resource. But in the absence of enforceable quotas and effective co-operation between the Caspian states with the exception of Iran, overfishing has reached catastrophic levels threatening the commercial extinction of most species.

(c) International caviar trade is reported to be largely controlled by organized crime, protected by local police and officials in their pay. It is the most lucrative wildlife commerce in the world.

(d) The CITES Animals Committee in December will consider setting sustainable quotas for caviar under the "Significant Trade" process. Zero quotas - which would amount to a world ban on legal trade in caviar - are possible. However, a large underground trade would continue with major implications for enforcement in producing and consuming countries. There would be the possibility of a challenge to the quotas at the WTO, and socio-economic implications for fishing communities. CITES would need to ensure that a trade ban was scientifically watertight; UNEP would be asked to defend it.

(e) As with corals, the world community is looking for tangible action from UNEP. For example, can UNEP mobilize practical enforcement support such as patrol boats, from other CITES Parties to help Caspian States? At present rates of exploitation, sturgeon will be commercially extinct before we ever establish a Regional Convention for the Caspian.

3. Key questions for the consultation:

(a) What value added can UNEP including the Conventions deliver now in the face of the crisis facing sturgeon fisheries and species?
(b) Does CITES need support in preparing for a caviar trade ban?
(c) Can CMS and CBD do more?
(d) What should be the political message from UNEP HQ?
(e) What can the UN system do as a whole, including FAO?

4. **Results of the Meeting:** The sturgeon consultation in Monaco revealed both the gravity of the crisis and uncertainties about how to tackle it. UNEP was able to facilitate discussions between CITES and the Caspian Environment Programme. The latter had serious reservations – supported to some extent by previous experience in the Baltic – about a CITIES Caviar trade ban for all Caspian populations except those in the Iranian sector, which are still managed reasonably well. There were also valuable contributions from CBD, CMS, the Bucharest Convention and WCMC. In the end, a combination of stick (short-term trade ban) and carrot (investment in proper management of sturgeon stocks and assistance to root out mafia control of the trade) may be the optimal combination. All agreed that an early consultative meeting involving UNEP, CITES, CBD, CMS, CEP, FAO, UNDP, legitimate traders, producers, the Caspian authorities and funding agencies was advisable before the CITES trade prohibitions process gathered pace. This is now being arranged by UNEP's Division of Environmental Conventions with the cooperation of other UN agencies and is likely to take place in February 2001.

Annex 5

Consultative Meeting on Cooperation between UNEP and the Advisory Committee on the Protection of the Sea (ACOPS) in support of Regional Seas Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa (8 November 2000)

1. An evening consultation on the implementation of the GEF Medium-Sized Project on the Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa was held on 8 November. Participants included Jorge E. Illueca, Assistant Executive Director, Division of Environmental Conventions; Viktor Sebek, Executive Director, ACOPS; and Stjepan Keckes, ACOPS consultant. A principal outcome of the project will be the presentation of interventions addressing regional priority problems to the Partnership Conference for the Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa scheduled for June 2002. The project is being implemented in support of the decisions of the Maputo and Cape Town Conferences on the African Process for the Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is designed to identify problems of the marine and coastal environment in the geographic areas covered by the Abidjan and Nairobi Conventions and to prepare proposals for their solution or mitigation that will be submitted to a donors conference in late 2001 or early 2002.

2. The project is a direct contribution to the strengthening of the Abidjan and Nairobi Conventions and their action plans, and is intended to be implemented in the closest possible cooperation with the institutional structures of these conventions. UNEP as the secretariat of these conventions is envisaged to play a prominent role in the implementation of the project. In response to the Cape Town Conference decision requesting UNEP to take measures to vitalize the two Sub-Saharan regional seas conventions, UNEP has established within the Division of Environmental Conventions a Joint Umbrella Mechanism for coordinating the Secretariats of the Abidjan and Nairobi Conventions.

3. With the understanding that the Division of Environment Conventions is guiding and coordinating the UNEP-supported regional seas programmes, it was suggested that, taking into account the present status of the project, an early meeting should be organized between the staff of DEC and ACOPS directly involved in the implementation of this project. The purpose of this encounter would be to discuss and agree on a detailed technical workplan for UNEP's involvement in the project in the general framework of the MOU signed between UNEP and ACOPS. Arrangements for the preparation of such a meeting should be made during the forthcoming meetings of the projects Steering Group and the Preparatory Committee for the Donor Conference (The Hague, 25-27 November 2000) which the Assistant Executive Director of DEC, or his representative, will attend.

Annex 6

Consultative Meeting on Cooperation among the GPA, CBD and Regional Seas on Conservation of Coastal and Marine Resources (11 November 2000)

1. On 11 November 2000, within the framework of the Third Global Meeting of the Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, a half-a-day session was held for an exchange of ideas between the representatives of the regional seas conventions and action plans and the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UNEP/GPA Coordination Office. Representatives of other convention secretariats and of intergovernmental organizations also participated. In doing so, the meeting considered document UNEP/GPA/CBD/1/2, "Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities". The meeting also addressed the preparation of a strategic action plan for addressing physical alterations and destruction of habitats with the aim of implementing complimentary actions contained in the GPA and the Jakarta Mandate.

2. The meeting endorsed the general approach outlined to addressing the physical alteration and destruction of habitats, one of the GPA's 9 source pollutant categories, as set out in the flow chart submitted to the meeting, noting that it was necessary to place more stress on the socioeconomic aspects. The representatives of the Cartagena Convention and of the Barcelona Convention pointed out that the proposed approach in fact reflected the approach taken in their respective protocols on land-based sources of pollution.

3. The meeting stressed the need to ensure cooperation between the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA), the GPA and the Convention on Biological Diversity and the regional seas conventions and action plans, with the aim to ensure complementary ties and synergies.

4. Concerning the GPA clearing-house mechanism, it was noted that the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans held extensive information on data and activities in the regions, particularly concerning specially protected areas and activities concerning land-based sources of pollution.

Recommendations

5. It was agreed that the secretariats of the GPA and the Convention on Biological Diversity would develop a more concrete and focused version of the strategy to address physical alteration and destruction of habitats and submit it to the regional seas conventions and action plans for their review

and comments, focusing on regional-level aspects.

6. As a complementary follow-up for the memorandum of understanding between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GPA, the meeting agreed that interested regional seas conventions and action plans would develop an annex, to be appended to the memorandum, giving a detailed focus on the specificities of the region and the concrete areas of cooperation. The memorandum would enter into force regardless of the state of preparedness of the annexes, which could be prepared by regions within their own time frames. In cooperation with the Division of Environmental Conventions, the GPA Coordination Office would prepare a model format for the annexes, to give regions an idea of the information they could provide.

7. The meeting also agreed that the regional seas conventions and action plans would examine in detail the four activities listed in the work plan annexed to the memorandum of cooperation between the CBD and the GPA secretariats and submit their comments, together with details on how they could provide inputs to them.

8. The revised strategy on physical alterations and destruction of habitats and the regional annexes to the memorandum of cooperation would also be a concrete input into the 2001 GPA Intergovernmental Review meeting.

9. Concerning the GPA clearing-house node on physical alterations and destruction of habitats, the meeting agreed that

(a) the regional seas conventions and action plans would discuss and review the preliminary outline of the GPA clearing-house node and send their comments on how it could best address some regional issues.

(b) the regional seas conventions and action plans would make available relevant information on physical alterations and habitat destruction for use by the GPA clearing-house that should also be linked to the CBD clearing-house mechanism, thus permitting a user-friendly and rapid exchange of valuable information among the regions.

10. It was noted that, on all matters pertaining to the above agreements, the point of contact would be the UNEP/GPA Coordination Office.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/10
11 August 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SECOND GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS
CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS
The Hague, 5-8 July 1999

REPORT OF THE SECOND GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

Introduction

1. The regional seas programme, initiated in 1974, has remained the central United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) initiative providing the major legal, administrative, substantive and financial framework for the implementation of Agenda 21, and its chapter 17 on oceans in particular. The regional seas programme is based on periodically revised action plans adopted by high-level intergovernmental meetings and implemented, in most cases, in the framework of legally binding regional seas conventions, under the authority of the respective contracting parties or intergovernmental meetings.

2. Following the adoption of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities at the Washington Conference in November 1995, UNEP initiated actions to revitalize the regional seas programme. In addition, by its decision 20/19 A of 5 February 1999, the UNEP Governing Council stressed the need for UNEP to strengthen the regional seas programme as its central mechanism for implementation of its activities relevant to chapter 17 of Agenda 21.

3. The second global meeting of the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans, which in the new organizational structure of UNEP falls under the responsibility of the Division of Environmental Conventions, was hosted in response to that need and had the following specific objectives:

(a) To channel more effectively UNEP programmatic support to the regional seas conventions and action plans, particularly in areas complementary to the UNEP programme of work (1999 and 2000-2001);

(b) To promote horizontal ties among regional seas conventions and action plans;

(c) To strengthen the linkages between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the Global Programme of Action through agreed upon specific actions, particularly regarding the role of the secretariats in the implementation of the UNEP/Global Programme of Action strategic action plan on sewage and the Global Programme of Action clearing-house;

(d) To strengthen the linkages between the regional seas conventions and action plans and other global conventions and agreements, specifically the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI), the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea;

(e) To promote cooperation between regional seas conventions and action plans and the UNEP regional offices.

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

A. Opening statements and organizational matters

4. The meeting was opened at 9 a.m. on Monday, 5 July 1999, by Mr. Jorge Illueca, Assistant Executive Director, Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP, who, on behalf of Mr. Klaus Töpfer, executive Director of UNEP, welcomed all participants. Ms. Veerle Vandeweerd, Director-designate, Coordination Office for the Global Programme of Action, also welcomed participants to The Hague and thanked the Government of The Netherlands which was hosting the Coordination Office for the Global Programme of Action, for providing the facilities for the meeting.

5. Mr. Illueca read out a statement by the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Klaus Töpfer, in which the Executive Director noted that the current meeting was attended by representatives of 21 environmental conventions and related international agreements, making it the largest meeting ever held of environmental conventions and related international agreements.

6. Among the results which the Executive Director hoped the meeting would achieve, he noted, in particular, the identification of clear priorities with strategic actions for the regional seas conventions and action plans which UNEP could support; recognition that the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA) responded to the priority assessment needs of the regional seas conventions and action plans and of its advantage to them as a valuable tool in the implementation of their programmes of work; proposals for specific actions to accelerate the implementation of the Global Programme of Action; meaningful collaboration between regional seas conventions and action plans and global environmental conventions and related international agreements; and increased technical horizontal cooperation between the more mature and less developed regional seas conventions and action plans.

7. He pledged the support of UNEP in 1999 and in the coming biennium to catalyse the building of synergies among the regional seas conventions and action plans and with global environmental conventions and related international agreements, and recalled that, to facilitate that process, the Governing Council at its twentieth session had approved the establishment of a Division of Environmental Conventions, which would work with the other divisions of UNEP in providing such support.

8. Noting that the current meeting was the first of four important meetings that UNEP was organizing in 1999 to facilitate collaboration among conventions, he assured participants that the results and recommendations of the meeting would be carefully considered by UNEP in the preparation of its strategic action programme on regional seas conventions and action plans for the remainder of 1999 and for the coming biennium and he wished them all every success in their deliberations.

9. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Illueca and considered the agenda contained in annex I to the present report.

B. Attendance

10. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following organizations:

(a) Regional seas conventions and action plans: Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission); Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP); Commission of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Commission); Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP); Northwest Pacific Region Environmental Cooperation Centre; Plan of Action of the South East Pacific; Protection Arctic Marine Environment (PAME); Regional Coordinating Unit for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU); Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA); Regional Coordinating Unit for the East Asian Seas (EAS/RCU); Regional Coordinating Unit for the West and Central African Action Plan (WACAF/RCU); Regional Coordinating Unit of the Eastern African Region (EAF/RCU); South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP); South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP);

(b) Global and international agreements: Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS); Convention on Biological Diversity; Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA); Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals; Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities; International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI); United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

(c) Intergovernmental organizations: Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); International Maritime Organization (IMO); Marine Environment Laboratory of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); World Conservation Union (IUCN).

11. The list of participants is provided in annex VIII to the present report.

II. LINKING THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS TO RELEVANT GLOBAL CONVENTIONS, AGREEMENTS AND INITIATIVES

12. Introducing the item, the Chair noted that UNEP played a facilitating role in the area of regional seas and that the actual work carried out under the regional seas programme was driven by the conventions and action plans adopted in the respective regions. He also drew attention to the need to consider how the regional seas programme could interact with such global environmental agreements and organizations as, inter alia, the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and ICRI. In addition, he suggested that the meeting should consider such issues as the interface between the regional conventions and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; the importance of information exchange; and the need to ensure the sustainability of the regional seas conventions and action plans.

13. In their introductory statements, representatives drew attention to issues of particular concern to their respective organizations and in respect of which they hoped to receive guidance during the course of the current meeting. Those issues included:

(a) The need for newer organizations and conventions to learn from mature conventions and organizations with longer experience;

(b) Issues of communication and coordination among environmental organizations, as well as with the Global Programme of Action and with organizations outside the UNEP family, such as AOSIS;

(c) The need to define more clearly the respective roles of regional environmental programmes;

(d) The legal regimes covering regional sea areas and other relevant legal issues;

(e) The need to update some regional seas conventions, and to take into account the consequences for those conventions of the Convention on the Law of the Sea;

(f) The need, when determining future action, to be guided by the availability and sources of funding and to ensure follow-up to the recommendations of the Commission on Sustainable Development at its seventh session;

(g) The importance of partnership and, accordingly, of partnership conferences.

A. Global International Waters Assessment

1. Introduction

14. Mr. Per Wramner, Scientific Director of the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA), gave a presentation on the work carried out by GIWA to date. He noted that, of the four focal areas identified by GEF, only international waters had as yet no assessment: GIWA had been established as a four-year programme to meet that need. He also pointed out that, as a small organization with limited funding, GIWA would be working in cooperation with a number of other partners and would base its global assessment largely on those sectoral and regional assessments already in existence. In view of the limited funding, it was vital for GIWA to prioritize its work and to concentrate on its objective of assessing the ecological status of international waters - both coastal and inland - and identifying the social and economic causes of environmental degradation.

15. Turning to the working methods of GIWA, he said that it had a regional and subregional emphasis and had provisionally identified 66 subregions, grouped into nine megaregions, for the purposes of its assessment. As an initial stage, a pilot assessment would be conducted at a regional level, possibly in the Mediterranean region, in view of the extensive data already available in the secretariat of the Barcelona Convention. Following that pilot assessment and the establishment of the GIWA network, work would be carried out over a period of four years, in phases, ending with the dissemination of its products, which would be made as widely available as possible. He suggested that the regional seas conventions and action plans could act as focal points for the GIWA subregions which fell within their responsibility.

2. Discussion

16. In the ensuing discussion, the view was expressed that the GIWA subregions - which were based primarily on environmental and biogeographical factors, taking due account of linkages between freshwater and marine systems - should be harmonized with those applied in other forums, such as UNEP, to avoid the further proliferation of such regional divisions. In addition, it was stressed that the different regional and inter-regional environmental assessments and related complementary activities currently being carried out should be carefully harmonized and synchronized, with a view to avoiding duplication. The need for such harmonization was even greater when it came to a global exercise such as that undertaken by GIWA.

17. On the issue of funding, Mr. Wranmer clarified that $14 million had already been provided to GIWA, half from GEF and half in combined funding from the Government of Finland, the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Municipality and University of Kalmar, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and UNEP, and that additional funding would be needed for all the work that GIWA had to conduct, especially in studying the social and economic causes of pollution, about which little was known. In addition, he pointed out that GEF funding was restricted to covering incremental costs in developing countries and there was consequently a need for counterpart funding or in-kind assistance from developed countries for activities in their region. The meeting agreed

on the need to define precisely what was covered by incremental costs and he explained further that, by raising interest from donors in international waters issues, GIWA would help leverage additional funding for all actors concerned.

18. In response to questions about the relationship between GIWA and other bodies, particular attention was given to cooperation with the Joint Group of Experts on Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP). It was noted that, although GIWA and GESAMP had different schedules for the completion and scope of their respective assessments, their combined involvement with the assessment of marine and coastal areas had resulted in useful cooperative arrangements, in particular, with the activities of the GESAMP Working Group on Marine Environmental Assessments, which was preparing a global report on land-based activities and a report on the state of the marine environment.

19. Concern was expressed by a number of representatives about the different priorities set by different bodies and there was agreement on the need to harmonize those priorities, as it would be unwise to send conflicting signals to potential donors. Representatives also drew attention to the problem, particularly for smaller States, of having to deal with an increasingly large number of intergovernmental organizations.

20. Attention was drawn, also, to the need for capacity-building and technology transfer, to assist smaller countries in complying with their requirements under GIWA. At the same time, it was suggested that the GIWA project document might need to be amended, to ensure that it responded to the actual needs of States.

21. It was pointed out that the scope of GIWA extended beyond the jurisdiction of all except one of the regional seas conventions and action plans - covering inland areas like river-basins - and, accordingly, it was suggested that there was a need for enhanced coordination among regional bodies for the purposes of GIWA, including through such measures as an inventory of all existing institutions, bodies, etc. In accordance with the work plan currently being drafted, that inventory would be carried out during the initial phase of GIWA.

22. In addition, it was noted that a number of regional seas assessments had already been completed or were being finalized and might help meet the information requirements under GIWA.

23. In response to a question about the future of GIWA, once its four-year programme had been completed, the meeting was informed that, in the view of the Executive Director of UNEP, consideration must be given to continuation of the work undertaken by GIWA.

24. A small contact group was established to consider such issues as the relationship and linkages between GIWA, the Global Programme of Action and GESAMP; the scope of GIWA; complementarity, additionality, synergy and integration of activities; whether and in what way GIWA would use the numerous assessments already produced through the regional seas programme and its subprogrammes, as well as through the Global Programme of Action and GESAMP; what would be the role of the regional seas units and secretariats in

the implementation of GIWA; and what would become of GIWA after conclusion of its assessment, and also to suggest how collaborative arrangements could be organized, especially during the four distinct phases of the project.

25. The contact group refined the table setting out the programme for the integration of the regional seas convention plans in the work of GIWA. The table, as revised, is provided in annex II to the present report.

3. Recommendations

26. Following that debate, the meeting agreed on the following recommendations on organizational and operational principles to facilitate effective implementation of GIWA and the regional seas programme:

(a) In the area of consultations, that:

(i) The annual meeting of the regional seas programmes would serve the broad purpose of consultations on GIWA-related issues;

(ii) Regional consultations should precede each GIWA phase;

(iii) At the subregional level, GIWA focal points would facilitate coordination between the GIWA team and other collaborating partners;

(b) In the area of taking stock, that:

(i) GIWA would take into account existing information and data as well as existing programmes and activities;

(ii) Quality assurance procedures would be applied to the data sets and information to be utilized by GIWA and that due recognition should be given to the gaps, in data or information, which may exist, especially in the developing regions;

(c) In the area of capacity-building, that capacity-building would be an integral part of the GIWA process;

(d) In respect of contributions by the regional seas programmes to GIWA, that:

(i) The programmes should, to the extent possible, participate actively in the assessment, for instance, as subregional focal points, task team members, etc.;

(ii) Available data should be compiled to meet the needs of GIWA, as follows:

a. Basic ecological data;

b. Data about human impacts on the environment;

c. Environmental assessments, including trends;

d. Basic social and economic data;

e. Data about the social root causes of environmental problems;

(e) In respect of contributions by GIWA to the regional seas programmes, that:

(i) Consideration would be given to the provision of financial assistance to secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans, to assist them in the conduct of activities under GIWA;

(ii) GIWA should provide subregional assessments of environmental status, information on the social and economic root causes of environmental problems and other data which could be used as a basis, inter alia, for work plans, fund-raising (especially GEF funds), and more detailed assessments; and

(f) Recognizing the linkages between GIWA and the Global Programme of Action, that GIWA should take into account the particular needs of the regional seas conventions and action plans in terms of scientific assessments on land-based activities and that it should also consider modalities to support the identification or, as appropriate, updating of priority actions as a contribution to the implementation of the regional programmes of action and protocols on land-based activities.

27. The meeting provided inputs into the work plan components that should constitute the four phases of the programme for the integration of the regional seas conventions and action plans in the work of GIWA, including the identification of main institutional players, as set out in the table contained in annex II to the present report.

B. Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities

1. Introduction

28. Introducing the subitem, Ms. Vandeweerd noted that it was important at the current stage to move the implementation of the Global Programme of Action forward, paying particular attention to the need to revitalize some of the regional seas programmes. Given the decisions of the UNEP Governing Council at its nineteenth and twentieth sessions and of the Commission on Sustainable Development at its seventh session, there was a need for real progress to be made in the abatement of the degradation of the marine environment from land-based activities through, inter alia, strengthening the regional seas programmes, particularly those in developing countries. Specific measures should be considered within a holistic framework to implement those regional programmes.

29. The following account of the discussions on the Global Programme of Action is divided in two sections: the first describes the current work of the Coordination Office and the related discussion; the second provides some initial direction for the way forward.

2. Current work of the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office

(a) Regional programmes of action on land-based activities

30. Mr. Omar Vidal, Deputy Coordinator, Global Programme of Action Coordination Office, introduced the background documents relevant to the Global Programme of Action, as listed in annex VII to the present report, drawing particular attention to document UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/8 on the Global Programme of Action implementation of regional and national programmes of action. He affirmed that, in accordance with the provisions in the Global Programme of Action itself and its implementation plan, as well as the General Assembly resolution 51/189 of 16 December 1996 and successive decisions of the UNEP Governing Council, the underlying philosophy of the Global Programme of Action was to foster the implementation of regional programmes of action. One of the principal mechanisms for its implementation was through the regional seas conventions and action plans. Accordingly, a number of workshops had been held in eight regions and, as a result, in six of those, regional programmes of action had now been formulated.

31. The meeting had before it a preliminary summary of proposed actions for delivery by the Coordination Office in 1999 and beyond, contained in the annexes to background document UNEP(DEC)/R.2/INF/8, on the implementation under the Global Programme of Action of regional and national programmes of action. Draft tables of selected needs identified in the regional processes for implementation of the Global Programme of Action are contained in annex III to the present report.

32. In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that the report on progress in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action only covered activities carried out by the Coordination Office. Many other institutions, international and regional organizations and countries were also contributing to implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The Coordination Office needed to remain abreast of the latest developments, programmes and actions undertaken by them (including the regional seas), to implement the Global Programme of Action. It was suggested that a questionnaire could be developed as a means of obtaining up-to-date information and that a compilation of activities that contributed to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action should be published on a regular basis. To compile the document, use had to be made of existing overviews, such as those produced within the framework of the Commission on Sustainable Development, the United Nations Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea and regional organizations. It was also suggested that a diagram be prepared, indicating the linkages between the Global Programme of Action, GIWA, the regional seas, the UNEP divisions and regional offices and other organizations.

33. It was noted that several regions and countries had developed or were in the process of developing regional or national programmes of action for implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The need for a consistent definition of regions throughout UNEP programmes was highlighted but not further discussed. It was pointed out that efforts should be made to avoid a situation where one and the same country had to report to two different regional bodies.

34. Attention was drawn to the forthcoming major conference on water in the Netherlands and the need to present a coherent UNEP water strategy at that conference.

35. The meeting recommended that:

(a) Periodic overviews should be produced of national, regional and international programmes that contributed to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action;

(b) Preparations should be made for the Netherlands water conference.

36. In addition, the strategic approach for the implementation and operationalization of the Global Programme of Action, as set forth in the section entitled "Way forward" below, was approved.

(b) UNEP/Global Programme of Action strategic action plan to address sewage as a major land-based pollutant

37. Mr. Leo de Vrees, Senior Expert, Global Programme of Action Coordination Office, briefed the meeting on activities planned and undertaken by the Coordination Office pursuant to decisions of the UNEP Governing Council, at its nineteenth and twentieth sessions, on the issue of sewage and in response to the prioritization of sewage as a land-based source of marine pollution in most of the regions. He noted that responsibility for the actual implementation of measures to address sewage was at the local and national level. The Coordination Office had developed a strategic action plan on Sewage and, as a first step, was facilitating its implementation by providing assistance to a small number of regions (Eastern Africa, South Asian Seas, East Asian Seas, South-East Pacific). He invited the other regions to contribute and share their experiences.

38. The primary aim of the strategic action plan on sewage was to initiate and facilitate a process leading to the development and implementation of national strategies to address sewage and the promotion of global interest and commitment. The emphasis of the strategic action plan was envisaged to be on linking the sewage problem with social and economic opportunities and benefits. He described the different phases under the plan, for which national, regional and global actions had been identified. Those steps would lead to the global conference on building partnerships for sewage management, planned for the year 2001.

39. Attention was drawn to a tentative draft programme for the conference (contained in the annex to document UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/2) and comments on that programme were invited.

40. In the ensuing discussion, it was pointed out that there were three main components to sewage, namely, bacteria, organic pollutants and nutrients. When developing mitigation measures, the effects of each should be assessed, as it might not be necessary to remove all three components. That could have significant cost benefits in the case of nutrients, the most costly to remove. Other factors, such as point and non-point sources, sludge disposal, storm water run-off and loads of industrial waste carried with the

sewage, also had to be considered. It was noted that, in some cases, the reporting of monitoring data, such as the mussel watch, might be politically sensitive, particularly where pollution data had implications for trade.

41. There was some debate on whether or not the issue of sewage was of a transboundary nature and relevant to the regional seas conventions and action plans. The meeting agreed that, in view, in particular, of its extensive transboundary effects and the global extent of the problem, it was relevant to all regions and their conventions and action plans.

42. Attention was drawn to information on useful mechanisms and experience already available under other instruments and organizations, such as the London Convention on Dumping at Sea and its 1996 Protocol, the UNEP International Environment Technology Centre (IETC), the World Health Organization (WHO) and others, as well as to the need for synergies with other instruments, in particular, the provisions on habitat protection in the Convention on Biological Diversity.

43. In addition, it was suggested that countries under financial constraints could be assisted with the auditing of their current environmental situations, with capacity-building measures and with the use of environmental impact assessments. Attention should be given to the introduction of environmentally sound technologies for the management of freshwater resources and for environmental management in urban areas.

44. It was noted that, on sewage, the Global Programme of Action could provide a conducive framework and stimulate action at the national and local levels through, inter alia, regional action plans and agreements, information and knowledge dissemination, the sharing of best practices and the brokering of partnerships. The Global Programme of Action could be instrumental in securing - or heightening - the commitment of Governments to address the problems associated with sewage.

45. The meeting recommended that:

(a) The Global Programme of Action should be a standing item on future global meetings of the regional seas conventions and action plans, with a particular focus on the status of, and barriers to, its implementation;

(b) In view, in particular, of its extensive transboundary effects and the global extent of the problem, the issue of sewage must be considered relevant to all regions and their conventions and action plans;

(c) At the next global meeting of the regional seas conventions and action plans, when considering land-based activities, attention must also be given to the issue of sewage and, in that context, the participation at that meeting of the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank and other interested international organizations should be encouraged;

(d) The Global Programme of Action clearing-house mechanism should play an important role in the dissemination of information on the issue of sewage and in the related capacity-building process;

(e) At the same time, the Global Programme of Action could not address the problem of sewage at the local level, but should instead develop a framework which national authorities could apply to their own situations, giving particular attention, in that context, to financial, technological and managerial aspects and to the transfer of knowledge and experiences;

(f) Efforts must be made to assess the effects and impacts of sewage discharge, prior to taking action, and to differentiate between pollution control and habitat protection;

(g) Consideration should be given to the provision of assistance to countries under financial constraints, for the auditing of their current environmental situations, through capacity-building measures and the use of environmental impact assessments.

(h) Attention should be given to the introduction of environmentally sound technologies for the management of freshwater resources and for environmental management in urban areas.

(c) Implementation of the Global Programme of Action clearing-house and the role of the regional seas conventions and action plans

46. Mr. Kenneth Korporal, Programme Officer, Global Programme of Action Coordination Office, introduced working document UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/3 on the clearing-house mechanism, which was being set up as envisaged in the Global Programme of Action.

47. In the ensuing discussion, concern was expressed about the compatibility of different databases, in particular, the use of incompatible formats, and it was suggested that standards and protocols should be developed to ensure that the data in the clearing-house were uniform in format. Mr. Korporal said that the issue of data compatibility was being addressed and the clearing-house would use accepted standards and protocols such as the future International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard for metadata.

48. The meeting agreed that databases should not be too complex: the quality, reliability and exchangeability of the data were more important than their overall quantity. In particular, it was important to consider user needs in developing the clearing-house mechanism: to that end, the meeting was informed that the Coordination Office planned to hold a consultation on user needs.

49. It was noted, however, that data constituted only one of the issues addressed in the Global Programme of Action clearing-house. Equally - if not more - important was the information on technologies, policies, strategies and measures to address land-based activities and on financial mechanisms. Investment issues (needs and possibilities) needed to be addressed.

50. The representative of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) informed the meeting that IMO had signed a memorandum of understanding with the Government of Canada, pursuant to which Canada would assist in the development of a joint IMO/Global Programme of Action clearing-house node on

oils and litter. The meeting commended Canada and IMO on their spirit of cooperation and encouraged similar cooperative initiatives among other clearing-house players.

51. The meeting recommended that:

(a) In developing any database, use should be made of already available data;

(b) Efforts should be made to ensure compatibility and strong linkages with other clearing-house initiatives, including that of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UNEP clearing-house on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and the UNEP Global Resource Information Database (GRID);

(c) The quality, reliability and exchangeability of the data were of paramount importance, and not their overall quantity, and user needs should be borne in mind in developing the clearing-house mechanism;

(d) The clearing-house should strike a balance between technical, scientific and financial information and work with what was readily available;

(e) Bearing in mind the definition of the clearing-house contained in the report of the technical meeting on the Global Programme of Action clearing-house, held in Geneva on 26 and 27 September 1996, particular attention should be given to establishing an appropriate institutional process for developing, organizing and maintaining the directory and the delivery mechanisms.

3. Way forward

52. Given the central role of the Global Programme of Action in the discussions at the current meeting, participants agreed on a strategic approach for the implementation and operationalization of the Global Programme of Action, as set forth in the following paragraphs.

(a) Development of, or follow-up to, the regional programme of actions and legally binding instruments

53. It was noted that, as indicated above, since 1996 UNEP had catalysed the development of regional programmes of action to address land-based activities in eight regions, culminating in the adoption of six regional seas action programmes by government-designated experts. In some regions, legally binding instruments were already in existence or were being developed. In other regions, an overall convention on the protection of the marine resources existed, to which protocols, annexes or decisions specifically addressing land-based activities were associated. An overview of the current status with regard to the regional programmes of action, protocols, etc., related to land-based activities is provided in annex III to the present report.

54. The meeting observed that, in the coming years, the need to develop regional legally binding instruments should be assessed and pursued as appropriate. In that context, it was important to have the regional programmes of action endorsed by the intergovernmental meetings or other decision-making mechanisms of the regional seas programmes, as well as to secure the necessary funding to enable the secretariats of the regional seas to carry out the priority actions identified.

(b) Implementation of the regional programmes of action

55. It was pointed out that, without awaiting the endorsement or acceptance of a legally binding instrument on land-based activities, urgent action must be taken to promote the practical implementation of the existent regional programmes of action. In some regions, action had already been initiated or is planned for 1999, as indicated in the overview contained in annex III to the present report.

56. To forward the implementation of the regional programmes of action, the following clusters of activities were proposed:

(a) Identifying at what stage of the policy life cycle the regional seas were with regard to land-based activities (problem identification and assessment; solution identification and action planning; solution implementation; evaluation);

(b) Preparing a "toolkit" of strategies, measures and policy options (supply side);

(c) Preparing a priority list of regional and national needs (demand side);

(d) Brokering deals between supply and demand;

(e) Conducting evaluation and review.

57. In that context, with a view to avoiding an ad hoc or piecemeal approach to the facilitation of actions in priority areas, as defined in the different regional programmes of action, it was agreed that the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office would develop, maintain and implement a systematic brokering mechanism with a view to linking specific requests for support to possible providers of that support.

(c) Developing the "supply toolkit"

58. The meeting noted that, in most cases, the problems, issues and actions identified in the regional programmes of action were too generic in nature to enable practical action to be instigated to address the problem. Accordingly, the Coordination Office would prepare a systematic framework, or checklist, of necessary and required policies, strategies and measures to address the different pollutant source-categories, as they pertained to the different stages of the policy life cycle - from monitoring to evaluation of effectiveness. For each of those policies, strategies and measures, specific examples of best practices would be provided, together with a reference to areas or institutions where those items had been put into practices.

59. Thus, in the case of addressing sewage, consideration would be given not only to the infrastructure development but also to such issues as:

(a) Institutional requirements: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(b) Legal aspects, including enforcement: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(c) Financial instruments, such as taxes, subsidies, permits, capital flows and market-based incentives: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(d) Voluntary action and public participation: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(e) Trade policies, where relevant: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(f) Public awareness-building and information dissemination: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(g) Capacity-building: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(h) Monitoring, reporting and evaluation: examples of best practices and institutes or organizations that could provide support;

(i) Technical measures and cleaner production technologies (see, in this regard, annex V to the present report, listing relevant work by IETC in the area of the development of "soft" and "hard" technology).

60. Annex IV contains examples of implementation of the Baltic Convention and the Baltic Sea Joint Comprehensive Environmental Programme, which could be useful for other regions and in developing the systematic framework for the "supply side".

61. It was agreed that the preliminary compilation of selected needs identified in the regional processes for implementation of the Global Programme of Action, provided in annex III to the present report, would be further developed and completed by the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office, in the light of the outcome of the current meeting.

62. In addition, within the overarching frameworks of supply and demand, the specific actions required in each of the regions would be identified over the coming months, and addressed on a case-by-case basis.

(d) Brokering deals and facilitating financing

63. It was noted that the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office would play a facilitating role, brokering expertise between less developed regions and countries, regional and international programmes, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and United Nations organizations that had

the capacity and willingness to provide support. There were regional seas programmes and action plans in need of support, while others were able and willing to provide such support. The support needed would be diverse in nature, depending on regional specifications, and would range from such activities as the training of experts to financial support for implementing specific programme elements.

64. On the issue of funding, as called for by the Global Programme of Action itself, there was a need to identify innovative mechanisms to ensure that projects were self-sustaining and not dependent on donor funding alone. Support to project development and formulation to potential donors would also be provided.

65. It was also observed that an added value of the Global Programme of Action was that, through providing a global overview of needs and supply and promoting participation in a common framework, with the involvement of all stakeholders, in particular the private sector, a cohesive approach could be used when seeking support from major donors. To that end, a particular focus should be placed on sewage, including with the involvement of WHO and financial institutions such as the World Bank. Other important measures included brokering partnerships between developed and developing regions and countries, holding partnership conferences and twinning arrangements would be considered.

C. Jakarta Mandate of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity

1. Introduction

66. Introducing the subitem, Mr. Salvatore Arico, Head, Jakarta Mandate on Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity, secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, explained that the Convention contained no specific article on marine and coastal biodiversity and that those issues were addressed, instead, in two decisions of the Conference of the Parties: II/10, a policy decision, now known as the Jakarta Mandate on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity, containing provisions of a general nature, and IV/5, which operationalized that policy through a multi-year programme of work, based on six implementation principles and following the thematic areas identified in decision II/10.

67. The programme of work was currently at the phase of developing implementation tools. He stressed that, while the regional seas conventions and action plans had a major role to play in the promotion of the Jakarta Mandate at the regional level, their programmes and activities could also make a substantial contribution to the development of implementation tools for, and the products of, the work programme. Those included, inter alia, guidelines on integrated marine and coastal area management, criteria for protected marine and coastal area establishment and management and guidelines for ecosystem evaluation, including indicators.

68. On the issue of the regional dimension of the Convention's work, he said that it had close cooperation with the Cartagena Convention and the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) and that negotiations were currently under way with other bodies, such as the Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden (PERSGA), the Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) and the Regional Coordinating Unit for the East Asian Seas Action Plan (EAS/RCU).

69. Mr. Frits Schlingemann, Director, UNEP Regional Office for Europe (ROE), introduced the "Environment for Europe" process under way in the European Union and highlighted, in particular, the activities undertaken in the context of the fifth thematic area of the Jakarta Mandate, on coastal and marine ecosystems, under its pan-European biological and landscape diversity strategy. Of particular relevance to the regional seas programmes were the Code of Conduct for Coastal Zones and the Model Law on the Sustainable Development of Coastal Zones, developed under the auspices of the Council of Europe, the partner organization of UNEP. Drawing attention to the background documents on the issue that had been placed before the meeting, he informed participants that both documents were to be submitted for consideration by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, which would be asked to recommend them for use by Governments in addressing and improving national and transboundary coastal zone management. He suggested that the secretariats of the regional seas programmes should screen the documents for their usefulness to their respective regions and provide ROE with their comments and suggested amendments, as appropriate.

2. Discussion

70. During the ensuing discussion, representatives noted the extensive and growing cooperation in the six thematic areas of the Convention on Biological Diversity with the Cartagena Convention and the experience of cooperation between CPPS and the Convention on Biological Diversity, which were offered as a useful model for other regional seas conventions and action plans. Attention was drawn, in particular, to the memoranda of cooperation which the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity had signed with CPPS and CAR/RCU.

71. The representative of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR) said that, while his organization was a relative newcomer to species conservation, its work programme bore considerable similarity to that of the Jakarta Mandate and there was, accordingly, wide scope for cooperation with the Convention on Biological Diversity. To that end, he sought clarification of the Convention's working methods, stating that his organization, with a relatively small secretariat, normally worked through lead countries or lead persons.

72. Mr. Arico explained that the Convention secretariat performed its technical work through designated experts and he suggested that the regional seas conventions and action plans might likewise identify experts for the purpose of cooperation with the Convention.

73. The representative of GIWA said that biodiversity was also an important issue in the work of GIWA and he hoped that the assessment would provide useful information for the implementation of the Jakarta Mandate, both through the provision of data directly to the Convention secretariat and, indirectly, through the provision of information to the regional seas conventions and action plans, to assist them in their implementation of the Mandate.

74. The representative of IMO briefed the meeting on work under way within IMO relevant to biodiversity issues and ICRI, relating, inter alia, to ballast water management and banning the use of tributyl tin in anti-fouling paint.

75. Some representatives noted that, notwithstanding the existence of legislation on biological diversity in those regions, implementation remained weak. Legislation and guidelines alone were insufficient: what was needed was more action and implementation and the resources for that implementation. Accordingly, there was a need to identify pragmatic, innovative ways of raising investment for biodiversity projects.

3. Recommendations

76. Accordingly, the meeting agreed that:

(a) With regard to cooperation with the Convention, this should be substantive in nature, comprising three levels: the identification of priorities for action at the regional level; the use of regional networks; and the development of joint implementation strategies and identification of joint activities;

(b) A two-way mechanism for cooperation between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity should be developed and UNEP should be invited, in close consultation with the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, to formulate options for such a coordination mechanism, to be sent to all participants for their reaction;

(c) There was a good opportunity for collaboration between the clearing-house of the Global Programme of Action and that of the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly in the areas of habitat degradation and habitat protection and of coastal zone management.

D. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

1. Introduction

77. Mr. Willem Wijnstekers, Secretary-General, secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), briefed the meeting on the work of CITES, with particular reference to regions. He said that there was a strong need within CITES to regionalize its operations but as yet funds for that were lacking. In particular, there was a need for training and capacity-building activities at the regional level. Before those activities could be carried out,

legislation would have to be in place and, in that regard, CITES had already made a start, by analysing the legislation and performance of all its parties.

78. He agreed that there was a need for strengthened cooperation among convention secretariats and with regional organizations and that UNEP offered an appropriate vehicle for such cooperation. In addition, there was a need to exploit existing links with such organizations as the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), which was now under the responsibility of UNEP. In that context, it was noted that CAR/RCU had offered to house the regional office of the CITES secretariat for that region.

2. Discussion

79. In the ensuing discussion, some representatives expressed their wish to develop memoranda of understanding with CITES on regional issues and suggested, in particular, that their respective secretariats could represent CITES in their regions. Ms. Cristina Boelcke, Director, Division of Regional Cooperation and Representation, UNEP, stressed that the UNEP regional offices were ready to work closely both with CITES and with the secretariats of other conventions in assisting, inter alia, with the preparatory process for their conferences of parties. The Chair noted that some regional offices were already housing regional coordination units for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa.

80. In response to a question about the relationship between CITES and ICRI, Mr. Wijnstekers explained that, with the exception of fossil corals, corals were included within the scope of the Convention, but that coral reefs constituted one area where protection of the habitat itself - rather than control of trade - was of paramount importance.

3. Recommendations

81. Accordingly, the meeting recommended that collaboration should be strengthened between the regional seas conventions and action plans, on the one hand, and CITES, on the other, particularly in respect of those conventions and action plans which had specially protected areas and wildlife protocols, and that UNEP and CITES would collaborate on the preparation of a proposal to that effect.

E. International Coral Reef Initiative

1. Introduction

82. Mr. Denis Vene, Head, International Affairs Division, and Co-Chair, ICRI secretariat, introducing the work of the Initiative, stressed the need for strengthened cooperation with regions. He pointed out that ICRI was not a permanent structure, but an informal network which neither implemented nor funded projects: instead it acted as a catalyst in identifying best practices and in identifying sponsors. In his view, its successful functioning was largely due to its informal status, which should be preserved.

83. He reviewed the activities of ICRI, listing important areas of cooperation with regional bodies, such as monitoring and capacity-building, and outlining projected activities for the future. In that connection, he invited participants to submit examples of good practices, which ICRI would place on its web site.

2. Discussion

84. The Chair informed participants that, pursuant to the meeting of the ICRI Coordination and Planning Committee (CPC) in Paris in March 1998, UNEP was particularly interested in strengthening the capacity of the regional coordinating units in coral reef areas in the monitoring of those reefs. In response to the urgency of the issue, the GEF secretariat had recently requested UNEP, as an implementing agency of GEF, to act as lead agency for coral reefs. He also said that the Executive Director of UNEP wanted a specific request from the regional seas conventions and action plans for UNEP support to strengthen their participation in ICRI. UNEP would need to collaborate closely with both ICRI and WCMC in the assessment of coral reefs and it had already concluded a memorandum of understanding with the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in that area. All those actions responded, in addition, to the renewed call for action on coral reefs contained in Governing Council decision 20/21 of 4 February 1999.

85. Some representatives reported on initiatives relating to coral reefs in their respective regions. The Regional Coordinating Unit for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU), in particular, had raised $1.3 million for coral-reef activities. There had been little activity, however, on coral reefs in the Indian Ocean and the representative of the Regional Coordinating Unit for the Eastern African Action Plan (EAF/RCU) urged UNEP, ICRI and other concerned organizations to promote awareness of the problem of coral reefs, which were perhaps the most vulnerable of all ecosystems.

86. It was suggested that the issue should also be brought to the attention of the UNEP Division of Environmental Assessment and Early Warning and that consideration should be given to establishing a global watch for coral reefs, on the lines of that already established for forests.

87. In response to a question about an IETC-sponsored initiative on environmentally sound techniques for waste water, which would also have implications for coral reefs, Mr. Vene confirmed that, while ICRI had originally been a purely scientific body, it had widened its scope and was now focusing on management issues as well.

88. The meeting also considered the issue of coral bleaching, and was informed of a decision of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its latest session, that the issue of coral bleaching should be addressed, in conjunction with climate change effects, by the Convention's Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA). SBSTTA had decided that the issue was very specific and should be addressed in isolation. To that end it planned to hold an expert consultation, with the participation of ICRI, perhaps in a tripartite process with the regional seas organizations, in view of the valuable information available in the regions, in particular on social and economic aspects of the problem. It was also pointed out that bleaching was due not only to climate

effects, but also to man-made causes, such as cyanide poisoning of fish and that the bottom line in coral-reef protection was enforcement: small island States did not have the capacity to enforce protection regimes.

3. Recommendations

89. The meeting agreed on the following recommendation regarding ICRI:

(a) The regional seas programmes and action plans welcomed the decision by the UNEP Governing Council to renew its support for ICRI. It also welcomed the request by GEF for UNEP, as an implementing agency of GEF, to take the lead on coral reefs;

(b) The regional seas programmes and action plans requested UNEP to strengthen their capacity in the monitoring of the status of coral reefs and to ascribe the utmost importance to capacity-building and training activities;

(c) The relevant regional seas programmes and action plans were actively working with ICRI and called for strengthened cooperation between and among the regional seas and action plans, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change in the areas of coral reefs, climate change and coral bleaching. In addition, attention was drawn to the importance of enforcing environmental law development for the protection of coral reefs, in particular, with the assistance of local communities and local authorities;

(d) The regional seas programmes and action plans recommended that those issues should be presented at UNEP ministerial conferences, to gather political will and support for the enforcement of the protection of coral reefs.

F. Buenos Aires Programme of Action of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its relation to the regional seas conventions and action plans

1. Introduction

90. Mr. Janos Pasztor, Coordinator, Conference and Information Support, secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, introduced the package of measures comprised by the Buenos Aires Programme of Action and explained that the measures fell into two sections, the so-called "classical issues", deriving from the Convention itself, and more recent issues, deriving from the Kyoto Protocol.

91. Reviewing the various issues in the Programme of Action, he pointed out, in respect of capacity-building in particular, that the role of the secretariat of the Framework Convention on Climate Change was to facilitate and not actually to conduct activities. He also explained that the Programme of Action was addressing political issues, as well as technical issues.

92. Turning to the regional seas conventions and action plans, he identified, as key areas of cooperation, impacts and vulnerability; and capacity-building, involving both the regional seas bodies and the UNEP

105. It was suggested that regions should give closer attention to the issue of adaptation strategies and the need to raise awareness. To that end, the regional seas conventions and action plans could be offered as a regional framework for joint implementation. In particular, a European-Mediterranean partnership could serve as a model for joint implementation of the Framework Convention on Climate Change. It was noted that a decision of the Conference of the Parties would be required for that purpose.

106. The meeting expressed interest in working more closely with the Framework Convention on Climate Change. Participants noted that the socio-economic and ecological consequences of climate change for the coastal and marine environment were expected to include sea-level rise, flooding and storms, and threats to coral and other species.

3. Recommendations

107. Accordingly, the meeting recommended that the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change should consider the regional seas conventions and action plans as an effective regional mechanism for the implementation of the activities set forth below and that, to that end, UNEP would follow up with the secretariat of the Framework Convention:

(a) In the area of vulnerability and adaptation, the regional seas conventions and action plans could offer the Framework Convention on Climate Change an existing and effective regional mechanism for assessing vulnerabilities, exploring adaptation options, implementing adaptation strategies, and incorporating climate change considerations into national and regional planning;

(b) In the area of awareness-raising, given that the expected impacts of climate change were extremely negative for the billions of people living in coastal areas and that their compelling and relatively specific nature offered good opportunities for public awareness-raising at the regional level, the regional seas conventions and action plans could cooperate with the secretariat of the Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNEP and other relevant United Nations, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in launching local and regional awareness campaigns;

(c) In the area of capacity-building, many climate-related impacts would require response options that could also address issues such as sustainable coastal development and the protection of mangrove and other ecosystems. Capacity-building for the Framework Convention on Climate Change should be coordinated with capacity-building offered by institutions dealing with those other issues;

(d) In the area of joint implementation, projects for strengthening adaptation to expected climate change impacts in coastal areas could be implemented through the regional seas conventions, action plans and secretariats.

G. Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States

1. Introduction

108. Mr. Peter Donigi, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations, speaking on behalf of AOSIS, presented a statement from AOSIS to the meeting, copies of which were made available to all participants and the text of which is provided in annex VI to the present report. He drew the attention of the participants to the recent meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development, at which many small island developing States had supported a comprehensive approach to the conservation and sustainable use of the world's oceans, including the overarching issues of coastal management, atmosphere, and tourism - the areas in which UNEP had pioneered global action.

109. He noted that the UNEP regional seas programme, the Barbados Programme of Action, the Global Programme of Action and the regional institutions offered excellent tools for addressing issues relating to the vulnerability of small island developing States to:

(a) Overexploitation of fisheries resources;

(b) Environmental degradation;

(c) Sustainable development issues, including land-based sources of pollution;

(d) Effects of climate change; and

(e) Preparedness for natural disasters.

110. He further stressed the need for capacity-building in general but emphasized, in particular, the area of feasibility studies and project design to meet donors' requirements, so as to facilitate an early draw-down of aid funds for the representation of small island developing States at international meetings.

111. He drew attention to the problems of coordination of programmes associated with the enforcement of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the initiatives of FAO, GEF, IMO, UNEP and other international organisations in respect of oceans and seas. He mentioned in particular the representation problems experienced by small island States in having to cover all those meetings. To address those problems, an initiative had been put forward by a number of small island delegations through the Commission on Sustainable Development, to request the General Assembly to organize an annual informal consultation process over a period of one week devoted to oceans and the law of the sea. He invited support from other organizations at the meeting for that initiative.

2. Discussion

112. Several representatives expressed support for the work of AOSIS and said that even those regional seas areas which had few or no small island States shared many of the same concerns in their low-lying coastal areas. Attention was drawn, inter alia, to the important linkage between fisheries and the environment; the importance for small island developing States of the revitalization of the regional seas programmes and the Global Programme of Action; the need to raise awareness of the greater vulnerability of those States and the important role of the regional seas organizations in monitoring progress in meeting the objectives of the Barbados Programme of Action; the need for capacity-building, in particular, to ensure that project proposals were properly presented and received the necessary support from Governments; and the crucial importance of integrating environmental strategies into national development.

113. Representatives reported on relevant activities in their respective regions, highlighting planned measures in the areas of training and information; the preparation of environment outlook reports on their regions; the organization of donors' meetings; the preparation of waste management programmes; the promotion of sustainable tourism; and logistic problems in dealing with large numbers of scattered States. The meeting noted, in particular, a consultation between the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), CAR/RCU and ROLAC, to prepare a common position for the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly for an assessment and appraisal of the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. Calls were made for strengthened support from UNEP for small island developing States initiatives. It was suggested, inter alia, that AOSIS might consider organizing a high-level political meeting with a view to securing stronger commitment to its members' action plans.

3. Recommendations

114. Following that discussion, the meeting endorsed the measures proposed by the representative of AOSIS in his paper as priority actions in support of the Barbados Programme of Action (see annex VI to the present report) and recommended:

(a) That the extensive involvement of UNEP in the 14 priority areas of the Barbados Programme of Action should be demonstrated to the Commission on Sustainable Development and that input should be prepared for the special session of the General Assembly for an assessment and appraisal of the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, on 27 and 28 September 1999, showing specific results already achieved, including from the UNEP Technology, Industry and Economics Division, and transmitting the outcome of the preparatory meeting of CAR/RCU, ECLAC AND ROLAC;

(b) That UNEP, in consultation with the regional seas conventions and action plans, should prepare a paper for presentation to the General Assembly at its special session, on activities in support of the work of the Barbados Programme of Action.

H. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

1. Introduction

115. Mr. Juan Antonio Escudero, Law of the Sea/Ocean Affairs Officer in the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, reviewed the relevance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to the regional seas conventions and action plans and the kind of assistance that the Division could provide to the regional seas programme. He also addressed institutional issues regarding ocean governance, including the outcome of the last session of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

116. Concerning the Convention, he pointed out that it was generally recognized as "the Constitution for the Oceans". The constitutional character of the Convention, he explained, stemmed from two different facts; on the one hand, the Convention spelt out the rights and duties of States concerning all uses of the oceans; on the other, it was a framework for further global, regional and national development, usually through the competent international organizations.

117. To illustrate those points, he referred to the provisions in the Convention dealing with the protection and preservation of the marine environment and the balance achieved between the rights and obligations of the different categories of States. In that context, he drew particular attention to the rules of the Convention dealing with the control and prevention of pollution from vessels (that was incidental to or derived from the normal operation of vessels), which took into account both the right of the coastal State to protect maritime zones under their jurisdiction against pollution and the freedom of navigation of other States. He explained that, in that context, the competent organization for the further development of the rules contained in the Convention was IMO, which provided a guarantee that a single legal regime would be developed and applied to all States.

118. He also pointed out the need for a coordinated approach to the implementation of the provisions of the Convention. In that regard, he referred to marine protected areas and noted that rules for the establishment of such areas had been adopted or were being considered by different international organizations such as IMO, some of the regional action plans and conventions, UNESCO and the Convention on Biological Diversity. He also pointed out that the Convention on the Law of the Sea laid out rules regarding marine protected areas which needed to be taken into account. In that context, he explained that, from the point of view of the law of the sea, two factors at least needed to be considered when establishing such areas: the different jurisdictional regimes in the various existing maritime zones such as internal waters, territorial waters, exclusive economic zones, fishery zones and the high seas; and, in relation to those regimes, the regulatory measures that could be adopted and enforced in those areas by the coastal State in respect of foreign vessels. He stressed that, although marine protected areas were important and useful tools for the conservation of the marine environment, including its biodiversity and habitats, historical sites, etc., care should be taken to ensure that regulatory measures adopted for such areas were consistent with the provisions of the Convention dealing with the rights and obligations of States.

119. In his view, the examples provided concerning pollution from vessels and marine protected areas illustrated the need for any legal development regarding the law of the sea to conform to the constitutional rules contained in the Convention. In that context, he recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution on oceans and the law of the sea, reaffirms every year the importance of ensuring the uniform and consistent application of the Convention and a coordinated approach to its overall implementation, and invited the competent international organizations and other international bodies to support those objectives. Those same objectives were also implicit in other international instruments, such as chapter 17 of Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological Diversity, which recognized the Convention on the Law of the Sea as the legal framework in law of the sea issues, in particular regarding the rights and obligations of States.

120. Other issues dealt with in the Convention of possible relevance to the work of the regional seas conventions and action plans included marine scientific research, transfer of technology, information gathering and dissemination and certain fisheries issues.

121. Concerning ocean governance, he referred to the outcome of the seventh session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, which, in order to make the deliberations on oceans and the law of the sea in the General Assembly more effective, had recommended the establishment of an open-ended informal consultative process under the auspices of the General Assembly. That recommendation would be considered by the General Assembly during its fifty-fifth session. The consultative process would identify priority areas in ocean affairs, including the necessary actions to be taken. That goal would be achieved through a comprehensive, in-depth and action-oriented discussion on ocean affairs held annually and open to all stakeholders such as States, United Nations programmes and agencies and non-governmental organizations. He also referred to the different international organizations competent in the field of marine affairs with which the regional seas programmes and action plans might wish to collaborate.

122. He then addressed the way in which the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea could be of assistance to the regional seas programme. In that respect, he noted that the Division should not be seen as the watchdog of the Convention but rather as a partner in ensuring that the declared objective of the international community - namely, the promotion of the uniform and consistent application of its provisions - was achieved. He also noted that one of the mandates of the Division, as stated in different General Assembly resolutions, was to assist international organizations in the development of legal instruments in the field of the law of the sea in harmony with the provisions of the Convention.

123. In conclusion, he referred to the annual report on oceans and the law of the sea prepared by the Division, which provided the basis for the debate on ocean affairs at the General Assembly, and encouraged the regional seas and action plans to contribute to that report and to use it as an instrument to convey to the international community salient issues or matters which might require further action, as well as any recommendations which they might wish to make in their area of competence.

2. Discussion

124. In the ensuing discussion, it was pointed out by one of the participants that boundaries drawn up on the basis of ecological considerations did not necessarily coincide with administrative or political boundaries. Accordingly, efforts to make environmental rules more effective sometimes led to conflicts with other legal regimes. In response, Mr. Escudero said that environmental boundaries and political boundaries were not in contradiction with each other but operated on different levels. According to him, political boundaries were needed in many instances, such as for the actual enforcement of environmental rules. In any event, he agreed with the idea expressed during the meeting that legal disputes on maritime zones and boundaries should not jeopardize or delay intergovernmental cooperation for the protection of the marine environment.

125. Concerning the objection raised by two regional seas bodies that environmental rules needed to go beyond what was provided for in the Convention and that article 237 of the Convention itself allowed such developments, Mr. Escudero recalled what had been said earlier regarding the balance achieved by the Convention as to the interests of different groups of States. In this regard, he noted that developments of the rules of the Convention were desirable, provided that they were carried out in accordance with the rights and obligations of States contained in the Convention or following the appropriate procedures through the competent international organizations.

126. Attention was also drawn to the need for strengthened coordination. It was pointed out that a serious effort was being undertaken in that respect among international organizations, one example of which was the current meeting of regional seas conventions and action plans, but that much work remained to be done at the national level between different ministries and regarding the integration of environmental aspects into other activities.

127. It was agreed that the regional seas programmes and action plans provided the appropriate level for the implementation of global instruments, in particular those dealing with the protection of the marine environment, and for ensuring proper coordination between regional and global conventions as well as a vehicle for the gathering of information. It was pointed out, nevertheless, that, although many international instruments had been adopted for the protection and preservation of the marine environment, implementation was often lacking because of various factors, such as insufficient funding or lack of political will of the States concerned. In that respect, Mr. Escudero said that it was pointless to develop new legal instruments going beyond the legal regime provided for by the Convention when there was already so much to do in implementing the existing instruments. In that context, he referred to the obligation of all States, according to the Convention, to prevent, reduce and control marine pollution from land-based activities and the need to implement the Global Programme of Action.

128. In the area of research, there was a need to develop synergies with the involvement of such bodies as, inter alia, IOC, the IAEA Marine Environment Laboratory. As for technology transfer, Mr. Escudero said that, if that was an important part of the work of the regional seas conventions and action

plans, they should work with UNESCO to develop specific programmes for technology transfer. He also stressed the need for concerted efforts to improve the implementation of the existing instruments.

129. In addition, it was suggested that an issues-oriented process should be fostered among the regional seas and other pertinent organizations for coordinating the work and concerns of the Convention, the regional seas programmes and other interested partners. In that regard, it was suggested that a meeting should be organized, on a regular basis, with the participation of international lawyers, experts and the UNEP legal unit, to address sensitive emerging issues and to elaborate a common approach by United Nations agencies. Mr. Escudero said that his Division could provide legal assistance in any development concerning the law of the sea.

130. The Chair drew attention to the background document on the subitem, circulated under symbol UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/5 and transmitting document UNEP/GC.20/19/Add.1, on UNEP activities regarding oceans management. The document contained inputs for the seventh session of the Commission on Sustainable Development on the subject of oceans and presented a historical overview of the development and future perspectives of the regional seas conventions and action plans. Initially their focus had been more on marine pollution but currently they were focusing on coastal management and fisheries issues. He said that there had been four generations of protocols developed for the regional seas conventions: on oil spills, biodiversity, transboundary movement of hazardous waste and land-based sources of pollution.

3. Recommendations

131. Following that discussion, the meeting welcomed the offer of the secretariat of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to provide its legal expertise to regional seas conventions and action plans and its assistance in the further development of their legal instruments and recommended:

(a) That the regional seas conventions and action plans, the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea and other competent organizations and interested secretariats should consult with one another periodically, with a view to ensuring a uniform and consistent approach regarding specific issues of common concern, including trade, marine protected areas, land-based sources of pollution and others, and, to that end, should hold regular meetings, on an annual or biennial basis, of technical and legal experts;

(b) That those informal consultations should be complementary to the work of the Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC);

(c) That the regional seas conventions and action plans would continue, through UNEP, to contribute information on their yearly activities to the annual report of the Convention on the Law of the Sea to the General Assembly.

III. ADDRESSING MORE EFFECTIVELY THE ISSUE OF THE SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES

A. Integrating environmental considerations into the fisheries sector

1. Introduction

132. Briefly introducing the item, Mr. Illueca drew attention to Governing Council decision 20/19 A of 5 February 1999, on the contribution of UNEP to the Commission on Sustainable Development at its seventh session in the area of oceans and seas, and, in particular, to its subparagraph 1 (e), calling for an enhanced collaboration between UNEP, FAO and other organizations in the area of sustainable fisheries and aquaculture.

2. Discussion

133. In the ensuing discussion, participants agreed that a strong and effective partnership should be fostered between UNEP and FAO in addressing issues of sustainable fisheries, particularly in areas of complementarity and common concern.

3. Recommendations

134. Following that discussion, the meeting recommended:

(a) That UNEP and FAO should develop a more consolidated approach to integrating fisheries and environmental considerations and should define the role and responsibilities of both UNEP and FAO in the following areas of common concern: protected areas; bycatches; marine and coastal habitat protection; marine mammals; protected species; integrated coastal and marine management, including fish resources conservation; and the effects of fisheries on biological diversity;

(b) That UNEP should prepare a draft paper on those subjects and should ask the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans for their suggestions, following which UNEP would meet with FAO and use that paper as a building block in their consultation.

B. Revitalizing the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals

1. Introduction

135. Ms. Monica Borobia, Programme Officer, Global Programme of Action Coordination Office, introducing the background document on the subitem (UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/9) on behalf of the Division of Environmental Conventions, said that the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals had been developed jointly by UNEP and FAO, in collaboration with other intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies, in response to growing international concerns about the status of and need for measures to conserve marine mammal populations throughout the world and that the General Assembly had designated UNEP as secretariat to the Plan.

136. Although the Plan had significantly contributed to the enhancement of technical and institutional capacities required for the conservation and management of marine mammals in several developing regions of the world, such as Latin America and the Caribbean, East and West Africa, the Black Sea and South East-Asia, institutional support needed within UNEP for its effective implementation had declined considerably over the years.

137. As part of the implementation of their protocols on such areas as biodiversity, specially protected areas, and wild fauna and flora, certain regional seas conventions had established regional action plans dealing specifically with marine mammals. In addition, cooperation with global convention secretariats and other relevant global instruments had been extremely beneficial and in some cases key to the development of programmes and policies on important marine mammal issues at the international level.

2. Discussion

138. In the discussions that followed, representatives of regional seas conventions and action plans summarized ongoing activities in their respective regions. The meeting voiced strong support for the revitalization of the Marine Mammal Action Plan and endorsed the need for UNEP headquarters to assign sufficient human and financial resources for its implementation. In addition, the recommendations contained in document UNEP(DEC)RS.2/9 were also supported in their entirety.

139. In the light of fruitful past experience, it was reiterated that the Plan offered a suitable vehicle for continued support for the development of regional marine mammal plans under the regional seas conventions and action plans, as it provided the necessary overall framework for cooperation and expertise at the international level. Interest was expressed in the development of such regional marine mammal action plans for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden and for the ROPME sea area.

140. The protection of endangered species such as the Mediterranean monk seal (Monachus monachus) and the dugong (Dugong dugong), and the maintenance of critical habitats for their survival were identified as areas where the Marine Mammal Action Plan could contribute to advance conservation measures. It was also felt that the Plan should continue to play a coordinating role in promoting interregional sharing of experiences and best practices in the management of marine mammals.

141. The meeting recognized the role that marine mammals could play as bioindicators of the health of the marine environment and their importance in fisheries. As top level predators they had an impact on local food webs and ecosystems as a whole, and also indicated the exposure and effects of pollutants over spatial, temporal and trophic scales.

142. It was stressed that cooperation with the secretariats of global conventions should continue and be strengthened. The representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity offered the assistance of the Convention's secretariat to evaluate how the provisions of the Jakarta Mandate on coastal and marine biodiversity applied to issues of relevance to marine mammals.

3. Recommendations

143. Following that discussion, the meeting recommended:

(a) That UNEP should reaffirm the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals as a priority in its and the regional seas conventions and action plans;

(b) That sufficient human and financial resources should urgently be assigned for UNEP to continue its function, at UNEP headquarters, as secretariat to the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals;

(c) That a task force should be established within UNEP to oversee technical aspects of the development of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals, in cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans;

(d) That UNEP should re-engage key partners and explore modalities for the involvement of other partners such as the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), the Convention on Biological Diversity and the regional seas conventions and action plans for the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals and, in that context, that it should request the secretariat of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals to undertake, as soon as possible, active consultations with such partners;

(e) That UNEP should recognize the urgent need to support the development of regional marine mammal programmes in those regional conventions and action plans which have not developed such programmes and should promote interregional cooperation and exchange of experience on implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals;

(f) That UNEP, as secretariat of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals, should further explore such subjects as interactions between marine mammals and fisheries; the application of well managed and responsible sustainable uses of marine mammals, such as ecotourism, including whale and dolphin watching and, similar activities; and other emerging issues.

IV. STRENGTHENING HORIZONTAL COOPERATION AND TIES AMONG REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

A. Cooperation between and among the regional seas conventions and action plans and other interested organizations

1. Introduction

144. Mr. Illueca briefly introduced the subitem, drawing attention to the different levels of development among the regional seas conventions and action plans. He noted that some of the more mature regional seas conventions had developed considerable expertise in the management of coastal and marine areas and that they were currently in a position to provide technical cooperation and assistance to the younger and less developed conventions. The sharing of experience, best practices and lessons learned among the regional seas conventions and action plans would be an invaluable

form of cooperation. He concluded that the current meeting represented the first occasion the a meeting of the regional seas conventions and action plans had addressed the issue of horizontal cooperation and that that was a major step forward in the evolution of their work.

2. Discussion

145. Representatives reported on cooperative activities in which their respective organizations were already engaged and also drew attention to areas where further cooperation was needed, including negotiations with the World trade Organization (WTO), information exchange, performance indicators, assessment and monitoring, reporting activities, enforcement measures and their coordination with national legislation, the development of protocols, fund-raising techniques, geographic information systems (GIS), atmospheric transports, and others. In addition, further information was needed on contributions and assistance that could be provided in the area of horizontal cooperation by the Coordination Office and by the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions.

146. While some representatives expressed willingness to cooperate directly with other organizations, there was a general preference for such cooperation arrangements to be channelled through UNEP, with a view to ensuring that contact was made with the appropriate offices or units. Attention was also drawn to the need for functional relationships among the various regional seas organizations, with a view to exchanging experience and best practices in such areas as tourism, trade and the development of performance indicators, and for increased capacity-building in the regional seas areas.

147. Representatives outlined areas in which their respective organizations had useful experience or expertise, which could be made available to other interested organizations. Those included the development of project proposals and partnerships with non-governmental organizations (Cartagena Convention); monitoring and assessment, reporting, enforcement measures and providing information to the public on the state of the environment (MAP); and traditional ecological knowledge and community-based action (PAME).

3. Recommendations

148. Accordingly, the meeting recommended:

(a) That horizontal cooperation among the regional seas conventions and action plans and other relevant organizations should be of a flexible nature and should be channelled through UNEP;

(b) That UNEP should continue to facilitate such cooperation, where necessary, with the provision of financial assistance;

(c) That the UNEP regional offices should be involved in the regional preparatory process for the various conferences of parties;

(d) That UNEP should reinvigorate its role in the Barbados Programme of Action for Small Island Developing States;

(e) That secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans whose respective seas areas were contiguous, in particular, MAP, PERSGA and ROPME; EAS and SACEP; OSPAR, MAP and WACAF, should coordinate their activities relating to issues of common concern;

(f) That efforts should be made to enhance the exchange of information in such areas as experience in dealing with international organizations, non-governmental organizations and donors and in the preparation of project proposals.

B. Public information and outreach

1. Introduction

149. The subitem was briefly introduced by Mr. Michael Williams, Chief, UNEP Information Unit for Conventions, who outlined the public and media services offered by UNEP to the regional seas conventions and action plans. The Unit currently managed press relations, published information materials, organized seminars and maintained web sites for a number of global environmental conventions.

150. The Unit also offered to establish a global regional seas web site, as well as region-specific web sites for those secretariats needing such assistance. The global site could include popular and educational materials, official documents, a calendar of events, and links to relevant sites, while the regional sites would carry similar information targeted for that particular region, in the appropriate languages. The regional sites could be maintained on a UNEP server until such time as secretariats were technically prepared to take over responsibility.

151. The Unit also proposed the production of a general brochure describing the environmental challenges facing the seas, their causes and impacts, and the solutions promoted by the conventions and action plans. A quarterly newsletter, perhaps modelled on the highly successful Siren published in the 1980s, could eventually be considered if there was sufficient demand.

2. Discussion

152. The participants welcomed the proposal to produce a global regional seas web site and a general brochure, and many secretariats requested support for establishing or strengthening their own regional sites. The Unit undertook to make those activities a priority during the second half of 1999, on the basis of funds to be provided by the UNEP Environment Fund.

3. Recommendations

153. Following that discussion, the meeting welcomed the undertaking by UNEP to help strengthen the public profile of the regional seas plans by the following measures, to be completed in 1999:

(a) Developing and publishing a general brochure, in the official United Nations languages, explaining the overall regional seas regime, including causes, impacts, and policy responses;

(b) Providing technical and editorial assistance to regional seas secretariats to create or to strengthen their individual web sites;

(c) Establishing a regional seas home page with links to the individual secretariat sites, a brief explanation of the regional seas regime, and links to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, other relevant sites, the brochure and other general information;

154. Furthermore, the meeting recommended:

(a) That UNEP, the regional seas conventions and action plans and other interested organizations should prepare brief inputs on, and links to, their own organizations for insertion in one another's web sites;

(b) That the work on web sites would be carried out in cooperation between UNEP and the Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action; and

(c) That consideration would be given to developing additional communications tools, such as a newsletter on the lines of the earlier Siren, for the year 2000, in consultation with the secretariats;

(d) That regional seas conventions and action plans should include in their web sites cross-links to other conventions and action plans and to relevant parts of the UNEP web site.

V. UNEP SUPPORT TO STRENGTHENING THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

155. The subitem was briefly introduced by Mr. Illueca, who noted that the previous discussions had led to several important recommendations on, first, strengthening the regional seas conventions and action plans and their links to global conventions and related international agreements, particularly the Global Programme of Action and GIWA; second, addressing the priority issues of the regional seas conventions and action plans; and, third, promoting horizontal cooperation. Those recommendations could serve as the basis for UNEP support and for revitalizing the relationship between UNEP and the regional seas conventions and action plans.

2. Discussion

156. In the ensuing discussion, several representatives of regional seas conventions and action plans agreed that the decisions of the current meeting should serve as the framework for UNEP support. A number felt that the decline in UNEP support to their work had reflected a growing lack of interest on the part of UNEP. They felt that the current meeting had gone a long way towards demonstrating that the regional seas conventions and action plans were a priority of UNEP.

3. Recommendations

157. Following that discussion, the meeting welcomed the revitalization of the relationship between UNEP and the regional seas conventions and action

plans and recommended that UNEP support to strengthening the regional seas conventions and action plans should be based on the recommendations of the current meeting.

VI. OTHER MATTERS

A. Proposed outputs of the meeting

158. Following a discussion, it was agreed that, in addition to the standard report of the present meeting, several other outputs should be prepared, to ensure maximum benefit from the meeting and to address the needs of different audiences.

159. One such additional output would be a resource document on the regional seas conventions and action plans to be prepared by UNEP, bearing in mind the recommendations of the present meeting and follow-up to the seventh session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, which could include the following elements:

Executive summary.

1. Introduction - an overview:

   (a) Objectives and historical perspective of the development of regional seas conventions and action plans;

   (b) Role of donors in supporting activities in international waters;

   (c) Challenges facing the regional seas conventions and action plans in their follow-up to the seventh session of the Commission on Sustainable Development;

   (d) Strengthening interagency partnerships in support of regional seas programmes, between and among, inter alia, FAO, IAEA, IMO, IOC, UNEP, WHO, WMO, WTO and relevant regional organizations;

   (e) Challenges facing the regional seas conventions and action plans.

2. Coordination and collaboration among regional seas conventions and action plans:

   (a) Second global meeting of regional seas conventions and action plans;

   (b) Linkages to global environmental conventions and related agreements;

   (c) Building horizontal cooperation among regional seas conventions and action plans.

3. Global International Waters Assessment:

   (a) Objectives and scope;

   (b) Role of the regional seas conventions and action plans.

4. Global Programme of Action for the protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities:

   (a) Status of implementation;

   (b) Linkages with GIWA;

   (c) Challenges in the coming years;

   (d) Strategic actions within regional seas conventions and action plans.

5. Building partnerships with global biodiversity-related conventions and relevant international agreements:

   (a) Jakarta Mandate of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine and Coastal Biodiversity;

   (b) International Coral Reef Initiative;

   (c) Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

6. Addressing fisheries issues within the framework of regional seas conventions and action plans: the Marine Mammal Action Plan - a renewed call for action.

7. Strengthening cooperation with the United Nations framework Convention on Climate Change: Strategic actions in response to climate change.

8. Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States:

   (a) Vulnerability of small island developing States to environmental degradation and urgency for increased action;

   (b) Status of implementation;

   (c) Focus on priorities and strategic actions.

9. Forging a stronger partnership with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

10. Emerging issues.

11. Strengthening the individual regional seas conventions and action plans.

160. The text of chapter 8 could be an abridged version of a separate report on small island developing States to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forthcoming special session.

161. In addition, the meeting agreed on the preparation of an input for the Oceans and Law of the Seas yearly report; a report for the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly meeting for an assessment and appraisal of the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States.

B. Further coordination measures

162. The representative of IAEA undertook to report to the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas at its next meeting on the outcome of the current meeting.

C. Arrangements for the next meeting

163. Representatives suggested a number of issues which might be considered in preparing the agenda for the next global meeting of regional seas conventions and action plans. Those included chemicals, trade and matters of concern to IMO, such as oil-spills. Representatives agreed on the usefulness of the participation of convention secretariats and, with regard to the inclusion of chemicals-related issues at the next meeting, the participation of the secretariats of the Basel and Rotterdam conventions, as well as UNEP Chemicals, which was currently engaged in the negotiations of a convention on POPs, was encouraged.

164. In addition, it was suggested that half a day should be set aside at the next meeting for the purpose of consultations exclusively among the regional seas bodies, on issues of common concern.

165. Attention was drawn to the cost, particularly high for organizations representing small island States in remote regions, of attending such meetings and it was suggested that consideration might be given by UNEP to the provision of assistance for the participation of such organizations.

166. The meeting gratefully accepted the offer of IAEA to provide the facilities for the next meeting, which, it was agreed, would be held in June 2000, in the offices of the IAEA Marine Environment Laboratory, in Monaco.

VII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

167. The present report was adopted on the basis of the draft that had been prepared by the secretariat and circulated to all participants and on the understanding that finalization of the report would be entrusted to the secretariat.

VIII. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

168. In their closing remarks, representatives affirmed the benefit and importance of the consultations. Thus, the representative of PAME conveyed his organization's appreciation at having been invited to the meeting and noted the considerable benefit of the interregional seas discussions. He also noted the benefit of continuing the productive exchanges between UNEP and the Arctic Council programme activities.

169. The representative of the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity said that the meeting had offered a valuable opportunity to clarify the respective roles of the regional seas conventions and action plans in the work of his secretariat and demonstrated the great benefit of such cooperation.

170. Noting that his organization was currently developing the operation of its regional activity centre, the representative of the Northwest Pacific Region Environmental Cooperation Centre said that the experience in that field of other regional seas organizations was particularly useful and he expressed his pleasure at having been able, through the consultation process, to join the wider UNEP family. Looking forward to their continued participation in that process and to strengthened horizontal cooperation, other representatives expressed the hope that the consultation process would help in the revitalization of UNEP and the regional seas programme in particular.

171. The representative of SPREP drew attention to the positive relationship that obtained between UNEP and the regional seas organizations and the benefit that had resulted from the participation of the global convention secretariats at the current meeting. Noting that the value to his organization of the meeting had even exceeded his expectations, he confirmed his organization's wish to attend the third meeting as well and suggested that consideration might be given to the provision of financial assistance for such attendance, particularly for representatives who had to travel long distances.

172. The representative of EAF/RCU, speaking also on behalf of WACAF/RCU, conveyed the thanks of those organizations to UNEP and the Coordination Office for their moral and technical support and, in particular, for organizing the current meeting, which would provide valuable guidance for the forthcoming meetings in the EAF and WACAF regions.

173. The Chair thanked all those present for their valuable contributions and the Coordination Office for its excellent work in preparing the meeting, which, he believed, would provide strong impetus for future action. Following that statement, he declared the meeting closed at 3 p.m. on Thursday, 8 July 1999.

Annex I

AGENDA OF THE MEETING

1. Opening of the meeting.

2. Linking the regional seas conventions and action plans to relevant global conventions, agreements and initiatives:

   (a) Global International Waters Assessment;

   (b) Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities;

   (c) Jakarta mandate of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity;

   (d) Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora;

   (e) International Coral Reef Initiative;

   (f) Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States;

   (g) Buenos Aires Programme of Work of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its relation to regional seas conventions and action plans;

   (h) United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

3. Addressing more effectively the issues of the sustainable management of fisheries.

4. Strengthening horizontal cooperation and ties among regional seas conventions and action plans

5. UNEP support to strengthening the regional seas conventions and action plans.

6. Other matters.

7. Adoption of the report.

8. Closure of the meeting

Annex II

PROGRAMME FOR THE INTEGRATION OF THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTION PLANS IN THE WORK OF GIWA

GIWA work plan components	RSP	GPA	CONVS	UNEP	NGOs	Academic	Private sector
Phase 1. (Establishment)							
1. Establishment of GIWA							
2. Network of national experts and collaborating centres							
3. Focal points and task teams							
4. Identification of information and data gaps							
5. Legal and institutional arrangements and gaps							
6. Linkages							
7. Development of assessment protocol							
Phase 2. (Analytical)							
1. Gathering and analysis of information (including socio-economic pressures)							
2. Quality assurance							
3. Sub-regional assessment							

GIWA work plan components	RSP	GPA	CONVS	UNEP	NGOs	Academic	Private sector
Phase 3. (Predictive policy option analysis)							
1. Prioritizing transboundary water-related issues							
2. Subregional and regional scenarios of future state of international water trends							
3. Global analysis of the societal causes of identified water-related concerns							
4. Analysis of the socio-economic responses							
5. Global overview of the relative importance of the various concerns by region							
6. Analysis of technology options							
Phase 4. (Financial requirements and other means of implementation)							
Phase 5. (Dissemination)							
1. Preparation of regional and global products, e.g., reports, reviews, databases, etc., that are easily comprehensible to various sectors of society							
2. Public awareness campaigns							

Annex III

DRAFT TABLES OF SELECTED NEEDS IDENTIFIED IN THE REGIONAL PROCESSES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION

The following regional seas organizations could assist as partners in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action in the regions listed below, given their advanced stage and experience with land-based activities: BSEP, the Helsinki Commission, MAP, PAME and the OSPAR Commission.

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments.
East African Region (EAF)	Sewage / waste water	• Intermediate technologies and innovative solutions	X			UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Solid waste	Management of dumping sites • Training of personnel				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Industrial waste	• Incentives for cleaner production • Planning for locating industries in appropriate locations				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank Industries
	Agricultural run-off	• Workshop to set guideline concentrations				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank, FAO
	Habitat degradation	• Regulation/legislation on sand extraction on coastal zone • Establish code of good practices for tourism construction				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank, UNESCO, FAO IUCN, WWF, WCMC

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments.
West African region (WACAF)	Sewage / waste water	• Collect qualitative and quantitative data on sewage • Prepare detailed regional report on sewage				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Agricultural run-off	• Collect data on the use of agrochemicals • Review and compile existing legislation				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank FAO
	Industrial waste	• Inventory of main industries in coastal and drainage basins • Status of regulations at national level • Adopt clean technologies				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank Industries
	Solid waste	• Evaluate status of problems and impacts through regional study • Evaluate in each country collection and treatment capabilities				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Habitat degradation	• Identify problem extent and causes • Protection of critical areas				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank UNESCO, FAO, IUCN, WWF, WCMC

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
East Asian Seas (EAS)	Sewage / waste water	• Establishment of data and information network to link with the Global Programme of Action clearing-house based on the existing regional monitoring network • Set up scientific infrastructure for sewage discharge and provide scientific information on the impacts on the marine environment, marine habitats and human health • Reduction of the discharge of sewage using a treatment system on the key sources of pollution, with potential technical transfer to other sewage	X			UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Agricultural run-off	• Establish a data and information network to assess the quantities and types of fertilizers used and the quantity of solid and liquid manure produced by farm animals • Promote of rational use of fertilizers and reduce the losses of nutrients by misuse of inorganic fertilizers and manure				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA , UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank FAO
	Industrial waste	• Establish data and information network • Undertake a feasibility study to introduce cleaner production in the region				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO,UNDP, World Bank Industries
	Habitat degradation	• Assemble available information on developments, habitats and risks and prepare maps • Commission a review of ESCAP/World Bank/United Nations guidelines on environmental impact assessment of these developments in the region • Convene a COBSEA workshop to adopt these guidelines				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO,UNDP, World Bank UNESCO, FAO IUCN, WWF, WCMC

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments.
Kuwait Action Plan (ROPME sea area)	Oils	• Update national surveys on land-based activities • Conduct a pilot study on POPs • Preparation of a manual on the implementation of the LBA Protocol • Develop a river basin management programme *[The above four actions address all priority source categories]*				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Physical alteration, sediment mobilization and destruction of habitats					UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank FAO
	Sewage and nutrients					UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank Industries
	Litter					UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
Upper South West Atlantic (SWAT)	Sewage / waste water	• Identify and quantify heavily contaminated areas				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Solid waste	• Identify and quantify main pollution sources				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank FAO
	Industrial waste	• Inventory of main sources of industrial waste				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank Industries
	Agricultural run-off	• Inventory of pollution and degradation from agriculture run-off				
	Habitat degradation	• Inventory of impacted ecosystems				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank UNESCO, FAO IUCN, WWF, WCMC

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
South-East Pacific (SE/PCF)	Sewage / waste water	• Minimise impacts of sewage discharges	X			UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Solid waste	• Training on best management practices				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Industrial waste	• Advocate appropriate and alternative technologies and adoption of clean technologies				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank Industries
	Agricultural run-off	• Framework for adoption of principles and best management practices				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank FAO
	Habitat degradation	• Support development of rehabilitation plans for key critical habitats in specific sites				UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank UNESCO, FAO IUCN, WWF, WCMC

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU)	Domestic sewage					
	Agricultural non-point sources					UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	POPs (Chemical industries)					UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank FAO

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)						
	[Pending outcome of GPA workshop, Apia, 14-16 October 1999]		X			Regional office United Nations agencies Non-governmental organizations, etc.

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
South Asian Seas (SACEP)						
	Sewage / waste water	***[Pending development of the regional programme of action]***	X			UNEP relevant divisions GIWA, UNCHS (Habitat), WHO, UNDP, World Bank
	Industrial waste	"				
	Agricultural run-off	"				
	Solid waste					

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA)						
	Sewage / waste water	***[Pending development of the regional programme of action]***				
	Solid waste	"				
	Industrial waste	"				
	Agricultural run-off	"				
	Habitat degradation					

Regional seas	Priority pollutant source category	Selected priority needs from the regional process	1999	2000	2001	Main partners In addition to regional seas secretariats and Governments
North-West Pacific						
	[Pending outcome of GPA workshop, tentatively November 1999]		X			Regional Office UNEP Division.of Environmental Conventions United Nations agencies Non-governmental organizations

Central East Pacific - Support to consideration of priorities and actions required to address land-based activities as the development of the action plan progresses

Annex IV

PRACTICAL EXAMPLES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT OF THE BALTIC SEA AREA AND THE BALTIC SEA JOINT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMME

A. Ecoconversion

1. Finland and Poland have created so called ecoconversion to address the reduction of bilateral State loan for the reduction of pollution load. At the beginning of the 1990s, Poland still had a considerable loan from the Finnish Government, which became impossible to be paid back by normal terms. Finland offered Poland a solution whereby environmental investments (pumps, pipelines, filters, control instrumentation, etc.) made by Poland using Finnish environmental know-how and technology would be deducted from the amount of its loan. As a follow-up to that process, a bilateral group was established to safeguard the implementation.

B. Ecofunds

2. The best example is in Poland, where all environmental taxes, fees, penalties, etc., will be deposited to the national ecofund administrated by the Ministry of the Environment. Annually one third of the fund resources will be used for environmental purposes based on the proposals by the Ministry, another third based on proposals of the regional authorities and the last third according to the needs of local authorities. This system guarantees that all financial resources originally collected for the environment will be addressed back for environment, not for filling gaps in the State budget.

C. Bilateral cooperation

3. The bilateral agreements for protection of environment between an industrialized country or countries and developing countries or countries with economies in transition have been used for more tailor-made, action-orientated cooperation for environmental sectors, including the transfer of technology, support for investment activities and for increase of public awareness and environmental education. In the Baltic Sea region, there are currently 15 bilateral agreements.

D. Partnerships

4. A partnership agreement has been established between the Great Lakes and the Baltic Sea, which share many environmental problems. This agreement includes both fellowship arrangements for training visits by environmental experts from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and the Russian Federation (for a maximum of six months) in the Great Lakes in the United States of America and Canada, as well as joint comprehensive action programmes containing environmental, social and economic aspects for three transboundary river basins in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

E. Institutional strengthening and human resources development

5. In the first phase, this has aimed at building up the organizational and human capacities necessary for the development of effective management systems and for the planning, design and operation of pollution control measures, including follow-up and monitoring. In the second phase, the focus will be on improving planning and the administrative, financial and technical skills of public sector, private sector and non-governmental organizations. Special emphasis should be placed on supporting the ongoing decentralization process in both urban and rural areas. The co-lead parties for this activity are Germany, the International Network for Environment Management (INEM) and the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI).

F. Special expert visits

6. Several expert groups from other regions of the world have visited the secretariat and the appropriate Contracting Parties. in addition, an expert group from the Baltic Sea region attended the meetings in Manila to convey information about the Baltic Sea experiences for future action in the South China Sea region.

Annex V

RELEVANT WORK BY IETC IN THE AREA OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF "SOFT" AND "HARD" TECHNOLOGY

A. Promoting sustainable management of waste water and storm water

1. General objective

1. The general objective is to increase the capacity of decision makers in the management of waste water and storm water.

2. Outputs

2. The following are the expected outputs:

(a) Source book on environmentally sound technologies for urban waste water and storm water management, considering the following aspects:

(i) Selected in-depth case studies from both developed and developing countries of innovative cost-effective technologies for environmentally sound urban waste water drainage systems;

(ii) Sound practices, including endogenous technologies;

(b) Training modules;

(c) Information fliers (few languages) to enhance awareness;

(d) Pilot training course to examine the effectiveness of the training module.

3. Activities

3. In order to achieve the objectives of the project, the following activities are considered:

(a) Problem identification, in-house consultations and potential partners (done);

(b) Expert meeting to prepare the project (done);

(c) Selecting information sources in six world regions (in process);

(d) Incorporating information into IETC information system (maESTro);

(e) Regional overviews on practices in six regions (in process);

(f) Selecting information on cost-effective technology options from existing databases;

(g) Identification of sound practices in selected locations;

(h) Preparation of the publication and production of training modules;

(i) Peer-review;

(j) Evaluation and dissemination of information.

4. Potential partners

4. The following potential partners have been identified: Global Programme of Action, UNEP regional offices, International Environment Lake Committee Foundation (ILEC), Global Environment Centre Foundation (GEC), WHO, UNDP, World Bank, International Association of Water Quality and others.

B. Integrated liquid and solid waste management in small island States

1. General objective

5. The general objective is to provide assistance to very small island States in the management of liquid, solid and hazardous waste.

2. Outputs

6. The following outputs are expected:

(a) Guidelines for integrated liquid and solid waste management (including hazardous waste) for very small islands in the Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Atlantic region and the Pacific region;

(b) Training module(s);

(c) Pilot case study in each region.

3. Activities

7. In order to achieve the objectives of the project, the following activities are considered:

(a) From the existing guidelines on solid waste management from the Pacific region, prepare adapted guidelines for the Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Atlantic region;

(b) Prepare integrated guidelines for the Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Atlantic region and the Pacific region, considering liquid, solid and hazardous waste;

(c) Convene an expert meeting to revise the draft guidelines;

(d) Conduct a regional seminar or workshop in each region or combined;

(e) Conduct a pilot case-study to test the guidelines.

8. In addition, the following points should be taken into consideration:

(a) Talks between UNEP headquarters and IETC are already in progress;

(b) Participation of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) (Habitat) has already been verbally agreed (Asia and the Pacific region);

(c) IETC is already discussing with a consultancy firm in New Zealand the preparation of a directory containing the most suitable environmentally sound technologies to manage solid, liquid and hazardous waste for small islands in the Pacific region;

(d) UNEP headquarters has already identified the consultants for the Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Atlantic region.

9. The draft guidelines are expected to be ready by October 1999 and the regional seminar-workshop(s) by December 1999. The pilot case study will be undertaken during 2000.

4. Partners

10. The project is coordinated by the focal point for small island developing States at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi. For the Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and Atlantic region, the partners will be identified by UNEP headquarters, while for the Pacific region the expected partners are UNCHS (Habitat) (Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific) and SPREP. The Global Programme of Action is also expected to participate as appropriate.

C. Planning and management of lakes and reservoirs to address eutrophication

1. General objective

11. The general objective is to assist local decision makers in the management of eutrophication in lakes and reservoirs.

2. Outputs

12. The following are the expected outputs:

(a) Publication on the issue, entitled Planning and Management of Lakes and Reservoirs. An Integrated Approach to Eutrophication;

(b) Training module;

(c) Regional workshop;

3. Activities

13. In order to achieve the objectives of the project, the following activities are considered:

(a) Preparation of project (done);

(b) Preparation of first draft (done);

(c) Expert meeting to revise the draft (done);

(d) Final version (done);

(e) Preparation of training module (to start in August 1999);

(f) Pilot regional workshop to test the training module (Kenya, January 2000).

3. Partners

14. It is planned to work with the following partners: University of California at Santa Barbara (United States of America), Environment Canada, Kenya Wildlife Service Training Institute (KWSTI), Earth Watch (tentative), Global Programme of Action (tentative) and others still to be identified.

D. Other areas

15. On the basis of the needs of the Global Programme of Action and taking into consideration the experience of IETC, the following areas are also suggested:

(a) Capabilities and mandate (urban areas and freshwater resources);

(b) Identification of potential areas of cooperation for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

16. It should be noted that budget availability, as well as the timetable, will have to be considered when discussing cooperation schemes and support from IETC.

Annex VI

AOSIS STATEMENT ON OCEANS AND SEAS TO THE UNEP SECOND GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

by Mr. Peter D. Doniqi, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea to United Nations Headquarters, on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)

1. It is a great pleasure to be here, and I am honoured to address this distinguished audience on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS). I wish to thank the sponsors of this meeting, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and the United Nations Environment Programme. The Chairman of AOSIS, His Excellency Mr. Neroni Slade, Permanent Representative of Samoa to the United Nations, conveys his apologies. As this is my first representative duty for AOSIS outside of New York, I look forward to the further exchange of your views and ideas on the important subjects before us.

2. AOSIS is proud to join UNEP in taking an active role in the area of oceans management. You may recall that this has been a special year following on the heels of the International Year of the Ocean, and facing the forthcoming five-year review and appraisal of the Global Conference for the sustainable development of small island developing states, in New York.

3. The chapters related to oceans and coastal management in Agenda 21, the Barbados Programme of Action and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Sources are extremely important to our countries. At the recent session of the Commission on Sustainable Development on the conservation and sustainable use of the world's oceans, many of our delegations supported the majority view for a comprehensive approach, including the overriding issues on coastal management, atmosphere and tourism - areas where UNEP has pioneered global action.

4. Ecological, economic and social objectives must be taken into account if we are to achieve effective, sustainable management of coasts and oceans. We note that at least 70 per cent of commercial species in every ocean and sea are fully exploited, depleted or are "recovering", as a consequence of the fishing practices of high-seas fishing nations. The grave dangers of over-exploitation of fish stocks and other marine living life are a danger to our survival. For instance in my country - Papua New Guinea - a large percentage of our people live in coastal areas and the marine environment is their livelihood. The incidence of marine and coastal degradation poses serious socio-economic threats, in particular the pressures to adjust from cultural practices towards a market-based system.

5. Many factors influence the current state of our response to the protection of oceans and seas. Many are beyond our control. The deadly tsunami that ripped the coast of the Sepik and the impact of the El Niño phenomenon around the country are prime examples. We are accustomed to natural disasters, but the increase in frequency and the size of these natural disasters is a topic of concern for scientists and the world

community, with growing evidence of the links with climate change and sea-level rise. Human development-related threats are a serious concern that has global repercussions, particularly on vulnerable communities, coastal ecosystems and marine biodiversity.

6. The UNEP regional seas programmes, the Barbados Programme of Action, the Global Programme of Action and regional institutions are excellent tools - if I may use that term loosely - for addressing these issues. We do not want a proliferation of institutional mechanisms at any level.

7. According to current knowledge, land-based sources contribute around 80 per cent of marine pollution. For small island States, problems of waste disposal and pollution prevention are increasing and add constraints to sustainable development. We have identified a number of actions, both in the Global Programme of Action and in the Barbados-plus-five review paper that need to be implemented. Key among the priorities are the training of national staff to undertake legislative changes, the completion of inventories of all forms of wastes by source categories, and the management of equipment and infrastructure for the handling and disposal of solid wastes, waste water and sewage.

8. Equally important is the development of regional and subregional guidelines and procedures for the safe handling and transport of hazardous and toxic wastes. We welcome the work that UNEP is doing in this area, especially the measures identified with industry. UNEP and other organizations, such as UNESCO and WHO, are also assisting our countries in freshwater management and early warning systems for emergencies. Those activities need strengthening through existing regional arrangements.

9. We also need more support for regional cooperation, where applicable, in integrated coastal zone management. The ICM approach is an innovative concept and we have been responsive to it in our countries, but the application of customary norms, different stakeholders, and the lack of clearly defined marine zones or borders in some of our countries make it difficult to measure performance. This is also compounded by the limited technical capacity, financial resources, and appropriate technology.

10. We maintain that international efforts should be complementary to the regional and national mechanisms. We agree that a centralized body is not the panacea for the problems in coordination and integration. The Commission on Sustainable Development has, to some degree, played a pivotal role in bridging this gap and our collective response has resulted in progress in enforcement of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and other initiatives of FAO, IMO, UNEP and GEF.

11. It seems, however, that the collective response remains unfulfilled from Rio and Barbados, due, in part, to the fragmentation of approaches and the poor spirit of compliance with existing regimes. This question of a "coordinating forum" for international policy directions on issues impacting on oceans and seas will no doubt be further debated by the United Nations General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session and the results of our meeting in the Hague should offer further insight for those deliberations.

12. I have attached, in the appendix to this statement, an OASIS position paper on oceans and seas, and an excerpt of the relevant paragraphs of the Commission on Sustainable Development text on international coordination and cooperation. I should mention that the Commission's text was agreed to at the last moment following the Chair's appeal to delegations which had reservations about creating additional institutions. The final agreed text, as you can see, clearly states that it is not the intention of the Commission on Sustainable Development to recommend the creation of additional institutions and that the consultative process should:

(a) Be conducted annually within the existing budgetary resources of the United Nations; and

(b) Be reviewed no later than four years after its inception.

I thank you for your attention.

Appendix

AOSIS POSITION ON OCEANS AND SEAS

A. Benefits

1. Oceans and seas:

(a) Provide small island developing States with a wealth of natural resources, the benefits of which are vital to our socio-economic well-being, especially as regards our coastal dwellers;

(b) Are vital to our character and well-being;

(c) Represent our culture and heritage.

2. The livelihood and sustainable development of small island developing States is dependent on the health, protection and preservation of the oceans and seas.

3. The continued health of the oceanic and coastal system help to ensure the success of the national development schemes of small island developing States.

B. Challenges

4. A major challenge for small island developing States is the need for development and management programmes aimed at achieving ecological and economical sustainable use of coastal and marine resources, particularly in the areas of:

(a) Sustainable fisheries;

(b) Sustainable use of coastal resources;

(c) Combating and preventing marine pollution from all sources;

(d) Understanding the linkages of interactions between the oceans and seas and the world's climate system;

(e) Enhancing international cooperation and coordination to achieve the above.

5. The lack of an integrated approach is a significant constraint to small island developing States and has limited the effectiveness of past and present management measures, resulting in coastal habitats being degraded through pollution and the over-exploitation of natural resources.

C. Action by small island developing States

6. Small island developing States have committed themselves to a set of actions based on new approaches for pursuing the protection and sustainable development of marine and coastal areas. Examples include:

(a) Governments of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) have moved to have the Caribbean Sea internationally recognized as a special area in the context of sustainable development;

(b) In the Pacific, steps have been taken through the Strategic Action Programme to integrate national and regional sustainable development priorities with shared global environment concerns for protecting international waters. This regional programmes draws strength from institutional arrangements such as the South Pacific Organizations Coordinating Committee (SPOCC), its regional development strategy and working groups on marine, land resources and tourism.

D. Priorities

7. The following are the priorities of AOSIS:

(a) Increasing our ownership and management capacities of commercial fisheries, through strengthened national capacity for promoting, assessing and monitoring commercial investment in sustainable fisheries, including catching, processing and marketing;

(b) Building capacity through education, training and awareness-raising;

(c) Strengthening national capacity for the development of a methodology or guidelines for sound practices and techniques suitable for small island developing States, for achieving the integrated management of an sustainable development of the coastal and marine areas under their sovereign or national jurisdiction;

(d) Building on the International Coral Reef Initiative and global reef assessments to ensure food security, fish stock replenishment, and to provide a focus for implementation of the Jakarta Mandate, including marine protected areas, and the Global Programme of Action on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities;

(e) Encouraging national and regional community-based reef conservation and management;

(f) Exploring initiatives on alternative livelihoods such as aquaculture and ecotourism;

(g) Exploring post-harvest technology and management initiatives;

(h) Exploring integrated reef management initiatives;

(i) Strengthening research, monitoring and the transfer of technology to assess the impact of exploration of non-living resources on the coastal and marine environments.

E. Coordination and cooperation

8. There is a need for:

(a) Improved alignment of United Nations system activities with existing regional organizations' strategies, work plans and coordination mechanisms. These are scrutinized by and reflect the collective decision of small island developing States;

(b) Improved mechanisms for the implementation of priority programmes and goals in a consistent and mutually reinforcing manner within the United Nations system;

(c) For United Nations agencies and members to use small island developing States conventions and protocols as the umbrella for programme design, and to ensure that programme coordination is undertaken within existing regional conventions, declarations and policy statements;

(d) For United Nations agencies and members to fulfil their commitments to assist small island developing States to build their capacity for considering ratification and implementation of relevant conventions and protocols;

(e) Further promoting accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the coordinated implementation of its provisions, particularly those relevant to small island developing States.

F. Appeal to the international community

9. The international community is called on:

(a) To support small island developing States in scientific research and analysis relevant to the conservation and management of highly migratory straddling fish stocks on the high seas and in the marine areas under their sovereignty or national jurisdiction;

(b) To support small island developing States in enhancing the conservation and management resources of the marine areas under their sovereignty or national jurisdiction;

(c) To ratify or accede to the 1995 United Nations Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and the 1993 FAO Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas;

(d) To support small island developing States in formulating policies, strategies and measures to address fisheries needs, including the urgent need to address illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing in the marine areas under their sovereignty or national jurisdiction;

(e) To support small island developing States in data collection and the preparation of documentation necessary for the delineation of areas under their sovereignty or national jurisdiction, in accordance with the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea;

(f) To support small island developing States in ensuring greater national coordination in managing, monitoring, controlling and surveillance, including the system of vessel monitoring and enforcement, of the marine areas under the sovereignty and national jurisdiction of small island developing States, including the management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks;

(g) To assist small island developing States in assessing the impact of land-based sources of marine pollution and to develop mechanisms to eliminate or minimize pollution sources;

(h) To assist small island developing States in national and regional efforts to assess resource information and to develop appropriate policies and legislative regimes for deep-sea minerals.

Annex VII

LIST OF DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE MEETING

UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/0	Provisional agenda
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/1	Briefing document on the objectives, scope and Activities of the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/2	UNEP/Global Programme of Action strategic action plan to address sewage as a major land-based pollutant
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/3	The Global Programme of Action clearing-house and the possible role of the regional seas convention and action plans
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/4	Possible roles of the regional seas conventions and action plans in the implementation of the Jakarta Mandate of the Convention on Biological Diversity on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine and Coastal Biodiversity
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/5	Possible roles of the regional seas conventions and action plans in the implementation of the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI)
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/6	UNEP/GC.20/19 - Preparations for the seventh session of the Commission on Sustainable Development: Activities of the United Nations Environment Programme regarding small island developing States
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/7	Climate change and sea-level rise: Implications for regional seas conventions and action plans and recommendations for future actions
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/8	Regional seas conventions and action plans on fisheries management
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/9	Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals and the role of the UNEP regional seas programme
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/1	Provisional list of documents
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/2	Provisional list of participants
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/3	Input received from secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans on issues to be discussed at the meeting
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/4	Report of the interregional seas programme consultation, the Hague, the Netherlands, 24-26 June 1998

UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/5	UNEP/GC.20/29/Add.1 - Preparations for the seventh session of the Commission on Sustainable Development: Activities of the United Nations Environment Programme regarding oceans management
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/6	UNEP/GC.20/16 - Strengthening the role of the United Nations Environment Programme in promoting collaboration among environmental conventions
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/7	Status report on the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/8	Global Programme of Action implementation of regional and national programmes of action
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/9	Report of the ICRI CPC meeting, Paris, 15-16 March 1999
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/10	UNEP/International Ocean Institute: United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the twenty-first century
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/11	Joint implementation of the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions: Strategy for the Special Initiative for Africa - oceans sub-component
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/12	UNEP/GC.20/17 - Programmatic support provided by the United Nations Environment Programme to environmental conventions
UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/INF/13	Matrices of the status of implementation of regional seas conventions and action plans

Annex VIII

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Regional seas conventions and action plans

BALTIC MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMISSION (HELSINKI COMMISSION)

Dr. Tapani Kohonen
Executive Secretary
Helsinki Commission
Katajanokanlaituri 6B
001600 Helsinki
Finland
Tel: (358-9) 6220 2233
Fax: (358-9) 6220 2239
Email: tapani@helcom.fi
Internet: www.helcom.fi

BLACK SEA ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMME (BSEP)

Mr. Radu Mihnea
Black Sea Environmental Programme (BSEP)
Dolmabahce Sarayi,
II Harekat Kosku, 80680 Besiktas,
Istanbul, Turkey
Tel: 90 212 227 9927/8/9
Fax: 90 212 227 9933
Email: rmihnea@dominet.in.com.tr

COMMISSION OF THE CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT OF THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC (OSPAR COMMISSION)

Mr. Ben van de Wetering
Executive Secretary
OSPAR Commission
New Court, 48 Carey Street
London WC2A 2JQ
England
Tel: 44 171 242 9927
Fax: 44 171 831 7427
Email: secretariat@ospar.org
Internet: http://www.ospar.org

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN (MAP)

Mr. Lucien Chabason
Coordinator
UNEP/MAP
48 Vas. Konstantinou,
PO Box 18019,
11610 Athens, Greece
Tel: 301 72 73 100/123
Fax: 301 72 53 196/7
Email: chabason@unepmap.gr
Internet: http://www.medu.unep.org

NORTHWEST PACIFIC REGION EVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION CENTRE

Mr. Masamitsu Oritani
Executive Director and Secretary-General
Northwest Pacific Region
Environmental Cooperation Centre
7-18 Azumicho
Toyama City 930-0094
Japan
Tel: 76 445 1571
Fax: 76 445 1581
Email: oritani@npec.or.jp
Website: http://www.npec.or.jp

PLAN OF ACTION OF THE SOUTH EAST PACIFIC

Mr. Ulises Munaylla Alarcon
Adviser of the Plan of Action of the South East Pacific
Comision Permanente del Pacifico Sur
Coruna 2061 y Whimper
P.O. Box 17-21-720
Quito, Ecuador
Tel: (593 2) 234 331/5/6 / 234 357/8
Fax: (593 2) 234 374
Email: cpps@ecuanex.net.ec / ulisesmunaylla@porto.net

PROTECTION ARCTIC MARINE ENVIRONMENT (PAME)

Mr. John H. Karau
Chairman, Protection Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)
Marine Environment Division
Environmental Protection Service
Place Vincent Massey
12th Floor, 351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Hull, Quebec K1A 0H3
Canada
Tel: (1 613) 953 1699
Fax: (1 613) 953 0913
Email: John.Karau@EC.GC.CA

REGIONAL COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE CARIBBEAN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (CAR/RCU)

Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares
Coordinator
Regional Coordinating Unit for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CAR/RCU)
United Nations Environment Programme
14-20 Port Royal Street
Kingston, Jamaica
Tel: 1 876 922 9267
Fax: 1 876 922 9292
Email: uneprcuja@toj.com / nac.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com
Internet: www.cep.unep.org

REGIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE RED SEA AND GULF OF ADEN (PERSGA)

Dr. Mohamed A. Fawzi
Deputy Secretary General
Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA)
PO Box 53662
Jeddah 21583
Saudi Arabia
Tel: (966 2) 651 4472
Fax: (966 2) 651 9868 / 651 4472
Email:

REGIONAL COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE SOUTH-EAST ASIAN SEAS (EAS/RCU)

Dr. Hugh Kirkman
UNEP
EAS/RCU
Coordinator
United Nations Building, 10th floor
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: (66 2) 288 1860
Mobile: 01 845 1167
Fax: (66 2) 281 2428
Email: kirkman.unescap@un.org / Hkirkman@loxinfo.co.th
URL: www.unep.org/unep/regoffs/roap/easrcu/index.htm

Mr. Yihang Jiang
Programme Officer
UNEP, EAS/RCU
UN Building, 10th Floor
Rajadamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: (662) 288 2084
Fax: (662) 281 2428
Email: jiang.unescap@un.org

REGIONAL COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICAN ACTION PLAN (WACAF/RCU)

Ms. Nasséré Kaba
Interim Coordinator
WACAF/RCU
20 BP 650
Abidjan 20
c/o Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Forêt
Côte d'Ivoire
Tel: (225) 21 1183 / 0623
Fax: (225) 21 04 95
Email: biodiv@africaonline.co.ci

REGIONAL COORDINATING UNIT OF THE EASTERN AFRICAN REGION (EAF/RCU)

Mr. Rolph Payet
Regional Coordinating Unit of the Eastern African Region (EAF/RCU)
PO Box 487, Victoria,
Mahe, Seychelles
Tel: 248 324 525
Fax: 248 324 573
Email: uneprcu@seychelles.net

SOUTH ASIA COOPERATIVE ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (SACEP)

Mr. Prasantha Dias Abeyegunawardene
Deputy Director Programmes
South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP)
10 Anderson Road
Colombo 5, Sri Lanka
Tel: 941 596 442
Fax: 941 589 369
Email: pd_sacep@eureka.lk
Internet:

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (SPREP)

Mr. Tamarii Tutangata
Director
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
P.O. Box 240
Apia, Western Samoa,
Tel: 685 21 929
Fax: 685 20 231
Email: sprep@sprep.org.ws
Website: www.sprep.org.ws

B. Global and international agreements

ALLIANCE OF SMALL ISLAND STATES (AOSIS)

Mr. Peter Donigi
Ambassador
C/o Papua New Guinea Mission to the United Nations
201 East 42nd Street, Suite 405
New York
NY 10017
USA
Tel: (1 212) 557 5001 x17
Fax: (1 212) 557 5009
Email: pdonigi@un.int / png@un.int

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Dr. Salvatore Arico
Head, Jakarta Mandate Unit on Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
World Trade Center, Suite 300
Montreal, Canada H2Y 1N9
Tel: (1 514) 287 7009
Fax: (1 514) 288 6588
Email: salvatore.arico@biodiv.org

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA (CITES)

Mr. Willem Wijnstekers
Secretary General
CITES
Geneva Executive Centre
15 chemin des Anemones
CH-1219 Châtelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8139/40
Fax: 41 22 797 3417
Email: willem.wijnstekers@unep.ch

GLOBAL INTERNATIONAL WATERS ASSESSMENT

Prof. Per Wramner
Scientific Director
Global International Water Assessment (GIWA)
P.O. Box 905
SE - 39129 Kalmar
Sweden
Tel: (46 480) 447 350
Fax: (46 480) 447 355
Email:

GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

Ms. Veerle Vandeweerd
Coordinator
United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP GPA Coordination Office - The Hague
PO Box 16227
5200 BE, The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: (31 70) 311 4461
Fax: (31 70) 345 6648
e-mail: v.vandeweerd@unep.nl
Internet: www.gpa.unep.nl

Mr. Omar Vidal
Deputy Coordinator
UNEP/GPA Coordination Office - The Hague
PO Box 16227
5200 BE, The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: (31 70) 311 4464
Fax: (31 70) 345 6648
e-mail: o.vidal@unep.nl
Internet: www.gpa.unep.nl

Mr. Leo de Vrees
Senior Expert
UNEP GPA Coordination Office - The Hague
PO Box 16227
5200 BE, The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: (31 70) 311 4465
Fax: (31 70) 345 6648
e-mail: l.dvrees@unep.nl
Internet: www.gpa.unep.nl

Mr. Robbert Droop
Expert
UNEP GPA Coordination Office - The Hague
PO Box 16227
2500 BE, The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: (31 70) 311 4466
Fax: (31 70) 345 6648
Email: r.droop@unep.nl
Internet: www.gpa.unep.nl

Mr. Kenneth Korporal
Programme Officer
UNEP GPA Coordination Office - The Hague
PO Box 16227
2500 BE, The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: (31 70) 311 4467
Fax: (31 70) 345 6648
Email: k.korporal@unep.nl
Internet: www.gpa.unep.nl

Ms. Monica Borobia
Programme Officer
UNEP GPA Coordination Office - The Hague
PO Box 16227
2500 BE, The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: (31 70) 311 4466
Fax: (31 70) 345 6648
Email: m.borobia@unep.nl
Internet: www.gpa.unep.nl

INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF INITIATIVE (ICRI)

Mr. Denis Vene
Chef du service des affaires internationales
Ministère de l'aménagement du terrirotire et de l'environnement
20, avenue de Ségur
75302 Paris 07SP
France
Tel: 331 42 19 17 75
Fax: 331 42 19 17 72
Email: denis.vene@environnement.gouv.fr

UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

Mr. Juan Antonio Escudero
Law of the Sea/Ocean Affairs Officer
Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea
Office of Legal Affairs
United Nations
DC2-0460
New York, NY 10017
Tel: (1 212) 963 3948
Fax: (1 212) 963 5847
Email: escudero@un.org

UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. Janos Pasztor
Coordinator
Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Cimate Change
P.O. Box 260 124
D-53153
Bonn
Germany
Tel: 49 228 815 1000
Fax: 49 228 815 1999/5
Email: jpasztor@unfccc.de
Website: www.unfccc.be

C. Intergovernmental organizations

INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (IOC/UNESCO)

Dr. Umit Unluata
Head
Ocean Science Section
IOC/UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
75732 Paris Cedex 15
France
Tel: 33 1 4568 40 08
Fax: 33 1 45 68 58 12
Email: u.unluata@unesco.org

INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION (IMO)

Mr. Jean-Claude Sainlos
Senior Deputy Director, Marine Environment Division
International Maritime Organization
4 Albert Embankment
London
United Kingdom
Tel: (44 171) 587 3142
Fax: (44 171) 587 3210
Email: jcsainlos@imo.org
Website: www.imo.co.uk

MARINE ENVIRONMENT LABORATORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)

Dr. Hugh Livingston
Director
IAEA - Marine Environment Laboratory
4 Quai Antoine 1er
B.P. No. 800
MC 98012
Monaco cedex
Tel: (377) 97 97 7279
Fax: (377) 97 97 7275
Email: H.D.Livingston@iaea.org

Dr. Stephen de Mora
Head, MESL
IAEA - Marine Environment Laboratory
4 Quai Antoine 1er
B.P. No.800
MC 98012
Monoco cedex
Tel: (377) 97 97 72 36
Fax: (377) 97 97 72 76
Email: S.de_Mora@iaea.org

WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN)

Ms. Jeanne Pagnan
Arctic Coordinator
World Commission on Protected Areas

World Conservation Union (IUCN)
53 Brouage
Aylmer, Quebec
Canada J9J 1J5
Tel: (1 819) 777 1767 / 994 0770
Fax: (1 819) 997 5883
Email: jpagman@compuserve.com

D. United Nations Environment Programme

Mr. Jorge E. Illueca
Director
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 2 622 4011
Fax: 254 2 622 4300
Email: jorge.illueca@unep.org

Ms. Cristina Boelcke
Director, Division of Regional Cooperation and Representation
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: (254 2) 62 35 17/19
Fax: (254 2) 62 42 70
Email: cristina.boelcke@unep.org

Mr. Mohamood Abdulraheem
Regional Director and Representative
UNEP/ROWA
P.O. Box 10880
Manama
Bahrain
Tel: (973) 2760 72/3
Fax: (973) 2760 75
Email: myanrowa@batelco.com.bh

Mr. Halifa Drammeh
Senior Programme Officer
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: 2542 62 4278/74
Fax: 2542 62 2788
Email: halifa.drammeh@unep.org

Mr. Ricardo Sanchez Sosa
Regional Director and
Representative
UNEP/ROLAC
Boulevard de los Virreyes No. 155
Col. Lomas virreyes
Apartado postal 10793
11000 - Mexico, D.F.
Tel: (525) 202 75 29/7493/
Fax: (525) 202 09 50/520 7768

Mr. Frits Schlingemann
Director
UNEP/ROE
15 chemin des Anemones
1219 Châtelaine
Switzerland
Tel: (41 22) 979 9276
Fax: (41 22) 979 3420
Email: fritz.schilingemann@unep.ch

Mr. Michael Williams
Chief
Information Unit for Conventions
(UNEP)
C.P. 356
Geneva Executive Center
CH-1219 Châtelaine
Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 917 8242
Fax: 41 22 797 3464
Email: michael.williams@unep.ch

Mr. Vincent Santiago
First Programme Officer
Division of Technology, Industry
and Economics
International Environment
Technology Center (IETC)
1091 Oroshimo-cho
Kustav City
Shigi 525-0001
Japan
Tel: (81 775) 68 4587
Fax: (81 775) 68 4585
Email: vstiago@unep.or.jp

Ms. Ivonne Higuero
Programme Officer
Division of Environmental
Conventions
United Nations Environment
Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (254 2) 62 3465
Fax: (254 2) 62 3926
Email: ivonne.higuero@unep.org

UNITED NATIONS

E

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr. Participants Only

UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.1.1

Original: English

Third Global Meeting of
Regional Seas Conventions
And Action Plans
Monaco, 6-11 November 2000

Status of Implementation of Decisions of the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans

The Hague, 5-8 July 1999

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF DECISIONS OF THE SECOND GLOBAL MEETING OF REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS THE HAGUE, 5-8 JULY 1999

Note: The numbering system reflects the actual paragraph numbers as they appear in the Report of the Meeting - UNEP(DEC)/RS.2/10

SECTION II: LINKING THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS TO RELEVANT GLOBAL CONVENTIONS, AGREEMENTS AND INITIATIVES

14. **A. GLOBAL INTERNATIONAL WATERS ASSESSMENT**

26. The meeting agreed on the following recommendations on organisational and operational principles to facilitate effective implementation of GIWA and the regional seas programme:

Decision	Status
(a) **In the area of consultations, that:** (i) The annual meeting of the regional seas programmes would serve the broad purpose of consultations on GIWA-related issues; (ii) Regional consultations should precede each GIWA phase; (iii) At the subregional level, GIWA focal points would facilitate coordination between the GIWA team and other collaborating partners;	This has been included as an agenda item of the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans. Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).
(b) **In the area of taking stock, that:** (i) GIWA would take into account existing information and data as well as existing programmes and activities; (ii) Quality assurance procedures would be applied to the data sets and information to be utilised by GIWA and that due recognition should be given to the gaps, in data or information, which may exist, especially in the developing regions;	Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).
(c) **In the area of capacity-building, that capacity-building would be an integral part of the GIWA process:**	Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).

(d) **In respect of contributions by the regional seas programmes to GIWA, that:** (i) The programmes should, to the extent possible, participate actively in the assessment, for instance, as subregional focal points, task team members, etc.;	Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).
(d) **In respect of contributions by the regional seas programmes to GIWA, that:** (i) The programmes should, to the extent possible, participate actively in the assessment, for instance, as subregional focal points, task team members, etc.; (ii) Available data should be compiled to meet the needs of GIWA, as follows: a. Basic ecological data; b. Data about human impacts on the environment; c. Environmental assessments, including trends; d. Basic social and economic data; e. Data about the social root causes of environmental problems;	Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).
(e) **In respect of contributions by GIWA to the regional seas programmes, that:** (i) Consideration would be given to the provision of financial assistance to secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans, to assist them in the conduct of activities under GIWA; (ii) GIWA should provide subregional assessments of environmental status, information on the social and economic root causes of environmental problems and other data which could be used as a basis, inter alia, for work plans; fund-raising (especially GEF funds), and more detailed assessments; and	Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).
(f) **Recognising the linkages between GIWA and the Global Programme of Action**, that GIWA should take into account the particular needs of the regional seas conventions and action plans in terms of scientific assessments on land-based activities and that it should also consider modalities to support the identification or, as appropriate, updating of priority actions as a contribution to the implementation of the regional programmes of action and protocols on land-based activities.	Pending due to the refinement of the network infrastructure of GIWA to enhance and sustain that network with existing regional seas programmes and relevant units in UNEP. A status report will be presented by the new Director of UNEP's Division of Environmental Information, Assessment and Early Warning (DEIAEW).

28. **B. GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES**	
(a) **Regional programmes of action on land-based activities**	
35. The meeting recommended that:	
(a) Periodic overviews should be produced of national, regional and international programmes that contributed to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action;	Some are being prepared, but much more is needed. Details on the substantial progress achieved during the last year are provided in two documents for this meeting prepared by the GPA Coordination Office: UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.1 and UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.2. Most recently, the Northeast Pacific countries are working on a regional diagnostic study with a view to subsequently preparing a regional programme of work. The GPA Coordination Office will provide more complete information at the Third Global Meeting.
(b) Preparations should be made for the Netherlands water conference.	This was done with the support of the GPA Coordination Office and UNEP's Divisions of Policy Development and Law (DEPDL) and Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE). See also UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.2, paragraph II.3.4. and UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.1, section V.
(b) **UNEP/Global Programme of Action strategic action plan to address sewage as a major land-based pollutant**	
45. The meeting recommended that:	
(a) The Global Programme of Action should be a standing item on future global meetings of the regional seas conventions and action plans, with a particular focus on the status of, and barriers to, its implementation;	This has been included as an agenda item of the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans.
(b) In view, in particular, of its extensive transboundary effects and the global extent of the problem, the issue of sewage must be considered relevant to all regions and their conventions and action plans;	The GPA Coordination Office has developed a strategic action plan of sewage in cooperation with the World Health Organization (WHO), Habitat and the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC). Further details are provided in UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.2, section II.5.
(c) At the next global meeting of the regional seas conventions and action plans, when considering land-based activities, attention must also be given to the issue of sewage and, in that context, the participation at that meeting of the World Health Organisation (WHO), the World Bank and other interested international organisations should be encouraged;	See above comment.
(d) The Global Programme of Action clearing-house mechanism should play an important role in the dissemination of information on the issue of sewage and in the related capacity-building process;	This is being done. For further details see UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.1, section IV.
(e) At the same time, the Global Programme of Action could not address the problem of sewage at the local level, but should instead develop a framework which national authorities could apply to their own situations, giving particular attention, in that context, to financial, technological and managerial aspects and to the transfer of knowledge and experiences;	The GPA Coordination Office is implementing this recommendation and will report on this at the Third Global Meeting.
(f) Efforts must be made to assess the effects and impacts of sewage discharge, prior to taking action, and to differentiate between pollution control and habitat protection;	Under the leadership of UNEP, the GESAMP Working Group on Marine

	Environmental Assessments has prepared a study on land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment. This study was approved at the 30th session of GESAMP (Monaco, 22-26 May 2000). New regional assessments have been prepared for the East Asian Seas and the South Pacific. A regional diagnostic study of land-based sources of pollution is being undertaken in the Northeast Pacific.
(g) Consideration should be given to the provision of assistance to countries under financial constraints, for the auditing of their current environmental situations, through capacity-building measures and the use of environmental impact assessments.	The GPA Coordination Office and the Division of Environmental Conventions are working with the UNEP/GEF Office in developing GEF PDF B and Medium Size Projects proposals for the consideration of the GEF. Further details are provided in UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.2, paragraphs 6, 7, 9, 14, as well as in UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.1.0, paragraphs 1, fourth (b), 2(c), 2(d). The latter makes reference to several other GEF-funded projects for regional seas in areas other than LBSs.
(h) Attention should be given to the introduction of environmentally sound technologies for the management of freshwater resources and for environmental management in urban areas.	The GPA Coordination Office is collaborating with DTIE on this matter.
(c) **Implementation of the Global Programme of Action clearing-house and the role of the regional seas conventions and action plans**	
51. The meeting recommended that:	
(a) In developing any database, use should be made of already available data;	To this end, the GPA Coordination Office is working closely with the relevant UNEP divisions, particularly DEIAEW, DEC (Regional Seas Programmes) and the GRID Centres. In addition, regional nodes are being developed in partnership with Regional Seas Programmes.
(b) Efforts should be made to ensure compatibility and strong linkages with other clearing-house initiatives, including that of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UNEP clearing-house on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and the UNEP Global Resource Information Database (GRID);	The GPA Coordination Office is Working on this and will provide additional information at the Third Global Meeting. Of particular importance is the work carried out with the UN Atlas of the Oceans project.
(c) The quality, reliability and exchangeability of the data were of paramount importance, and not their overall quantity, and user needs should be borne in mind in developing the clearing-house mechanism;	The GPA Clearinghouse Mechanism is following up on this.
(d) The clearing-house should strike a balance between technical, scientific and financial information and work with what was readily available.	The GPA Clearinghouse Mechanism is following up on this.
(e) Bearing in mind the definition of the clearing-house contained in the report of the technical meeting on the Global Programme of Action clearing-house, held in Geneva on 26 and 27 September 1996, particular attention should be given to establishing an appropriate institutional process for developing, organising and maintaining the directory and the delivery mechanisms.	The GPA Clearinghouse Mechanism is following up on this. For further details see also UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.4.2, section IV.1.

66. **C. JAKARTA MANDATE OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY ON THE CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**	
76. The meeting agreed that:	
(a) With regard to cooperation with the Convention, this should be substantive in nature, comprising three levels: the identification of priorities for action at the regional level; the use of regional networks; and the development of joint implementation strategies and identification of joint activities;	Adopted on 26 May 2000, decision V/3 (paragraph 18) of the Fifth Conference to the Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on the programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity requests the Executive Secretary of the convention to coordinate with the secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans with a view to exploring the possibility of further collaboration, including the development of joint work programmes, in the implementation of the Jakarta Mandate on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity. The decision goes on to focus on the three levels proposed by the Second Global Meeting.
(b) A two-way mechanism for cooperation between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity should be developed and UNEP should be invited, in close consultation with the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, to formulate options for such a coordination mechanism, to be sent to all participants for their reaction;	Follow-up to CBD decision V/3 will be one of the major items of the Third Global Meeting. Moreover, a memorandum of cooperation among CBD, the GPA and the Regional Seas Programmes on coastal habitat destruction will also be considered at the Third Global Meeting.
(c) There was a good opportunity for collaboration between the clearing-house of the Global Programme of Action and that of the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly in the areas of habitat degradation and habitat protection and of coastal zone management.	This will be further developed at the Consultative Meeting on 11 November that will consider the above-mentioned MOU.
77. **D. CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA**	
81. The meeting recommended that collaboration should be strengthened between the regional seas conventions and action plans, on the one hand, and CITES, on the other, particularly in respect of those conventions and action plans which had specially protected areas and wildlife protocols, and that UNEP and CITES would collaborate on the preparation of a proposal to that effect.	To this end, the Secretary General of CITES presented two papers that included elements calling for greater collaboration between the Regional Seas Programmes and CITES for the consideration of the Eleventh COP of CITES (Nairobi, 10-20 April 2000): the "Strategic Plan for the Convention" and "Co-operation and Synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity and Other Biodiversity-related Conventions". Both reports were endorsed by the CITES COP. Follow-up will be considered at the Third Global Meeting.
82. **E. INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF INITIATIVE**	
89. The meeting agreed on the following recommendation regarding ICRI:	
(a) The regional seas programmes and action plans welcomed the decision by the UNEP Governing Council to renew its support for ICRI. It also welcomed the request by GEF for UNEP, as an implementing agency of GEF, to take the lead on coral reefs;	DEC through its Regional Seas Programmes and DEIAEW have actively participated in the Coordinating and Planning Committee (CPC) of ICRI.

(b) The regional seas programmes and action plans requested UNEP to strengthen their capacity in the monitoring of the status of coral reefs and to ascribe the utmost importance to capacity-building and training activities;	UNEP in partnership with the International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management (ICLARM), and with $1.5 million in funding from the United Nations Foundation, is implementing Phase 1 of the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) project. Pilot activities are being carried out in three regional seas programmes: (i) East Asian Seas: analysis of reefs at risk; (ii) East African Seas: analysis of successful approaches and current management practices of marine protected areas and integrated coastal management with the aim of producing management guidelines; and (iii) Wider Caribbean: establishment of a regional system of demonstration and training sites on coral reefs focusing on integrated coastal management and marine protected areas. An ICRAN Phase II project will be launched with US$10 million support from the UN Foundation. UNEP activities under the ICRAN project for enhanced management of coral reefs will be implemented through the framework of the regional seas programmes. This will be dealt with in greater detail under agenda item 7 of the Third Global Meeting. In addition, in Collaboration with WCMC of DEIAEW, DEC provided support in 2000 for the development of a World Atlas of Coral Reefs, with special emphasis on the East Asian, East African, Wider Caribbean and Southeast Pacific regional seas programmes.
(c) The relevant regional seas programmes and action plans were actively working with ICRI and called for strengthened cooperation between and among the regional seas and action plans, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change in the areas of coral reefs, climate change and coral bleaching. In addition, attention was drawn to the importance of enforcing environmental law development for the protection of coral reefs, in particular, with the assistance of local communities and local authorities;	Follow-up will be done at the Third Global Meeting, largely within the framework of the decisions of the COPs of CBD and CITES to strengthen collaboration with the Regional Seas Programmes. The consideration of further collaboration with the UNFCCC has been programmed for COP 7, which should take place at the end of 2001.
(d) The regional seas programmes and action plans recommended that those issues should be presented at UNEP ministerial conferences, to gather political will and support for the enforcement of the protection of coral reefs.	More work needs to be done in this area through UNEP's Division of Regional Cooperation and Representation (DRCR), which is responsible for organizing UNEP's regional ministerial meetings.
90. F. BUENOS AIRES PROGRAMME OF ACTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND ITS RELATION TO THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS	
107. The meeting recommended that the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change should consider the regional seas conventions and action plans as an effective regional mechanism for the implementation of the activities set forth below and that, to that end, UNEP would follow up with the secretariat of the Framework Convention:	In follow-up, DEC has discussed this with the UNFCCC Secretariat. Given the heavy workload of the UNFCCC Secretariat in 2000 and the critical nature of the upcoming Sixth COP of the UNFCCC, which will be focussing on the operationalization of the Kyoto Protocol, the UNFCCC Secretariat requested that the consideration of this matter be deferred to the Seventh COP in 2001.

(a) In the area of vulnerability and adaptation, the regional seas conventions and action plans could offer the Framework Convention on Climate Change an existing and effective regional mechanism for assessing vulnerabilities, exploring adaptation options, implementing adaptation strategies, and incorporating climate change considerations into national and regional planning;	See above comment.
(b) In the area of awareness-raising, given that the expected impacts of climate change were extremely negative for the billions of people living in coastal areas and that their compelling and relatively specific nature offered good opportunities for public awareness-raising at the regional level, the regional seas conventions and action plans could cooperate with the secretariat of the Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNEP and other relevant United Nations, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations in launching local and regional awareness campaigns;	See above comment.
(c) In the area of capacity-building, many climate-related impacts would require response options that could also address issues such as sustainable coastal development and the protection of mangrove and other ecosystems. Capacity-building for the Framework Convention on Climate Change should be coordinated with capacity-building offered by institutions dealing with those other issues;	See above comment.
(d) In the area of joint implementation, projects for strengthening adaptation to expected climate change impacts in coastal areas could be implemented through the regional seas conventions, action plans and secretariats.	See above comment.
108. **G. BARBADOS PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES**	
114. The meeting endorsed the measures proposed by the representative of AOSIS in his paper as priority actions in support of the Barbados Programme of Action and recommended:	
(a) That the extensive involvement of UNEP in the 14 priority areas of the Barbados Programme of Action should be demonstrated to the Commission on Sustainable Development and that input should be prepared for the Special Session of the General Assembly for an assessment and appraisal of the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, on 27 and 28 September 1999, showing specific results already achieved, including from the UNEP Technology, Industry and Economics Division, and transmitting the outcome of the preparatory meeting of CAR/RCU, ECLAC AND ROLAC;	All of this was accomplished. Several papers on this subject were presented to CSD 7.
(b) That UNEP, in consultation with the regional seas conventions and action plans, should prepare a paper for presentation to the General Assembly at its Special Session, on activities in support of the work of the Barbados Programme of Action.	As indicated above, UNEP provided a number of papers to CSD 7 on small island developing states. These were used to prepare the CSD papers on the subject that were submitted to the Special Session.
115. **H. UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA**	
131. The meeting welcomed the offer of the secretariat of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to provide its legal expertise to regional seas conventions and action plans and its assistance in the further development of their legal	UNEP followed up by inviting the UNCLOS Secretariat to the First Session of High-level, Government-designated Experts of the Proposed Northeast Pacific Regional Seas Programme. The INCLOS Secretariat will also be invited to the

instruments and recommended:	Second Session that will focus on finalizing the negotiations of a legally binding instrument for the protection and sustainable development of the marine and coastal environment of the Northeast Pacific.
(a) That the regional seas conventions and action plans, the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea and other competent organisations and interested secretariats should consult with one another periodically, with a view to ensuring a uniform and consistent approach regarding specific issues of common concern, including trade, marine protected areas, land-based sources of pollution and others, and, to that end, should hold regular meetings, on an annual or biennial basis, of technical and legal experts;	This has not been done, but UNEP will follow-up with United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea.
(b) That those informal consultations should be complementary to the work of the Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas (SOCA) of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC);	Once the consultative meetings are set up, the reports of these consultations will be presented to the ACC/SOCA by the UNEP representative in that subcommittee.
(c) That the regional seas conventions and action plans would continue, through UNEP, to contribute information on their yearly activities to the annual report of the Convention on the Law of the Sea to the General Assembly.	This has been done.
SECTION III: ADDRESSING MORE EFFECTIVELY THE ISSUE OF THE SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES	
132. **A. INTEGRATING ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE FISHERIES SECTOR**	
134. The meeting recommended:	
(a) That UNEP and FAO should develop a more consolidated approach to integrating fisheries and environmental considerations and should define the role and responsibilities of both UNEP and FAO in the following areas of common concern: protected areas; bycatches; marine and coastal habitat protection; marine mammals; protected species; integrated coastal and marine management, including fish resources conservation; and the effects of fisheries on biological diversity;	Largely as a result of the United Nations Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and Law of the Sea, as well as the meetings of the ACC/SOCA, UNEP and FAO have had fruitful discussions on potential areas of collaboration. ACC/SOCA can serve as a valuable interagency mechanism for promoting collaboration between the two organizations and other SOCA members in areas of common concern such as the UN Atlas of the Oceans project.
(b) That UNEP should prepare a draft paper on those subjects and should ask the secretariats of the regional seas conventions and action plans for their suggestions, following which UNEP would meet with FAO and use that paper as a building block in their consultation.	As an outcome of the discussions at the Ninth Session of the ACC/SOCA (London, 26-28 July 2000), UNEP and FAO agreed to prepare a joint paper on the "Ecosystem-based Management of Fisheries: Opportunities and Challenges for Coordination between Marine Regional Fishery Bodies and Regional Seas Conventions" –UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.7.1, which will be discussed under agenda item 7 of the Third Global Meeting.
135. **B. REVITALIZING THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE CONSERVATION, MANAGEMENT AND UTILIZATION OF MARINE MAMMALS**	
143. The meeting recommended:	
(a) That UNEP should reaffirm the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals as a priority in its and the regional seas conventions and action plans;	To this end, UNEP has been analyzing the need to re-tool the Marine Mammal Action Plan, hopefully through a partnership involving the regional seas conventions and action plans, CMS, CITES and CBD, as well as FAO, IOC/UNESCO and other partner organizations. This will be the focus of the

	discussion of the marine mammals workshop at the Third Global Meeting.
(b) That sufficient human and financial resources should urgently be assigned for UNEP to continue its function, at UNEP headquarters, as secretariat to the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals;	With the improved staffing situation in DEC, UNEP is giving the MMAP the attention that it merits.
(c) That a task force should be established within UNEP to oversee technical aspects of the development of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals, in cooperation with the regional seas conventions and action plans;	DEC and DEIAEW are cooperating in UNEP in supporting the MMAP. It is expected that the marine mammals workshop will have as one of its major outcomes a re-tooled MMAP and MMAP task force.
(d) That UNEP should re-engage key partners and explore modalities for the involvement of other partners such as the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), the Convention on Biological Diversity and the regional seas conventions and action plans for the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals and, in that context, that it should request the secretariat of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals to undertake, as soon as possible, active consultations with such partners;	See above comments.
(e) That UNEP should recognise the urgent need to support the development of regional marine mammal programmes in those regional conventions and action plans which have not developed such programmes and should promote interregional cooperation and exchange of experience on implementation of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals;	In its considerations, the marine mammal workshop will have before it the regional marine mammal programmes prepared by the secretariats for the Wider Caribbean (UNEP(DEC)/RS 3/INF/4), the Baltic Sea (UNEP(DEC)/RS 3/INF/6), East Asian Seas (UNEP(DEC)/RS 3/INF/7), the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (UNEP(DEC)/RS 3/INF/8), the South-East Pacific (UNEP(DEC)/RS 3/INF/9) and the Mediterranean (UNEP(DEC)/RS 3/INF/10)
(f) That UNEP, as secretariat of the Global Plan of Action for Marine Mammals, should further explore such subjects as interactions between marine mammals and fisheries; the application of well managed and responsible sustainable uses of marine mammals, such as ecotourism, including whale and dolphin watching and, similar activities; and other emerging issues.	Under the Marine Mammal Action Plan, a protocol has been prepared on culling of marine mammals for conserving fisheries. This will be made available at the marine mammals workshop.
SECTION IV: STRENGTHENING HORIZONTAL COOPERATION AND TIES AMONG REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS	
144. **A. COOPERATION BETWEEN AND AMONG THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS** AND OTHER INTERESTED ORGANIZATIONS	
148. The meeting recommended:	
(a) That horizontal cooperation among the regional seas conventions and action plans and other relevant organisations should be of a flexible nature and should be channelled through UNEP;	This is being done. One concrete outcome has been the signing at Malmö on 30 May 2000 of the Twinning Arrangement between the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission and the Untied Nations Environment Programme as the Secretariat of the Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention) (see UNEP(DEC)/RS 3.3.11).
(b) That UNEP should continue to facilitate such cooperation, where necessary, with the provision of financial assistance;	UNEP/DEC has done this in regard to the above Twinning Arrangement by facilitating the participation of Nairobi Convention representatives in meetings of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission. It has also

	facilitated the provision of technical advice from the Cartagena Convention to the Northeast Pacific, from the Cartagena Convention to NOWPAP and from the Barcelona Convention to the Abidjan Convention.
(c) That the UNEP regional offices should be involved in the regional preparatory process for the various conferences of parties;	This actually relates principally to the global environmental conventions that attended the Second Global Meeting. UNEP regional offices have actively supported regional preparatory meetings for CBD, UNFCCC and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and Asia.
(d) That UNEP should reinvigorate its role in the Barbados Programme of Action for Small Island Developing States;	This is largely being done through the regional seas programmes and with the collaboration of the Division of Policy Implementation (DPI), particularly its GPA Coordination Office. DPI in Nairobi is working on the development of environmental vulnerability indices (EVI) applicable to SIDS.
(e) That secretariats of regional seas conventions and action plans whose respective seas areas were contiguous, in particular, MAP, PERSGA and ROPME; EAS and SACEP; OSPAR and WACAF; and WACAF and MAP, should coordinate their activities relating to issues of common concern;	UNEP (DEC and DPDL) has operationalized the Joint Umbrella Mechanism for the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions which is promoting closer collaboration between these two conventions. With the anticipated accession of South Africa to both MEAs in the not too distant future, they will be contiguous. Two Joint Meetings of the Bureaux of the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions have been held to explore potential synergies (Mauritius, 2-3 November 1999 and Accra, Ghana, 2 March 2000). The Wider Caribbean Region and the Northeast Pacific have initiated exchanges on coordination in areas of common concern such as land-based sources of pollution. Further dialogue will take place. However, this is an area that will receive more attention from DEC. For example, for the 2002-2003 biennium UNEP would like to organize a meeting of the five regional seas conventions and action plans of the Pacific Basin to discuss coordination in areas of common concern, hopefully with the support of the Asia Pacific Economic Council (APEC).
(f) That efforts should be made to enhance the exchange of information in such areas as experience in dealing with international organisations, non-governmental organisations and donors and in the preparation of project proposals.	DEC is planning an activity in this area for 2001.
149. **B. PUBLIC INFORMATION AND OUTREACH**	
153. The meeting welcomed the undertaking by UNEP to help strengthen the public profile of the regional seas action plans by the following measures, to be completed in 1999:	
(a) Developing and publishing a general brochure, in the official United Nations languages, explaining the overall regional seas regime, including causes, impacts, and	A monograph entitled Regional *Seas: A Survival Strategy for Our Oceans and*

policy responses;	*Coasts* was published in October 2000.
(b) Providing technical and editorial assistance to regional seas secretariats to create or to strengthen their individual web sites;	This is being done through DEC/IUC. For the NOWPAP website, the GRID Bangkok Office will collaborate with IUC.
(c) Establishing a regional seas home page with links to the individual secretariat sites, a brief explanation of the regional seas regime, and links to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, other relevant sites, the brochure and other general information;	The regional seas website (www.unep.ch/seas/) was launched in April 2000. It provides information on the implementation of the world's seventeen regional seas conventions and action plans, and provides direct links to the specific websites set up under the respective regional seas programmes. The website highlights the work undertaken by UNEP and partner agencies such as IOC/UNESCO, IMO, FAO and IAEA in supporting these regional agreements. The environmental conventions website (www.unep.ch/conventions/) was launched in July 2000. It provides information on all major global environmental conventions, as well as information and links to the regional seas conventions and action plans. Latest press releases and public information documents are found here.
154. Furthermore, the meeting recommended:	
(a) That UNEP, the regional seas conventions and action plans and other interested organisations should prepare brief inputs on, and links to, their own organisations for insertion in one another's web sites;	This is being done largely with the support of IUC.
(b) That the work on web sites would be carried out in cooperation between UNEP and the Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action; and	IUC and the GPA Coordination Office met to discuss this and together are following up. The two websites are linked (GPA and Regional Seas).
(c) That consideration would be given to developing additional communications tools, such as a newsletter on the lines of the earlier Siren, for the year 2000, in consultation with the secretariats.	While this has not been done, in 1999 UNEP launched a new publication entitled *Synergies* as a tool for disseminating information on collaboration among conventions, as well as for highlighting the work undertaken by the organization in supporting MEAs. It has also become a platform for the directors of secretariats to present their views on various issues being addressed by their respective conventions. Published in English, French and Spanish, *Synergies* can be accessed through the new UNEP website on environmental conventions: www.unep.ch/conventions/. All issues have contained articles on Regional Seas Programmes.
(d) That regional seas conventions and action plans should include in their web sites cross-links to other conventions and action plans and to relevant parts of the UNEP web site.	This needs to be checked and verified.
SECTION V: UNEP SUPPORT TO STRENGTHENING THE REGIONAL SEAS CONVENTIONS AND ACTION PLANS	
157. The meeting welcomed the revitalisation of the relationship between UNEP and the regional seas conventions and action plans and recommended that UNEP support to strengthening the regional seas conventions and action plans should be based on the	As a follow-up to the Second Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans (The Hague, 5-8 July 1999), strategic programmatic support

recommendations of the current meeting.	was provided or has been programmed by the Division of Environmental Conventions to the workplans of several regional seas conventions and action plans, particularly in areas such as the GPA, ICRI and integrated coastal area management (ICAM), among others, that interface with the priorities of UNEP's programme of work: the Abidjan Convention (West and Central African Region), the Nairobi Convention (East Africa), the Barcelona Convention (the Mediterranean), the Jeddah Convention (Red Sea and Gulf of Aden), the South Asian Cooperative Environment Programme, the East Asian Seas Action Plan, the Northwest Pacific Action Plan, the Lima Convention (Southeast Pacific) and the Cartagena Convention (Wider Caribbean). To this end, DEC worked closely with DEPDL, DEAEW and DPI. Details of this programmatic support are provided in document UNEP (DEC) /RS.2/10.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/IGM/2/INF/3
10 July 2001

ENGLISH ONLY

OPEN-ENDED INTERGOVERNMENTAL
GROUP OF MINISTERS OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES
ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE
Second meeting
Bonn, Germany, 17 July 2001

International Environmental Governance:

Multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)*

* This document has been produced without formal editing.

K0135377 110701

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Table of Contents

			Paragraphs
Executive Summary			26 paragraphs
Introduction			1 - 9
	A.	A Definition for International Environmental Governance	10 - 13
I.	Status of Multilateral Environmental Agreements		
	A.	Development of MEAs	14 - 19
	B.	Scope of the Core Environmental Conventions and Related International Agreements	20 - 28
	C.	The Legal Framework of the Core MEAs	29 - 33
	D.	The Governance Structure: the Policy-setting Layer	34
		• Decision-making Bodies	35 - 37
		• Subsidiary Bodies	38 - 43
	E.	The Institutional Structure	
		• Functions and Operations of MEA Secretariats	44 - 49
		• Monitoring and Evaluation of the Implementation of MEAs	50 - 52
		• Clearinghouse Mechanisms	53
		• Regional Centres	54
		• UNEP-administered Secretariats of MEAs	55 - 57
	F.	The Management Layer	
		• Corporate or Business Plans	58 - 63
		• Partnerships with International Organizations	64 - 71
		• Cooperative Agreements between MEAs	72 - 78
	G.	Participation of Civil Society in the Implementation of MEAs	79 - 93
	H.	Other Global Conventions Relevant to the Environment, Including Regional Conventions of Global Significance	94 - 101
II.	Review of Strengths and Weaknesses		102
	A.	Strengths	103 - 111
	B.	Weaknesses	112 - 123
	C.	The Role of UNEP in Preparing a Consolidated Overview of the Effectiveness of Implementation of MEAs	124 - 126
III.	Financing International Environmental Governance: the Situation of MEAs		127
	A.	Sources of Funding for MEAs	128 - 141
	B.	Administration of MEA Funds	142 - 144
	C.	Funding MEA Secretariats, Programmes and Activities	145 - 147
IV.	Issues and Options		149 - 150
	A.	Clustering of MEAs	151 - 155
	B.	Scientific and Technical Cooperation	156 - 157
	C.	Coordination of MEAs at the National Level	158 - 159
	D.	Co-location of MEA Secretariats	160
	E.	Towards a Systematic Approach for Promoting Collaboration Coordination among MEAs	161 - 167
Annexes		Available on website: http://www1.unep.org/meas/governancemeeting3teleconference28june2001.htm	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

1. This report on the status of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) (hereafter referred to as the MEAs Report) has been prepared as an input to the UNEP Executive Director's Report on International Environmental Governance (IEG) in pursuance of UNEP Governing Council decision 21/21. The paper is meant to be descriptive and not prescriptive concerning international environmental governance as it relates to MEAs. In chapter IV we have taken the opportunity to summarize proposals presented by MEA secretariats concerning challenges and problems facing environmental conventions and related international agreements. These are presented in the form of issues and options.

2. The 9th Meeting on Coordination of Secretariats of Environmental Conventions, convened by the Executive Director of UNEP in Nairobi from 11 to 12 February 2001, agreed on a process for involving MEAs in the follow-up to UNEP Governing Council decision 21/21, including a meeting of MEAs immediately following the first meeting of the Intergovernmental Group of Ministers that would review this paper in New York on 18 April 2001.

3. The first draft of this MEAs Report was based on information submitted by twenty MEA Secretariats in the form of responses to a questionnaire which was agreed upon at the 9th Meeting on Coordination of Secretariats of Environmental Conventions. This meeting was attended by representatives of the secretariats of the following 13 global MEAs and 3 regional seas conventions and action plans: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), the World Heritage Convention, the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Principle for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the future Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA), the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution, the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region and the South Asian Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP). In addition to these 16 Secretariats, four other independent regional agreements developed under CMS, namely, the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA), the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS), the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, the Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS) and the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS), provided responses to the questionnaire. Subsequently, comments were requested from the twenty MEA secretariats on chapters I-IV of this report. Fifteen provided their views on chapters I-IV plus additional information not contained in their responses to the questionnaire.

4. As indicated in paragraph 2, the Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG was held on 18 April 2001 on the margins of the 9th Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development to take advantage of the presence of MEAs attending the CSD. The meeting was attended by representatives of the secretariats of the UNFCCC, CBD, the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol, the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, CITES, the Basel Convention, the Barcelona Convention and the Cartagena Convention. It was agreed to modify UNEP/IGM/1/INF3 to include (a) the final comments received on the first draft, (b) the integration of an IEG definition, (c) a further elaboration of the three types of clustering (sectoral, functional and regional), and (d) the further development of chapter 4 to include an analysis of what has worked well for conventions. Most of these revisions are contained in chapter 4 of this paper. The inclusion of success

stories (d) has not been completed. A Third Consultative Meeting of MEAs was convened through a teleconference on 4 July, 2001 and some of the comments received from MEA secretariats are also reflected in this report. Representatives of the secretariats of the following MEAs: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Ozone), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Convention on Wetlands), Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs Convention), Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA), Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS), Agreement on the Conservation of the Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS) and Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS), Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention), Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) participated fully or in part in the teleconference.

5. The Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs agreed that the structure of IEG is comprised of 4 layers. The top layer is the focus of much of the discussion on governance, which is the international decision-making process. When looking to improve IEG, we are looking at the improvement of coordination of the decision making process, so there is no contradiction between what MEAs are trying to achieve. The second layer is the international institutional architecture. When policy decisions are taken, they must be implemented through an institutional structure. Actual implementation at the international level is the third layer: management or operationalization of the policies and decisions. Finally, there is a fourth layer: the coordination of the implementation of international environmental governance decisions at the national level. The Third Consultative Meeting of MEAs suggested that improvements at the decision-making level should come through better coordination at the national level since the decision making forums consist of governments, and therefore there is a need for more emphasis on national coordination. Regional mechanisms are also important in supporting implementation of global agreements.

I. Status of Multilateral Environmental Agreements

6. Today there are over 500 international treaties and other agreements related to the environment, of which over 320 are regional. Nearly 60 percent date from 1972, the year of the Stockholm Conference, to the present. Since 1972, there has been an accelerated increase in MEAs; over 300 agreements were negotiated.

7. In this report, MEAs are divided into three categories: (a) core environmental conventions and related agreements of global significance whose negotiation, development and/or activities have been associated with UNEP's work, which is further reflected in a number of Governing Council decisions dating back to the establishment of UNEP; (b) global conventions relevant to the environment, including regional conventions of global significance that were negotiated independently of UNEP and (c) others, largely restricted by scope and geographic range. The first category of MEAs is the focus of the MEAs Report; these are listed in Table 1.

8. The core environmental conventions and related international agreements are basically divided into five clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions, the atmosphere conventions, the land conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, and the regional seas conventions and related agreements. The objectives and priorities of MEAs vary significantly from one agreement to another, even within a cluster. The common aspects include the sustainable development focus of the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC), the sustainable use of natural resources and the environment.

or the protection of the environment in such a way as to ensure its sustainable use. None of the core environmental agreements are exclusively oriented to protection and conservation.

9. Given the different stages of implementation of the core MEAs, the variation in priorities is quite broad. There are crosscutting priorities for many that are primarily of a functional nature, such as strengthening of the capacities of Parties or member states to meet their obligations or responsibilities under these agreements, enhancing membership of governments, public education and awareness, strengthened scientific basis for decision-making, and strengthened international partnerships. One of the most important thematic crosscutting issues is the assessment and management of pollution, which cuts across the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, some biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions and related agreements.

10. Of the 41 MEAs listed in Table 1, all but 6 are legally binding instruments. Sixteen are framework conventions such as UNFCCC, CBD, the Basel Convention and the Barcelona Convention that can develop protocols for addressing specific subjects requiring more detailed and specialized negotiations. Eight are self-contained conventions that work through annexes or appendices, rather than protocols, which are revised periodically through the decisions of the Conferences of the Contracting Parties (COPs) of the respective MEAs. These include CITES, the World Heritage Convention, the Lusaka Agreement, UNCCD, the Rotterdam Convention, the Stockholm Convention, the Helsinki Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR). CMS is the only MEA that operates like an umbrella convention. It has fostered 5 independent regional treaties—the Agreement on the Conservation of Seals in the Wadden Sea, EUROBATS, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS and AEWA, all of which continue to work closely with CMS. Although the agreements concluded under the auspices of CMS are self-standing international legal instruments, they are also the primary means of implementing the goals of the parent convention. CMS has also developed 3 Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and 1 Action Plan with Party-Range States that operate as "soft law" instruments for the conservation and management of selected migratory species.

11. The regional seas conventions and action plans have the distinction of being closely, and in some cases systematically, linked to global conventions and agreements, and are proving to be useful regional instruments in supporting their implementation.

12. The 6 MEAs that are not legally binding are all oceans-related agreements, of which two are global in nature—the GPA and ICRI—and 4 are regional seas programmes—South Asian Seas Programme (SAS), the North-West Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP), the East Asian Seas Action Plan (EAS) and the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME), which receives its mandate from a non-legally binding declaration, adopted in 1996 by the 8 Arctic States. The three other regional seas programmes operate with action plans that were adopted in intergovernmental meetings by the respective member states.

13. MEAs adopted after 1972 generally have the following institutional elements: a Conference of the Parties (COP), a secretariat, advisory bodies, a clearing-house mechanism and a financial mechanism. The Conference of the Parties (COP) of each convention or the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) of a protocol to a convention are the ultimate decision-making bodies regarding the overall implementation and development of their respective MEA, including the programme of work, budget and the revision of annexes, where applicable. An important function of the COP is the adoption of protocols and annexes. The bureaus of the COPs and MOPs of several conventions (Vienna Convention, CBD, UNCCD) and protocols (Montreal Protocol) meet intersessionally to discuss matters within their bureau mandates. Most non-binding agreements (SAS, NOWPAP and EAS) also have intergovernmental bodies for decision making. Most MEAs have established or are associated with subsidiary bodies and assessment bodies that are generally advisory in nature and present their recommendations to the COP or MOP of the respective agreement. Several MEAs have clearing-houses, generally operated by the secretariats, to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation or facilitate the exchange of scientific, technical, environmental and

legal information and assist developing country Parties in the implementation of the MEA concerned. A few conventions (Basel Convention) have established or are in the process of establishing regional centres. The purposes of these centres range from training and technology transfer, to the provision of assistance in the implementation of the MEA. Corporate or Business Plans and strategic plans that form the basis for MEA implementation and governance are periodically adopted under most MEAs. Practically all of the newer MEAs that have not entered into force or have only recently entered into force are yet without corporate or business plans.

14. While the scope and mandate of MEA secretariats can vary, from a functional point of view they can be divided into two categories: (a) secretariats that prepare and service the meetings of the COPS and their subsidiary bodies and coordinate with other international organizations (UNFCCC, the Montreal Protocol, CBD, the Ramsar Convention, CMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention); and (b) secretariats that, while carrying out the functions of the first category, are also involved in implementing programmes or projects at the regional and country levels (WHC, CITES, the Basel Convention, the UNCCD, the GPA and regional seas conventions and action plans). An important function of most secretariats is the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of their MEA, proposing formats for national reports, receiving and analyzing reports submitted, and providing the COP or MOP with syntheses of the information contained in national reports.

15. All MEAs and their secretariats work to different degrees with other international organizations that support the implementation of their convention or protocol. Some have formal arrangements with defined roles for organizations that act as advisory bodies on specific issues and in providing training. Most MEAs have voluntary cooperative arrangements with international organizations, NGOs and bilateral donor agencies, or collaboration arrangements called for by COPs on specific issues.

16. The last two years has seen a marked rise in cooperation through both formal and informal arrangements between conventions, signaling a period of increasing political will for MEAs to collaborate more closely in the implementation of the programmes of work of their respective agreements. However, this has been concentrated principally in two clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions and action plans.

17. In most conventions, NGOs, private industry, civic groups, local communities and indigenous groups are invited and allowed to participate in the deliberations of the Parties. However, in some cases this does not necessarily apply to meetings that are not open-ended such as those of technical expert groups and liaison groups. Some secretariats maintain regular contacts with civil society organizations for exchange of information and views, receipt of documentation and preparation of background papers. Some also work with civil society groups and private industry in the implementation of activities. Conventions recognize the involvement of all relevant stakeholders as fundamental. Examples of roles being played by the major groups of the civil society in the implementation of MEAs include: (a) providing technical knowledge; (b) awareness raising; (c) assisting the secretariát in communicating with non-parties; (d) promoting implementation in the field; (e) gathering and transmitting information about possible non-compliance; (e) implementation of relevant national policies; (f) pressuring governments to implement the MEAs; and (g) participating in the decision making process.

II. Review of Strengths and Weaknesses of Existing Arrangements

18. In the responses to the questionnaire, MEA secretariats identified a number of strengths and weaknesses such as the following.

Strengths:

- Growing commitment by MEAs to explore opportunities for synergies, particularly within clusters where MEAs have much in common in terms of issues to be addressed, as well as across clusters on issues that are cross-cutting in nature such as trade, capacity building and the development of national legislation that supports the implementation of conventions and protocols at the country level.
- Increasing opportunities for cooperation among the scientific bodies of MEAs.
- The increase in arrangements for cooperation among conventions to work together in a more integrated manner, leading to the development of joint programmes of work in areas of common interest.

Weaknesses:

- Reluctance of some MEAs to cooperate with others.
- Inadequate attention to the harmonization of national reporting among MEAs although actions have started under UNEP with an initiative for the streamlining of national reporting focusing on the global biodiversity-related conventions.
- Inadequate implementation and coordination of MEAs at the national level
- Inadequate Compliance and Enforcement
- Lack of environmental and performance indicators for measuring the effectiveness of an MEA.
- Inadequate funding for selected MEAs:

19. Specific issues that are not being addressed effectively by MEAs include:

- Control of new ozone-depleting substances
- Impact of climate change on migratory waterbirds
- Commercial fishing from an environmental perspective
- The impact of high seas fisheries on marine species such as mammals and birdlife
- Lack of sites on the World Heritage list nominated for their marine values
- Coastal zone management and information
- Impact of population, poverty and urbanization on coastal resources
- Forests
- Tropical timber trade
- Freshwater resources
- River ecosystems
- The role of poverty and corruption in relation to environmental management practices
- The failure to identify and make available alternatives to bad environmental practices
- The failure to quantify and publicize the economic benefits from good environmental practices
- Economic instruments and incentives
- Practical indicators for measuring performance of MEAs
- Compliance and enforcement

III. Financing International Environmental Governance: the Situation of MEAs

20. The operation of MEAs, including their Secretariat costs and funding for their programme of work, are financed through various means: (a) the use of traditional trust funds, one or more of which may be established by an MEA, some for specialised purposes; (b) other multilateral financing mechanisms intended to address specific subject areas (the Multilateral Fund for the Montreal Protocol (MLF), the Global Environment Fund (GEF), and the Kyoto Protocol climate-related mechanisms), the World Bank and regional development banks; (c) bilateral arrangements with donor countries; (d) foundations such as the UN Foundation; (e) private sector donors; and (f) NGOs.

21. Traditional trust funds are generally administered by the international organisations that provide the Secretariats. These organisations have the responsibility of effectively managing the resources of the MEAs, and may assist them in programming, budgeting, accounting and meeting all their financial reporting requirements. For UNEP-administered conventions, UNEP serves as the Trustee. Most MEAs have agreed financial rules adopted by the Parties, and financial rules and regulations are strictly applied to trust funds. Trustees are able to provide guidelines for the transactions and accounts of the conventions and agreements, including systems and facilities that allow MEAs to undertake their programmatic activities effectively. Budgets are proposed by the Secretariats and approved by the conferences or meetings of the Parties. Activities should be in line with the contributions to their trust funds. The accounts and finances of the MEAs and their Secretariats are audited and reported.

22. Further analysis on the funding of MEAs will be undertaken subject to the provision of additional information from secretariats and the completion of the information contained in Table 5.

IV. Issues and Options

23. In responding to the questionnaire, views were presented that lead to some general recommendations for improving international environmental governance. Most proposals for enhancing international environmental governance focused on coordination among MEAs on substantive grounds and not along restructuring at the institutional level.

- Several of the secretariats felt that that closer cooperation and opportunities for synergies should be promoted at the cluster level. Opportunities for cooperating and synergies on specific non-cluster thematic and functional issues also existed and should be further developed.
- Several secretariats feel that greater cooperation among conventions at the scientific and technical level was desirable.
- Some convention secretariats proposed that there needs to be a holistic approach to compliance and enforcement of MEAs.
- Some conventions proposed that much greater attention needs to be given to enhancing coordination among MEAs at the national level.
- The issue of co-location of secretariats was applicable principally to the global MEAs. Most that are not co-located do not feel that their geographic location has adversely affected their operations, and those that are co-located in Geneva and nearby Gland strongly felt that co-location contributes to closer collaboration, particularly with conventions in the same cluster.
- Recognizing the difficulties and obstacles for improving international environmental governance, one secretariat proposed that the best approach may be for incremental improvements based on an analysis of needs and global benefits, rather than on new mechanisms that may not be practical to operationalize in the short term.
- Some convention secretariats underlined the importance of UNEP in promoting, facilitating and nurturing thematic and programmatic cooperation among MEAs and between MEAs and UNEP, including the monitoring of the implementation of MEAs.

24. On the issue of clustering, the Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG agreed that clustering of MEAs for promoting collaboration and coordination should be carried out at the sectoral level, the functional level and the regional level. The first refers to the five sectoral clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions, the land conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, the atmosphere conventions and the regional seas conventions and related agreements. The second refers to the cluster of conventions that share common functions such as, for example, the trade-related MEAs, conventions with prior-informed consent procedures and conventions with customs procedures. The final cluster deals with cross-cutting issues such as capacity-building, enforcement and compliance,

development of supportive national legislation, harmonized reporting, assessments and information exchange, as well as common sectoral issues, that can be addressed more effectively at the regional level through cooperative efforts and joint programmes.

25. Some thought has to be given to the enhancement of collaboration with the conventions relevant to the environment that are listed in Table 4. Most of these conventions have secretariats provided by basically 5 organizations of the UN system: (a) IMO; (b) the UN General Secretariat; (c) FAO; (d) ILO; and (e) IAEA. Of the 41 core environmental conventions, protocols and related international agreements in Table 1, UNEP provides the secretariat for 22 and has working relationships with all the core environmental conventions, albeit to different degrees. The possibility of establishing an interagency mechanism for promoting and facilitating collaboration among MEAs and relevant international conventions, comprised of these six organizations, could be explored.

26. The Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG agreed to further explore options for improving international environmental governance through two papers to be prepared by UNEP for the consideration of the Third Consultative Meeting (teleconference, 4 July 2001): "A Policy Paper for Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion" and "Proposal for a Systematic Approach to Coordination of Multilateral Environmental Agreements".

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE

Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)

Introduction

1. The Malmö Ministerial Declaration, adopted on 31 May 2000 at the First Global Ministerial Environment Forum convened by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), calls for the 2002 review of the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) to "review the requirements for a greatly strengthened institutional structure for international environmental governance based on an assessment of the future needs for an institutional architecture that has the capacity to effectively address wide-ranging environmental threats in a globalizing world."

2. Subsequently, the Governing Council of UNEP at its 21st session, in operative paragraph 2 of decision 21/21 decided "to establish an open-ended Intergovernmental Group of ministers or their representatives, with the Executive Director as an ex-officio member, to undertake a comprehensive policy-oriented assessment of existing institutional weaknesses as well as future needs and options for strengthened international environmental governance, including the financing of UNEP, with a view to presenting a report containing analysis and options to the next meeting of the Global Ministerial Environmental Forum".

3. Operative paragraph 4 of this decision also "requests the Executive Director, in consultation with governments to review the state of international environmental governance and elaborate a report to be submitted to the Intergovernmental Group at its first meeting", which will take place in April 2001 in New York during the 9th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

4. The Governing Council through the same decision, in operative paragraph 6 further "decides that the next meeting of the Global Ministerial Environmental Forum should undertake in depth discussion of the report with a view to providing its input on future requirements of international environmental governance in the broader context of multilateral efforts for sustainable development to the 10th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development acting as the preparatory body for the World Summit on Sustainable Development at its meeting at the Ministerial level in May 2002 as a contribution to the WSSD".

5. The 9th Meeting of Coordination of Conventions convened by the Executive Director of UNEP in Nairobi from 11 to 12 February 2001, analyzed and agreed upon the information to be provided by the secretariats of environmental conventions and related agreements to UNEP for the preparation of the report referred to above in operative paragraph 4. The meeting was attended by representatives of the secretariats of the following 13 global MEAs and 3 regional seas conventions and action plans: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), the World Heritage Convention, the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Principle for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the future Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA), the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution, the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and

Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region and the South Asian Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP).

6. It was agreed that the report should concentrate primarily on the status of the environmental conventions and related international agreements. It was also agreed that the secretariats would be given the opportunity to present their views on problems and challenges that they perceive regarding international environmental governance, but that, given the early stage in the assessment process, this was not as important as the provision of the information on the status of these multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

7. The 9th Meeting agreed that the information required should be requested by UNEP from the secretariats in the form of a questionnaire containing the elements agreed to in the meeting. The responses are contained in Annexes 1 to 20 of this paper. In addition to receiving responses from the 16 secretariats that participated in the meeting, four other independent regional agreements developed under CMS provided responses to the questionnaire.

8. The 9th Meeting on Coordination of Conventions also agreed on an overall process for involving MEAs in the follow-up to UNEP Governing Council decision 21/21, including the review of this paper. Subsequently, comments were requested from the twenty MEA secretariats on chapters I-III of this report, with thirteen providing their views plus additional information not contained in their responses to the questionnaire. It was also agreed that immediately following the first meeting of the Intergovernmental Group of ministers or their representatives that will review this paper (New York, 18 April 2001), a meeting of MEAs would be convened by the Executive Director of UNEP at the same venue to discuss follow-up.

9. The Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG was held on 18 April 2001 on the margins of the 9th Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development to take advantage of the presence of MEAs attending the CSD. The meeting was attended by representatives of the secretariats of the UNFCCC, CBD, the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol, the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, CITES, the Basel Convention, the Barcelona Convention and the Cartagena Convention. It was agreed to modify UNEP/IGM/1/INF3 to include (a) the final comments received on the first draft, (b) the integration of an IEG definition, (c) a further elaboration of the three types of clustering (sectoral, functional and regional), and (d) the further development of chapter 4 to include an analysis of what has worked well for conventions. Most of these revisions are found in chapter 4 of this paper. . A Third Consultative Meeting of MEAs was convened through a teleconference on 4 July, 2001 and some of the comments received from MEA secretariats are also reflected in this report. Representatives of the secretariats of the following MEAs: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Ozone), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Convention on Wetlands), Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs Convention), Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA), Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS), Agreement on the Conservation of the Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS) and Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS), Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention), Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) participated fully or in part in the teleconference.

A. A Definition for International Environmental Governance

10. It was noted at the first meeting of the Intergovernmental Group of ministers or their representatives on international environmental governance that IEG had not been defined adequately. The Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG also agreed and decided to tackle this issue with a view to facilitating the on-going discussions on how to improve governance, particularly within the context of MEAs.

11. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines both "governance" and "government" as "the act or manner of governing". While simple in its definition, the word governance is broad in scope, encompassing both the decision- and policy-making process and the institutional structure for implementing decisions and policies.

12. With this in mind, the MEAs Meeting agreed that the structure of IEG has 4 layers. The top layer is the focus of much of the discussion on governance, which is the international decision-making process. When looking to improve IEG, we are looking at the improvement of coordination of the decision making process, so there is no contradiction between what MEAs are trying to achieve. The second layer is the international institutional architecture. When policy decisions are taken, they must be implemented through an institutional structure. Actual implementation at the international level is the third layer: management or operationalization of the policies and decisions. Finally, there is a fourth layer: the coordination of the implementation of international environmental governance decisions at the national level.

13. In applying this definition to this paper, layer 1--the policy-setting process is described in section I.D. Layer 2--the institutional structure--is dealt with in I.E. Elements of the third layer--management--are addressed in sections I.F and I.G. The fourth layer of IEG--coordination and implementation at the national level--is not described in chapter 1 on the status of MEAs. It is addressed in section II.B of chapter 2 on the review of strengths and weaknesses of existing arrangements. The accompanying papers entitled "A Policy Paper for Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion" and "Proposal for a Systematic Approach to Coordination of Multilateral Environmental Agreements" address the issue of national coordination as a priority concern for improving international environmental governance as it relates to MEAs.

I. Status of Multilateral Environmental Agreements

A. Development of MEAs

14. The earliest multilateral treaty related to the environment dates back to 1868. Since then, the number has risen to at least 502 international treaties and other agreements related to the environment, of which 323 are regional. Nearly 60 percent, or 302, date from 1972, the year of the Stockholm Conference, to the present.

15. Many of the earlier MEAs were restricted in scope to specific subject areas, e.g., certain species of marine wildlife, selected chemicals, and quarantine procedures for plants and animals, among others, and were regional in focus. The largest cluster of pre-1972 MEAs, albeit very disjointed, accounting for 40% of the total were the biodiversity-related agreements, with one-half dealing with marine wildlife and three-fourths being regional in character. Four global agreements which today continue to be of major relevance to Governments are the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (1946), the International Plant Protection Convention (1951, revised in 1979 and 1997), the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas (1958) and the Ramsar Convention (1971).

Another large cluster, with several MEAs also in the first cluster, dealt with the marine environment, accounting for one-fourth of the total. Particularly significant in this cluster were the International Maritime Organization (IMO) conventions and amendments on marine pollution (see Table 2) adopted between 1954 and 1971. A third but smaller cluster of approximately 20 global and regional conventions addresses nuclear energy, testing of nuclear weapons and nuclear radiation. Agreements were negotiated in a few international freshwater basins, mainly in Europe and Africa. Conspicuous in their absence or paucity in the years before 1972 are MEAs dealing with land degradation, atmosphere and chemicals and hazardous wastes, with all but a few being regional in character.

16. The period 1972 to the present witnesses an accelerated increase in MEAs. Of the 302 agreements negotiated, 197, or nearly 70%, are regional in scope, as compared to 60% for the earlier period. The emergence of regional integration bodies concerned with the environment in regions such as Europe and Central America has contributed to this trend. In many cases, regional MEAs are closely linked to global MEAs. Of greatest impact has been the emergence of the 17 multisectoral regional seas conventions and action plans that account for 46 conventions, protocols, amendments and related agreements (see Table 1). By far the largest cluster of MEAs is related to the marine environment, accounting for over 40% of the total, and is distinguished by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) (1982), new IMO marine pollution conventions and protocols (see Table 2), the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (1995), as well as the regional seas MEAs and regional fisheries conventions and protocols. Biodiversity-related conventions form a second important but smaller cluster, including most of the key global conventions: the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), CITES (1973), CMS (1979) and its associated Agreements and CBD (1992). As in the earlier period, the cluster of nuclear-related MEAs remains important with the addition of 9 global conventions and protocols and several regional agreements.

17. Unlike the pre-1972 period, two new important clusters of MEAs emerge: the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions that are primarily of a global nature, and the atmosphere-related conventions. Several of the first are Industrial Labor Organization (ILO) conventions that address occupational hazards in the workplace. Most recently, we have the adoption of the Rotterdam Convention (1998) and it is expected that the new POPs convention will be adopted in Stockholm in May 2001. At the forefront of the atmosphere/energy-related conventions is the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (1985) and its Montreal Protocol (1987) and the UNFCCC (1992). MEAs for international freshwater basins are historically the most difficult to negotiate. A number of conventions and protocols have been adopted, but are concentrated in 6 and 4 international freshwater basins in Europe and Africa respectively.

18. From a combined global and regional perspective, the resultant proliferation of MEAs has placed an increasing burden on Parties and member states to meet their collective obligations and responsibilities to implement environmental conventions and related international agreements. For example, according to the European Environment Agency, European Community countries are Parties to as many as 65 global and regional environmental conventions and agreements.

19. For the purposes of this paper, multilateral treaties are divided into three categories: (a) core environmental conventions and related agreements of global significance whose negotiation, development and/or activities have been associated with UNEP's work, which is further reflected in a number of Governing Council decisions dating back to the establishment of UNEP; (b) global conventions relevant to the environment, including regional conventions of global significance that were negotiated independently of UNEP and (c) others, largely restricted by scope and geographic range. The first are listed in Table 1 and the second in Table 4. Regional seas conventions and action plans have been included in the first category since together they serve as a global mosaic for addressing a wide spectrum of environmental issues in oceans and coastal areas and because of their direct linkages in supporting the implementation of several global MEAs. Likewise, regional fisheries conventions have been included in the second category since they are also a global mosaic for addressing the development and management of fisheries, although they lack the programmatic and institutional characteristics that are commonly shared by regional seas

conventions and action plans. The focus of this paper as regards MEAs will be on the first category. Linkages between the first and second categories of agreements will be highlighted later in the paper. While the latter category, which make up three-fourths of the multilateral agreements, are important, it is not practical to consider them in this paper, given their more limited focus.

B. Scope of the Core Environmental Conventions and Related International Agreements

20. The core environmental conventions and related international agreements are basically divided into five clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions, the atmosphere conventions, the land conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, and the regional seas conventions and related agreements. Although the Vienna Convention is an atmospheric agreement, its Montreal Protocol could also be considered a chemicals agreement since it deals with the phasing out of the production and consumption of selected chemicals.

Objectives and Priorities

21. The objectives and priorities of MEAs can vary significantly from one agreement to another, even within a cluster (for specific details please refer to the annexes). However, there are common threads that link them together. While the sustainable development focus of the three Rio Conventions (CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC) are well known, most other multilateral environmental agreements address the sustainable use of natural resources and the environment or the protection of the environment in such a way as to ensure its sustainable use.

Table 1

Core Environmental Conventions and Related Agreements of Global Significance

MEA	Date adopted	Secretariat
Atmosphere Conventions:		
1. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	1992	UN
2. Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	1997	UN
3. Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer	1985	UNEP
4. Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer	1987	UNEP
Biodiversity-related Conventions:		
5. Convention on Biological Diversity	1992	UNEP
6. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity	2001	UNEP
7. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)	1973	UNEP
8. Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)	1979	UNEP
9. Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)[1]	1995	UNEP
10. Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (EUROBATS)[1]	1991	UNEP
11. Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, the Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS)[1]	1996	ACCOBAMS Sec.
12. Agreement on the Conservation of Seals in the Wadden Sea[1]	1990	Ind. Sec.
13. Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS)[1]	1991	UNEP
14. Ramsar Convention on Wetlands	1971	IUCN
15. World Heritage Convention	1972	UNESCO
16. International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI)	1995	ICRI Sec
17. Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora	1994	KWS
Chemicals and Hazardous Wastes Conventions:		
18. Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal	1989	UNEP
19. Basel Ban Amendment	1995	UNEP
20. Basel Protocol on Liability and Compensation	1999	UNEP
21. Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Principle for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade	1998	UNEP/ FAO
22. Future Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	2001	UNEP[2]
Land Conventions:		
23. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification	1992	UN
Regional seas conventions and related agreements[3]		
24. Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities	1995	UNEP
25. Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona)	1976	UNEP

26. Kuwait Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution	1978	ROPME[4]
27. Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region (Abidjan)	1981	UNEP
28. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific (Lima)	1981	CPPS[4]
29. Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment (Jeddah)	1982	PERSGA[4]
30. Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena)	1983	UNEP
31. Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi)	1985	UNEP
32. Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region (Noumea)	1986	SPREP[4]
33. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki)	1992	HELCOM[4]
34. Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea from Pollution (Bucharest)	1992	BSEP[5]
35. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic	1992	OSPAR[5]
36. Draft Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Northeast Pacific[5]		UNEP[2]
37. Draft Convention for the Protection of the [Marine] [Environment] of the Caspian Sea[5]		
38. The East Asian Seas Action Plan	1981	UNEP
39. Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment	1991	PAME[6]
40. The Northwest Pacific Acton Plan (NOWPAP)	1994	UNEP
41. South Asian Seas Action Plan	1995	SACEP[4]

[1]The 17 regional seas conventions and action plans are a global mosaic of agreements with one over-arching objective: the protection and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources. Protocols, amendments and agreements of regional seas conventions are not listed.
[2]Non-UN regional organizations.
[3]UNEP is providing the secretariat on an interim basis.
[4]Negotiations are expected to be completed in 2001.
[5]Regional body with its own secretariat established by the Arctic Council.
[6]These agreements, while independent treaties, were concluded under the auspices of CMS.

22. Given the different stages of implementation of the core MEAs, the variation in priorities is even greater. Nevertheless, there are crosscutting priorities for many that are primarily of a functional nature, which are listed below. Leading the list are the strengthening of the capacities of Parties or member states to meet their obligations or responsibilities under these agreements, enhancing membership of governments, public education and awareness, strengthened scientific basis for decision-making, and strengthened international partnerships. The most important thematic crosscutting issue is the assessment and management of pollution, which cuts across the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, some biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions and related agreements.

(a) Strengthening the capacity of Parties or member states through technical or financial assistance to meet their obligations or responsibilities under these agreements (UNFCCC, Montreal Protocol, CITES, Ramsar Convention, AEWA, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS, Basel Convention, Stockholm Convention, UNCCD, Cartagena Convention, SACEP);

(b) Mobilizing additional resources for implementing their respective MEAs (CITES, CMS, Ramsar Convention, AEWA);

(c) Provision of financial assistance to Parties or member states related to transfer of technologies (Montreal Protocol, Basel Convention);

(d) Strengthened scientific basis for decision-making (Montreal Protocol, CBD, CITES, CMS, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, AEWA)

(e) Assessment and management of pollution (Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, AEWA, Barcelona Convention, Cartagena Convention, SACEP, GPA)

(f) Sustainable development (CBD, CITES, UNCCD, Barcelona Convention)

(g) Integrated coastal zone management (Barcelona Convention, SACEP)

(h) The development and use of indicators (CBD);

(i) Compliance and monitoring of implementation of the convention (Montreal Protocol, Basel Convention, CITES)

(j) Public education and awareness (UNCCD, CBD, CITES, Ramsar Convention, EUROBATS, AEWA, Basel Convention, Barcelona Convention);

(k) Incentives (CBD)

(l) Enhance membership by governments (CITES, CMS, AEWA, Ramsar Convention, Basel Convention, Stockholm Convention, Barcelona Convention)

(m) Strengthened international partnerships, including with other conventions (CITES, CMS, AEWA, Ramsar Convention, Basel Convention, Cartagena Convention)

(n) Enhanced civil society role through the participative approach (UNCCD)

Cluster 1: biodiversity-related conventions

23. The scope of the biodiversity-related conventions ranges from the conservation of individual species (CITES and the Lusaka Agreement) via conservation of species, their migration routes and their habitats (CMS, AEWA, EUROBATS, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS and various MOUs) to the protection of ecosystems (CBD, the Ramsar Convention, the World Heritage Convention and the International Coral Reef Initiative--ICRI). However, it should be noted that CITES is concerned with ecosystems, specifically with ensuring that trade in specimens of CITES-listed species is limited to as to ensure those species are maintained throughout their range at a level consistent with the roles in the ecosystems in which they occur and well above the level at which they might become eligible for inclusion in Appendix I (Article IV, paragraph 3 of the Convention). The Cartagena Protocol of the CBD specifically aims at protecting both species and ecosystems by promoting the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology. Five regional seas conventions (the Mediterranean, the North-East Atlantic, East Africa, the Wider Caribbean and the South-East Pacific) have protocols or annexes on specially protected areas and wildlife (SPAWs) that cover both individual species and ecosystems. While all of these agreements aim at conserving species and/or ecosystems, several also promote their sustainable use (CBD, CITES, Ramsar and ICRI). The Cartagena Protocol promotes measures related to safeguarding the sustainable use of biodiversity against adverse effects that could be caused by living modified organisms. Likewise, the SPAWs, which are closely linked to CBD, CITES, Ramsar and ICRI, support the sustainable use of marine and coastal species and ecosystems.

Cluster 2: the atmosphere conventions

24. The Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol are closely associated in protecting the environment by eliminating or stabilizing anthropogenic emissions that threaten to interfere with the atmosphere. While the former focuses on the impacts that ozone depletion can have on human health, the latter addresses concerns that climate change may have on food production and economic development. The Montreal Protocol is well on its way to achieving its goal of gradually phasing out 96 listed ozone-depleting substances. Its overriding priority is to provide financial assistance through the Multilateral Fund to eligible developing countries to comply with the provisions of the Protocol and its amendments. The UNFCCC is in an earlier phase of implementation, with much of its future success depending on the operationalization of its Kyoto Protocol.

Cluster 3: the land conventions

25. This cluster is comprised of only one major global convention. As stated in the text, the main objective of the UNCCD is to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa. This objective is to be achieved through effective action at all levels, supported by international cooperation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas. There are very few regional agreements in the fields of arid lands and land degradation. Most notable are the Agreement for the Establishment of the Arab Centre for the Studies of Dry and Barren Land (1970) and the Convention Establishing a Permanent Inter-States Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) (1973). Given the sustainable development focus and the strong substantive linkages between climate change, desertification and drought and loss of biodiversity, the UNCCD is very much associated with the UNFCCC and the CBD.

Cluster 4: the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions

26. The overarching objective of the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions is the protection of human health and the environment from pollution by specific chemicals and hazardous substances. In the case of the Rotterdam Convention, it specifically addresses certain banned or severely restricted chemicals, as well as severely hazardous pesticide formulations, subject to international trade. The Stockholm Convention has as its priorities the phasing out of an initial list of 9 chemicals, the restriction to certain acceptable purposes the production and use of DDT, and the reduction or elimination of unintentionally produced chemicals (dioxin and furans). The Convention also has provisions to add further POPs to the treaty, and will require parties with new chemical programmes to prevent the introduction of new POPs onto the marketplace. The scope of the Basel Convention covers a broad range of hazardous wastes, including chemical wastes, subject to transboundary movements, aiming to reduce these movements to a minimum by minimizing the quantity and hazardousness of the wastes generated and by promoting the treatment and disposal of hazardous wastes and other wastes as close as possible to their source of generation. These global MEAs are complimented by regional agreements such as the Bamako Convention and the Waigani Convention, as well as the Protocol to the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources.

Cluster 5: Regional seas conventions and related agreements

27. By far the largest cluster of MEAs, the 17 regional seas conventions and action plans are a global mosaic of agreements with one over-arching objective: the protection and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources. In the early years shortly after the Stockholm Conference, the regional seas programmes focused on marine pollution control. In the ensuing 25 years they have involved into multi-sectoral

agreements addressing integrated coastal area management, including in several cases links to the management of contiguous freshwater basins; land-based sources of pollution; conservation and sustainable use of living marine resources; and impacts of offshore exploration and exploitation of oil and gas. The Barcelona Convention (1976), the oldest of these agreements, fostered the establishment of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development which is serviced by the Secretariat of the Convention.

28. Also included in this cluster are the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA) and the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) which were both adopted in 1995. The purpose of ICRI is to mobilize governments and a wide range of stakeholders to improve management practices, increase capacity and political support and share information on the health of coral reefs and related ecosystems, including mangroves and sea grass beds. In both agreements, the regional seas conventions and action plans are regional building blocks and vehicles for the implementation of the global agreements. From a substantive point of view, the GPA is closely related to the chemicals-related conventions on issues such as agrochemicals, persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals. Likewise, the work of ICRI is closely associated with the biodiversity-related conventions, specifically CBD, CITES and Ramsar.

C. The Legal Framework of the Core MEAs

29. Of the 41 MEAs listed in Table 1, all but 6 are legally binding instruments. Sixteen are framework conventions such as UNFCCC, CBD, the Basel Convention and the Barcelona Convention that can develop protocols for addressing specific subjects requiring more detailed and specialized negotiations. Eight are self-contained conventions that work through annexes or appendices, rather than protocols, which are revised periodically through the decisions of the Conferences of the Contracting Parties (COPs) of the respective MEAs. These include CITES, the World Heritage Convention, the Lusaka Agreement, UNCCD, the Rotterdam Convention, the Stockholm Convention, the Helsinki Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR). As in the case of the latter, if a new annex were added, it would have to go through a ratification process before entering into force. CMS is the only MEA that operates like an umbrella convention. It has fostered 5 independent regional treaties—the Agreement on the Conservation of Seals in the Wadden Sea, EUROBATS, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS and AEWA, all of which continue to work closely with CMS. Although the agreements concluded under the auspices of CMS are self-standing international legal instruments, they are also the primary means of implementing the goals of the parent convention. CMS has also developed 3 Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and 1 Action Plan with Party-Range States that operate as "soft law" instruments on, respectively, the Siberian Crane, the Slender-billed Curlew, the Marine Turtles of the Atlantic Coast of Africa and of the Indian Ocean and the Sahelo-Saharan Antelope.

30. The 6 that are not legally binding are all oceans-related agreements, of which two are global in nature—the GPA and ICRI—and 4 are regional seas programmes—SACEP, the North-West Pacific Action Plan (NOWPAP), the East Asian Seas Action Plan and the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME). The GPA was adopted by over 100 countries as a non-legally binding programme of action in Washington, D.C. in 1995. That same year 40 countries adopted the ICRI Call to Action and the Framework for Action. Established in 1991, PAME is under the umbrella of the Arctic Council, which receives its mandate from a non-legally binding declaration, adopted in 1996 by the 8 Arctic States. The three other regional seas programmes operate with action plans that were adopted in intergovernmental meetings by the respective member states.

Table 2

Regional Seas Conventions

Conventions	Protocols, Amendments or Convention Annexes by Subject						
	Pollution from Oil and Harmful Sub-stances	Land-based Pollution	Special Prot. Areas & Wildlife	Radio-activity	Trans-boundary Move-ment of wastes	Offshore Explora-tion and Exploita-tion	Dumping
1. Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution	*	* *	* *		*	*	* *
2. Kuwait Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution	*	*				*	
3. Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region	*						
4. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific	* *	*	*	*			
5. Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment	*						
6. Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region	*	*	*				
7. Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region	*		*				
8. Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region	*						*
9. Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area[1]	* * *	*				*	*
10. Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution	*	*					*
11. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic[1]		*	*			*	*
12. Draft Convention for the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Northeast Pacific[2]							
13. Draft Framework Convention for the Protection of the [Marine] [Environment] of the Caspian Sea[2]							

[1]Instead of protocols, the Helsinki Convention and OSPAR have related Annexes.

[2]Negotiations are expected to be completed in 2001.

31. Despite being regional in nature, the 11 regional seas conventions because of their multisectoral nature are the most comprehensive of the framework conventions (please see Annex 21). The Barcelona Convention leads the cluster with 6 protocols, two of which have been amended (land-based sources of pollution and dumping) and a third, which is in the process of revision (emergencies). The regional seas conventions have 5 principle sets of protocols, amendments or annexes. As indicated in Table 2, the largest with 13 protocols, amendments and annexes deals with pollution from oil and harmful substances. Only OSPAR does not have a protocol or annex in this area. However, the Northeast Atlantic is covered by separate treaties in this area—the Agreement for Cooperation in Dealing with Pollution of the North Sea by Oil and other Harmful Substances (1983) and the Cooperation Agreement for the Protection of the coasts and waters of the North-East Atlantic against Pollution (1990). The second largest set addresses land-based sources of pollution. Three important sets cover specially protected areas and wildlife, pollution caused by dumping from ships and aircraft, and pollution resulting from off shore exploration and exploitation.

32. The regional seas conventions have the distinction of being closely, and in some cases systematically, linked to global conventions and agreements, and are proving to be useful regional instruments in supporting their implementation. The protocols, amendments and annexes on pollution from oil and harmful substances and on dumping from ships and aircraft are operationally linked to the IMO marine pollution conventions in these areas. The protocols on land-based sources of pollution are also operationally linked to the GPA. Although developed independently, the protocols and annexes of the regional seas conventions on specially protected areas and wildlife are closely linked to CBD, CITES, the Ramsar Convention and ICRI and efforts are on-going to formally increase collaboration. In the specific instance of CMS, ACCOBAMS and` ASCOBANS, collaborative efforts have existed with the Barcelona Convention for the Mediterranean, the Bucharest Convention for the Black Sea and the Helsinki Convention for the Baltic Sea. The Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (1996) was negotiated in close consultation with the Basel Convention Secretariat.

33. It should also be noted that the four regional seas action plans without legally-binding instruments—PAME, SACEP, NOWPAP and the East Asian Seas Action Plan—are also engaged in similar activities concerning pollution from oil and harmful substances, pollution from land-based activities and conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity. On the first two issues they work closely with IMO and the GPA. The East Asian Seas Action Plan actively participates in the implementation of ICRI.

D. The Governance Structure: the Policy-setting Layer

34. Multilateral environmental agreements adopted after 1972 generally have the following institutional elements: a Conference of the Parties (COP), a secretariat, advisory bodies, a clearing-house mechanism and a financial mechanism.

Decision-making Bodies

35. The Conference of the Parties (COP) of each convention or the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) of a protocol to a convention are the ultimate decision-making bodies regarding the overall implementation and development of their respective MEA, including the programme of work, budget and the revision of annexes, where applicable. An important function of the COP is the adoption of protocols and annexes. The bureaus of the COPs and MOPs of several conventions (Vienna Convention, CBD, UNCCD) and protocols (Montreal Protocol) as a standard function meet intersessionally to discuss matters within their bureau mandates.

36. The World Heritage Convention is structured differently in the sense that instead of a COP it has A General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention, which meets during the UNESCO General Conference. The World Heritage Committee is responsible for the implementation of the convention and

its members are elected at the General Assembly. The work of the World Heritage Committee is prepared by the World Heritage Bureau.

37. The GPA has no regular COP or intergovernmental body as do other non-binding agreements such as SACEP, NOWPAP, the East Asian Seas Action Plan and PAME. Decisions on its work and budget are left to the Governing Council of UNEP, which provides the secretariat. Periodically the implementation of the GPA is subject to an intergovernmental review. The Global Programme of Action was adopted in 1995 and the First Intergovernmental Review will take place in November of 2001 in Montreal.

Subsidiary Bodies

38. Some, such as CITES, CMS, the Ramsar Convention, CBD, the Cartagena Convention and the South Asian Seas Action Plan have established standing committees or intersessional meetings that represent their COP, review progress in the implementation of the MEA and advise the secretariat on the implementation of the programme of work. It should be noted that the standing committees, although a subsidiary body of their respective COPs, differ fundamentally from the subsidiary bodies in paragraph 39 since they represent the authority of the COPs intersessionally. The Parties to the standing committees of CITES, CMS, the Ramsar Convention and the Cartagena Convention are elected, while the CBD Intersessional Meetings are open-ended. The Consultative Committee of the South Asian Seas Action Plan is comprised of the diplomatic representatives of the member states in Sri Lanka where SACEP, the secretariat, is located.

39. Subsidiary bodies are generally advisory in nature and present their recommendations to the COP or MOP of the respective agreement. Several conventions and protocols have subsidiary scientific and technical bodies that provide the COP or MOP with advice and recommendations on the scientific and technical aspects of the implementation of their MEA. Some of these are listed in Table 3 along with a description of the scope of their work. Others with subsidiary scientific and technical bodies include the Cartagena Convention for its protocols on specially protected areas and wildlife and on land-based sources of pollution, ACCOBAMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS. It should be noted that the latter four CMS Agreements combine the role of the standing committee and scientific/technical committee in one (variously called the advisory or technical committee). While the World Heritage Convention does not have its own subsidiary scientific and technical body, it works with three external organizations that provide it with expert advice.

40. The valuable assessments carried out by the scientific and technical panels under the Montreal Protocol have been particularly important in demonstrating important lessons learned:

- Wide membership: the members of the Panels ensured that the research and knowledge from all areas of the world were taken into account, as equitably as possible since Parties wanted real advice;
- Low cost: no consultants or consulting firm could have done this job at such a low cost to the Trust Funds;
- Excellence: the best scientists and experts of the world were engaged;
- Source and transfer of knowledge: the experts of the Panels from more than 80 developed and developing countries were the reference points for technical, scientific and environmental knowledge;
- Independence: the members of the Panels and Technical Options Committees had a security of tenure and were free to provide their opinions;

Table 3

Scientific and Technical Bodies of Selected Environmental Conventions and Their Protocols

Convention	Name of the Body	Scope
CBD	The Subsidiary Body on Technical and Technological Advice (SBSSTA)	The SBSTTA of CBD was established under Article 25 to provide the COP and, as appropriate, its other subsidiary bodies with timely advice relating to the implementation of the Convention. Under the authority of and in accordance with guidelines laid down by the Conference of the Parties, and upon its request, SBSTTA (a) provides scientific and technical assessments of the status of biological diversity; (b) prepares scientific assessments of the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of this convention; (c) identifies innovative, efficient and state-of-the-art technologies and know-how relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and advises on the ways and means of promoting development and/or transferring of such technologies; (d) provides advice on scientific programmes and international cooperation in research and development related to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity; (e) and responds to scientific, technical, technological and methodological questions that the Conference of the Parties and its subsidiary bodies may put to the body.
CITES	• The Animals Committee • The Plants Committee • The Nomenclature Committee	CITES has two scientific bodies, the Animals Committee (AC) and the Plants Committee (PC)—comprised of elected experts from all CITES regions that provide advice to the Conference of the Parties. There is also a nomenclature Committee comprised of a zoologist and a botanist. THE CITES COP established the AC and PC as its main scientific bodies. The Nomenclature Committee has an advisory role to the AC and PC. The next meeting of the Standing Committee will consider a secretariat proposal to establish a body for dealing with technical and implementation issues under the convention. In addition, the Convention receives a great deal of scientific inputs from the NGO community, which attends the COPs as observers.
CMS	The Scientific Council	The CMS has a Scientific Council established under Article VIII, to provide advice on scientific matters. Since COP 2 in 1988, the Scientific Council has meet in conjunction with every COP and between COPs. Article VIII defines the functions of the Scientific Council, which are: (a) providing scientific advice to the Conference of the Parties, to the Secretariat, and, if approved by the Conference of the Parties, to any body or Agreement set up under the Convention or any Party; (b) recommending research and the co-ordination of research on migratory species and reporting to the Conference of the Parties on such status and measures for its improvement; (c) making recommendations to the COP as to the migratory species to be included in Appendices I or II, together with an indication of the range of such migratory species; (d) making recommendations to the COP as to specific conservation and management measures to be included in Agreements on migratory species; and (e) recommending to the COP solutions to problems relating to the scientific aspects of the implementation of the Convention, in particular with regard to the habitats of migratory species.
Ramsar Convention	The Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP)	Composed of experts from the convention's 6 geographical regions elected by the COP, the STRP advises the COP, the Standing Committee and the secretariat on scientific and technical issues.
Montreal Protocol to the Vienna Convention	• Scientific Assessment Panel • Environmental Effects Assessment Panel • Technology and Economic Assessment Panel	The Montreal Protocol to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer in Article 6 defines the following assessment process: "Beginning in 1990, and at least every four years thereafter, the Parties shall assess the control measures provided for in Article 2 and Articles 2A to 2H on the basis of available scientific, environmental, technical, and economic information. At least one year before each assessment, the Parties shall convene appropriate panels of experts qualified in the fields mentioned and determine the composition and terms of reference of any such

		panels. Within one year of being convened, the panels will report their conclusions, through the Secretariat, to the Parties." The First meeting of the Parties in May 1989 endorsed the composition and the Terms of Reference of the Assessment Panels. Each scientific assessment, in 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1998, has served as a basis for the Amendments and Adjustments to the Montreal Protocol adopted in London (1990), Copenhagen (1992), Vienna (1995), Montreal (1997) and Beijing (1999). The next assessment will be ready in 2002. Another important issue is the interaction between some of the scientific advisory processes, e.g., between the Montreal Protocol's Scientific Assessment Panel and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
UNFCCC	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA)	Article 9 establishes SBSTA to provide the COP and its other subsidiary bodies with information and advice on scientific and technological matters relating to the convention. Under the guidance of he COP, the SBSTA has the following specific functions: (a) to provide assessments of the state of scientific knowledge relating to climate change and its effects; (b) to prepare scientific assessments on the effects of measures taken in the implementation of the convention; (c) to identify innovative, efficient and state-of-the-art technologies and know-how and advise on the ways and means of promoting development and/or transfer of such technologies; (d) to provide advice on scientific programmes, international cooperation in research and development related to climate change, as well as on ways and means of supporting endogenous capacity building in developing countries; and (e) to respond to scientific, technological and methodological questions that the COP and its subsidiary bodies may put to it.
	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)	The IPCC was established jointly by UNEP and WMO in 1988 and is today the world's authoritative scientific and technical source of climate change information. Its assessments provided the basis for the negotiations of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol. Although not an institution of the convention, it continues to provide vital scientific input to the climate change process. The SBSTA acts as a link between the COP and the IPCC, and a joint working group of the Bureaux of the two bodies meets regularly to ensure coordination.
UNCCD	Committee on Science and Technology	The Committee provides the COP with information and advice on scientific and technological matters relating to combating desertification and mitigating the effects of drought.
Basel Convention	Technical Working Group	The Technical Working Group was established by the Conference of the Parties to provide the COP and its other subsidiary bodies with information and advice on scientific and technical matters relating to the convention, including the preparation of technical guidance for the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes and the development of criteria on which wastes are suitable for recovery and recycling operations. Taking into account the development of the Basel Convention, the Technical Working Group is actively involved in defining more clearly, identifying and clarifying what hazardous waste is under the convention. Other tasks for the Technical Working Group include inter alia the preparation of technical guidelines on clinical wastes, disposal of waste tyres, waste batteries, recycling/reclamation of metals and metal compounds and wastes resulting for the surface treatment of plastics. The Technical Working Group is also responsible for reviewing the lists of wastes contained in Annexes VIII and IX of the convention.
Rotterdam Convention	Chemical Review Committee (CRC)	According to Article 18, paragraph 6, the 1st COP shall establish a Chemical Review Committee (CRC) that will perform the functions assigned to it by the Convention. Those functions are to review information provided with notifications of final regulatory actions and proposals for inclusion of severely hazardous pesticide formulations, and recommend to the COP on the inclusion of such chemicals, pesticides and hazardous pesticide formulations under the Convention. The CRC will also draft decision guidance documents for the chemicals, pesticides and hazardous pesticide formulations that it recommends for inclusion and forward those documents to the COP for adoption.

- Long term process: scientists and experts have been involved since the 1970s;

- Cooperation and contribution: International Agencies (FAO, UNEP, WHO, WMO, etc), regional bodies (EC), national agencies (NASA, NOAA, FAA, BMFT), Governments, industry (AFEAS), universities, research institutions, NGOs (national regional, global), among others, have been involved;

- Respect by the Parties: no Meeting of the Parties has disputed the facts, the options with the results, or the implications for policy formulations. What remained was only the political bargaining.

41. MEAs such as UNFCCC, the Montreal Protocol and the Basel Convention have Subsidiary Bodies for Implementation to assist the COPs in assessing and reviewing the effective implementation of the convention, including reviewing national communications or reports. The Open-ended Intersessional Meetings of the CBD also undertake this latter function. An Implementation Committee reviews implementation and non-compliance aspects of the Montreal Protocol. At the same time, the Montreal Protocol has an Open-ended Working Group of the Parties that meets annually to consider technical and policy issues relevant to the implementation of the protocol and make recommendations to the MOP

42. The COPs and MOPs can establish, as required, additional subsidiary organs with limited and defined mandates. For CBD, these include the Working Group on Biosafety, the Expert Panel on Access and Benefit-sharing, the Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing, the Working Group on Article 8(j) (indigenous knowledge related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity) and the Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP). The terms of reference, duration and composition of these bodies is determined by the COP.

42 bis In the case of UNFCCC, interim arrangements are specified in the Convention, requiring the Secretariat to cooperate closely with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to ensure that the Panel can respond to the need for objective scientific and technical advise. The IPCC was established by UNEP and WMO in 1988, to carry out periodic assessments on the state of knowledge of causes of climate change, its potential impacts and options for response strategies. The Panel has been responding to the requests of the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) to provide assessments of issues related to the implementation of the UNFCCC that require independent scientific guidance.

43. In a very unique case, under the Montreal Protocol a Multilateral Fund has been established with an Executive Committee comprised of 14 members representing the Parties, which considers and approves projects for phasing out ozone depleting substances in developing countries. Further details are provided in chapter III.

E. The Institutional Structure

Functions and Operations of MEA Secretariats.

44. While the scope and mandate of MEA secretariats can vary, from a functional point of view they can be divided into two categories. The first are those such as the secretariats for UNFCCC, the Montreal Protocol, CBD, the Ramsar Convention, CMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention that prepare and service the meetings of the COPS and their subsidiary bodies and coordinate with other international organizations. They provide administrative, technical and scientific support to the COP and the subsidiary bodies, as well as advice on implementation to Parties when requested. A major focus of their work is the preparation of background documentation for the meetings of the convention and in coordinating the work carried out under the convention with that of other relevant institutions and conventions. As required, they provide support to on-going negotiations. They are not involved with the actual implementation of the convention at the country or regional level, other than in an advisory capacity.

45. The second category are those convention secretariats that, while carrying out the functions of the first category of secretariats, are also involved in implementing programmes or projects at the regional and country levels. However, the degree of implementation work can vary from little or moderate to substantial. Because of the

much greater number of Parties in global conventions, these tend to be less involved in implementation than regional conventions. In this group are CITES (capacity-building, monitoring activities, development of conservation management plans for species), CMS (provision of technical support to Party-Range States in developing Agreements, MOUs and Action Plans), the Basel Convention (capacity building, training, development of guidelines and methodologies, project development, facilitation of national and regional programmes and public awareness), and the UNCCD (public awareness. The World Heritage Convention is an exception among the global conventions in that it is actively involved in implementation in areas such as training, technical cooperation, monitoring and assessment, identification of heritage and educational activities for young people on world heritage.). The GPA is another exception since it is actively involved in the development and implementation of national and regional demonstration and pilot projects addressing land-b ased sources of pollution.

46. The CITES Secretariat is different from other conventions by the amount of scientific work that it is expected to carry out directly. This includes the following: (a) to undertake scientific and technical studies in accordance with programmes authorized by the COP that will contribute to the implementation of the Convention, including studies concerning standards for appropriate preparation and shipment of living specimens and the means of identifying specimens; (b) to study the reports of Parties and to request from Parties such further information with respect thereto as it deems necessary to ensure implementation of the Convention; (c) to invite the attention of the Parties to any matter pertaining to the aims of the Convention; (d) to publish periodically and distribute to the Parties current editions of Appendices I, II and III together with any information which will facilitate identification of specimens of species included in those Appendices; (e) to prepare annual reports to the Parties on its work and on the implementation of the Convention and such other reports as meetings of the Parties may request and to make recommendations to the COPs for the implementation of the aims and provisions of the Convention, including the exchange of information of a scientific or technical nature. Each Party is required to have a management authority as well as a scientific authority to facilitate flow of information with the Secretariat and between and among Parties as well as the NGO fraternity.

47. In the second category, the cluster of secretariats of regional seas conventions and related agreements is the most actively involved of MEAs in implementation. These can include regional projects in marine pollution monitoring and assessment funded from their trust funds to the implementation of regional projects funded by multilateral donors, bilateral donors and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in areas such as integrated coastal area management, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, persistent organic pollutants, and land-based sources of pollution, among others.

48. Some regional seas programmes have established regional activity centres (RACs) coordinated by the secretariats that are responsible for supporting implementation of selected programmatic elements of their respective action plans, largely through capacity building programmes aimed at the Parties or member states. The Barcelona Convention Secretariat which is based in Athens coordinates 7 RACs, including the Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean (REMPEC) in Malta, the Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC) in Split, Croatia, the Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC) in Tunis, the Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC) in Valbonne, France, the Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre (ERS/RAC) in Palermo, the Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (CP/RAC) in Barcelona and the Programme for the Protection of Coastal Historic Sights (100 HS) in Marseille. NOWPAP has 4 RACs covering marine pollution emergency response in Taejon, Republic of Korea, marine pollution monitoring in Vladivostok, Russian Federation, special assessments in Toyama, Japan and information management in Beijing. The Cartagena Convention has two RACs responsible for capacity building linked to the implementation of their protocols on oil spills and biodiversity: the Marine Pollution Emergency Information and Training Regional Activity Centre for the Wider Caribbean Region (REMPEITC-Carib) in Curacao and the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife Regional Activity Centre (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe.

49. Most framework conventions with protocols are serviced by joint secretariats that oversee the overall implementation of the convention and its protocols. This is the case for The Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, the CBD and the Cartagena Protocol, the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol, the Cartagena Convention and its 2 protocols, and the Barcelona Convention and its 7 protocols and 2 amendments. An exception would be CMS in which the four regional agreements it fostered—EUROBATS, ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS and AEWA—are

independent but linked treaties with independent secretariats. However, recently, three—AEWA, EUROBATS and ASCOBANS) were co-located in Bonn where the CMS Secretariat is located.

Monitoring and Evaluation of the Implementation of MEAs

50. An important function of most secretariats (UNCCD, CBD, CITES, the Ramsar Convention, the World Heritage Convention, the Montreal Protocol, the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention) is the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of their MEA, proposing formats for national reports, receiving and analyzing reports submitted, and providing the COP or MOP with syntheses of the information contained in national reports. On national reports, the role of the UNFCCC Secretariat is more restricted in that it compiles and transmits the reports to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, which is responsible for assessing and reviewing the implementation of the convention. The CMS Secretariat also collates the reports of the Parties; similarly, CMS and its associated Agreements collect and collate information from other sources, including through the establishment and management of databases. With the assistance of UNEP-WCMC, it is carrying out a systematic review of needs and possibilities related to reporting. At COP 5 of the UNCCD, consideration will be given to the establishment of the Committee to Review the Implementation of the Convention, which will function as a permanent subsidiary body of the COP.

51. The role of some conventions in this area such as the Basel Convention and CITES goes much further. They have increased their cooperation with existing networks such as Interpol, the World Customs Organization and others to improve its monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the convention.

52. The regional seas conventions and action plans generally do not require national reports from Parties or member states. The evaluations on implementation largely are the responsibility of the secretariats, which present reports to the COPs or intergovernmental meetings for consideration. In the case of the Barcelona Convention, the evaluations prepared by the secretariat take into account the results of the MEDPOL monitoring system on the extent of and trends in marine pollution in the Mediterranean Sea. In the framework of the GPA Intergovernmental Review of Implementation, Governments, regional seas secretariats, UN agencies, IFIs and other stakeholders have been invited to prepare reports highlighting examples of successes and failures and identifying barriers and needs, which will be used in preparing multi-stakeholder workprogrammes for 2002-2006.

Clearing-House Mechanisms (CHM)

53. Several conventions and protocols and related international agreements have clearing-houses, generally operated by the secretariats. The CBD CHM was established to promote and facilitate technical and scientific cooperation. Under the Montreal Protocol, the UNEP/OzonAction Programme operates a clearinghouse mechanism, funded by the Multilateral Fund. A CHM has also been established under the Cartagena Protocol to the CBD to facilitate the exchange of scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on living modified organisms and to assist developing country Parties in the implementation of the protocol. The GPA in cooperation with other UN organizations has developed a clearing-house on the 9 land-based sources of pollution, including technologies and opportunities for mitigating or eliminating their impacts. The Stockholm Convention will set up a clearing-house on persistent organic pollutants.

Regional Centres

54. A few conventions have established or are in the process of establishing regional centres. The Basel Convention has as one of its priorities the further development of regional and sub-regional centres for training and technology transfer to facilitate the effective implementation of the Convention. UNCCD has also begun to set up regional centres to assist in the implementation of the convention. In its strategic action plan, CITES is looking into establishing regional offices that may be linked to the secretariats of regional seas programmes or to UNEP's regional offices. Some regional seas conventions and action plans (Barcelona Convention, Cartagena Convention and NOWPAP) have regional activity centres (RACs) that assist in the implementation of their agreements. These are further described below under the functions and operations of secretariats.

UNEP-administered Secretariats of MEAs

55. Of the 41 core MEAs, UNEP provides the secretariats of 22—12 of the 18 global MEAs and 10 of the 22 regional MEAs that have secretariats, including 7 of the 17 regional seas conventions and action plans. These secretariats are under the institutional and administrative structure of the UNEP secretariat and their staff are employed as UNEP staff members. UNEP through the United Nations Organization in Nairobi (UNON) provides them with administrative support. As such, they are under the same rules and regulations of the United Nations and the Executive Director of UNEP is responsible for the hiring of staff and the supervision of their administration and management. The policies, budgets and programmes of work of UNEP-administered MEAs, while mostly drafted and proposed by the secretariats in consultation with their Parties, are exclusively decided upon by their COPs or MOPs, taking into account UN rules and regulations. Because they are UNEP-administered, UNEP also provides them with strategic programmatic support in the form of scientific and technical expertise and financial resources.

56. For the other 19 core MEAs that are not UNEP-administered, UNEP also promoted and facilitated the negotiations of 13. With these 13 and the remaining 6 conventions and agreements, UNEP maintains a working relationship, albeit at different degrees of support. For most, it also provides scientific and technical expertise and strategic financial support. Of the 14 regional seas conventions and action plans brokered by UNEP, 7 are not UNEP-administered. This is largely due to the policy of UNEP to establish regional seas secretariats in competent regional organizations wherever these existed, subject to the approval of their COPs or intergovernmental meetings.

57 The UNEP-administered conventions can also be divided into two groups: (a) the secretariats of MEAs that operate as self-contained units with administrative capabilities whose staff and operations are financed from the budgets approved by their COPs or MOPs with funds drawn from their respective trust funds administered by UNEP and (b) the secretariats of 3 global MEAs (Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention, GPA) that are embedded within a functional unit of UNEP and whose operations are largely, but not exclusively, covered from UNEP's Environment Fund. This is a different governance structure than other MEAs. In the cases of the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, this means that the overall UNEP Chemicals Programme becomes a joint programme of UNEP's Governing Council along with the governing bodies of the two agreements. The Secretariat of the GPA is a unit of UNEP's Division of Policy Implementation; decisions relevant to its implementation emanate from UNEP's Governing Council, although periodic intergovernmental reviews of implementation (the first being in November 2001) are built into the GPA structure. There are strong signs that Governments are interested in expanding this concept, as reflected in recent chemicals-related decisions of the Governing Council. In many ways, this latter model resembles the institutional arrangements for the IMO-, ILO-, IAEA- and FAO-administered conventions listed in Table 4 in which the secretariat functions are embedded into the organizations themselves.

F. The Management Layer

Corporate or Business Plans

58. A Strategic Plan for CMS for 2000-2005 was adopted at COP 6 in November 1999. In April of last year, the COP of CITES approved the convention's first Strategic Vision, covering the period 2000 to 2005, and an accompanying Action Plan. The COP of UNCCD adopted a Strategic Plan at its Third Session in November 1999. That same month the COP of the Basel Convention adopted the Basel Declaration on Environmentally Sound Management that provides the strategy and priorities for the decade 2000-2010. The MOP of AEWA adopted in November 1999 the "International Implementation Priorities 2000-2004. In July 2000 the ASCOBANS MOP adopted the ASCOBANS Triennium Work Plan 2001-2003. That same month the EUROBATS Conservation and Management Plan with an Action Plan for 2000-2003 was adopted by its MOP.

59. Strategic action plans on certain issues are adopted every year by the World Heritage Committee. The GPA has a Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater and has developed regional programmes of action on land-based sources of pollution with regional seas conventions and action plans.

60. The Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol has a three-year rolling plan that corresponds to the Multilateral Fund's three-year replenishment cycle. In addition it has annual business plans comprised of the annual business plans of the four implementing agencies of the Fund, as well as those of several bilateral governmental agencies.

61. Others are currently preparing strategic action plans. The Open-ended Intersessional Meeting of the CBD will consider the Strategic Plan of the convention in November of 2001 and it is expected that it will be adopted at COP 6 in 2002. A strategic action plan for the next decade is being prepared for the Basel Convention.

62. Regional seas programmes generally do not have strategic plans since it is the practice for a regional seas convention to serve as the legal framework for an action plan. Both are negotiated in parallel by member states. However, most action plans, consisting mainly of programmatic elements, lack a comprehensive strategy for implementation with objectives, priorities, specific activities, timetables, identification of partners, involvement of stakeholders and budgetary estimations. Instead, they rely on programmes of work adopted by COPs that are limited in scope by the contributions that participating states are willing to make which often fall far below what is needed. An exception would be a few programmes such as the Barcelona Convention with a strong legal framework, a focused programme of work and higher levels of commitment by governments that translates into adequate and predictable financing. Nevertheless, some programmes are addressing this issue more forcefully. The member states of the East Asian Seas Action Plan are considering the document a "Vision and Plan—A Systematic Approach" that proposes to systematically and pragmatically coordinate the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of the marine environment in the East Asian Seas region. Although the COP of the Cartagena Convention at its last meeting in February 2000 considered the Strategy for the Financial Sustainability of the Caribbean Environment Programme, it deferred its further consideration and approval to the joint Thirteenth Meeting of the Monitoring Committee and Special Meeting of the Bureau of Contracting Parties and the next COP.

63. Practically all of the newer MEAs that have not entered into force or have only recently entered into force are without corporate or business plans.

Partnerships with International Organizations

64. All MEAs and their secretariats work to different degrees with other international organizations that support the implementation of their convention or protocol. Some such as the World Heritage Convention have formal arrangements with defined roles for organizations such as the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and restoration of Cultural Property (Rome Centre) (ICCROM). The first two are advisory bodies in charge of evaluating natural and cultural nominations to the World Heritage List. ICCROM is responsible for cultural heritage training. Most other MEAs have voluntary cooperative arrangements with international organizations or collaboration called for by COPs on specific issues.

65. Because it is a large cluster of MEAs, biodiversity-related conventions are involved collectively with a large number of international partners, including several international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Three of the 5 international organizations with cooperative arrangements with 3 or more conventions in this cluster are NGOs, led by IUCN, followed by Wetlands International and Birdlife International. The other two are UNEP and the International Whaling Commission. As a whole, the cluster of biodiversity-related conventions has cooperative arrangements with the World Bank (CBD), the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO (CBD), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (CBD, CITES), UNEP (CBD, CITES, World Heritage Convention), the World Trade Organization (WTO) (CITES), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (CBD), IUCN (CBD, CITES, CMS, Ramsar Convention, World Heritage Convention), World Wildlife Fund (WWF) (Ramsar Convention, CMS, CITES), the International Whaling Commission (CITES, CMS, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS), the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (ACCOBAMS, EUROBATS), the Helsinki Convention (ASCOBANS), OSPAR (ASCOBANS), Nordic Council (ASCOBANS), Wetlands International (CMS, AEWA, Ramsar Convention), Birdlife International (CMS, AEWA, Ramsar Convention, CITES), the International Crane Foundation (CMS), the Nature Conservancy (Ramsar Convention), ICPO-Interpol (CITES) and the World Customs Organization (CITES).

66. The atmosphere-related conventions are the smallest cluster and work with a smaller group of international organizations made up principally of organizations from the United Nations system and bilateral donor agencies largely linked to the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund. The Montreal Protocol and its Multilateral Fund have cooperative arrangements with UNDP, UNIDO, UNEP, WHO, WMO, FAO, WCO, WTO, the World Bank, GEF, GTZ, Casse Francaise de development, SIDA and CIDA. UNFCCC has no formal partners but receives inputs from some of the above organizations, including UNDP, UNEP, WMO and the World Banks, as well as from UNITAR, FAO and ILO.

67. Like the atmosphere conventions, the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions cluster is small. However, these conventions work with a broad range of organizations largely from the UN system. The Basel Convention has cooperative arrangements with Interpol, the World Customs Organization, IMO, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the United Nations Conference on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, WHO, ILO, FAO, UNIDO, UNCTAD, IAEA, UN regional commissions and the Organization of African Unity. For both the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) is a key partner. The IOMC is comprised of UNEP, FAO, ILO, UNIDO, OECD, WHO and UNITAR, with IMO soon to join. In addition, UNEP has an MOU with the World Bank on POPs, which will be extended to the Stockholm Convention.

68. Because of their regional character and global significance, the cluster of regional seas conventions and action plans works with a broad range of global and regional partners. However, they work with a core of 5 UN organizations whose work is associated with oceans. UNEP, IOC/UNESCO and IAEA play an important role in supporting the work of the regional seas programmes in monitoring and assessment of the marine and coastal environment. IMO is engaged with these agreements in the field of emergency response to marine pollution from oil and other hazardous substances. To a lesser degree, FAO works with some of the programmes in the area of living marine resources.

69. Other organizations that cooperate with regional seas conventions and action plans include UNDP, WHO, WMO, the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), regional development banks, bilateral donor organizations, the UN Commission on Sustainable Development and a wide range of regional intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. In the implementation of the GPA clearing-house, MOUs and letters of agreement have been signed with several UN organizations, FAO, WHO, IMO, IAEA and UNEP. This cooperation is based on UN General Assembly Resolution 51/189.

70. The role of IMO as the secretariat of the major global marine pollution conventions is important. Ten of the 11 regional seas conventions have protocols on pollution from oil and harmful substances. All are assisted by IMO in their implementation. Regional seas programmes without legal frameworks such as NOWPAP and SACEP that have programmes on marine pollution are also assisted by IMO in their development and implementation. Where RACs have been established on emergency response to oil spills and other accidents with hazardous substances, such as in the Mediterranean, the Wider Caribbean and the North-West Pacific, these have been done through MOUs agreed to by UNEP, IMO and the host governments. Moreover, a joint IMO/UNEP forum on emergency response to marine pollution is being established with a view to exchange experiences and to discuss issues of common concern among the regional seas conventions and action plans.

71. IOC/UNESCO is also involved in supporting the monitoring and assessment programmes of several regional seas programmes. At the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans held in Monaco in November 2000, it was agreed that UNEP will work closely with the Coastal Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS), directed by IOC/UNESCO, through a cooperative arrangement to ensure that the scientific and technical needs of regional seas programmes are fully taken into account in the development, management and implementation of the Coastal GOOS in particular, as well as the overall work of the Global Ocean Observing System, including the need to implement supportive capacity building activities in regional seas programmes as required.

Cooperative Agreements between MEAs

72. The last two years has seen a marked rise in the signing of memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between conventions, signaling a period of increasing political will for MEAs to collaborate more closely in the implementation of the programmes of work of their respective agreements. However, this has been concentrated principally in two clusters: the biodiversity-related conventions and the regional seas conventions and action plans. In addition to endorsing these MOUs, the COPS of some of these conventions have begun to adopt decisions calling for their secretariats to explore with other secretariats the development of joint programmes of work.

73. Within the biodiversity-related conventions cluster, some important MOUs have been signed in recent years. The CBD Secretariat has negotiated MOUs with the secretariats of the following MEAs:

- The Ramsar Convention;
- CITES;
- CMS
- The Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Joint work plans have been developed between CBD and the Ramsar Convention and CBD and CITES. An MOU and joint work plan is being developed between CITES and CMS. In the area of enforcement, an MOU has also been signed between CITES and the Lusaka Agreement. In addition to its MOU with CBD (which covers all Agreements and MOUs under CMS), the CMS secretariat has MOUs with the Ramsar Convention (which similarly extends to AEWA and the two MOUs for endangered waterbirds) and with the International Convention on the Regulation of Whaling (which covers ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS). The CMS secretariat is currently negotiating an MOU with the World Heritage Bureau. Besides its MOU with CBD, the Ramsar Convention Bureau also has an MOU with the World Heritage Convention. In addition to its MOUs with the Ramsar Convention, the World Heritage Convention has an MOU with CBD.

74. MOUs have also been signed between conventions in the biodiversity-related conventions cluster and conventions in other clusters. Particularly important have been the MOUs between biodiversity-related conventions and regional seas conventions and related international agreements. The CBD has also taken the lead in the negotiation of MOUs with conventions from other clusters:

- The UNCCD
- The Cartagena Convention and its Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife;
- The Lima Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific and its Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife.
- The Barcelona Convention and its Protocols on

An umbrella MOU (2000) has been signed between CBD and the GPA, which involves the regional seas conventions and action plans, for cooperation in the protection of marine and coastal habitats. The Ramsar Convention Bureau and the World Heritage Bureau also have MOUs with UNCCD. The Barcelona Convention has an MOU with the Ramsar Convention. ACCOBAMS is drafting MOUs with the Barcelona Convention and the Bucharest Convention for the Black Sea. ASCOBANS has a cooperative arrangement with the Helsinki Convention for the Baltic Sea.

75. As noted earlier, regional seas conventions and their protocols have several MOUs with biodiversity-related conventions. The Barcelona Convention has MOUs with CBD and the Ramsar Convention. In addition to MOUs with CBD and the Ramsar Convention, the Cartagena Convention has a letter of agreement (LOA) with the GPA for the development of a clearinghouse. The Cartagena Convention is also exploring the possibility of MOUs with CITES and CMS. A new trend since 2000 is the adoption of twinning arrangements between regional seas conventions that can be divided into two groups. The first are those in which more developed regional seas programmes provide technical cooperation to less developed programmes. Such an example is the Twinning Arrangement between the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission and the United Nations Environment Programme as the secretariat of the Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention), signed in Malmö, Sweden on 30 May 2000. Other such arrangements are in the process of being negotiated. The second group of twinning arrangements promotes cooperation between neighboring regional seas programmes. An example of this is the twinning between the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment Programme and the Regional Organization for the

Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME), as well as the Memorandum of Understanding for closer cooperation between the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment Programme and ROPME and the Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment and UNEP (May 2000).

76. In the atmosphere conventions cluster, no MOUs with other MEAs have been developed. The Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol have ad hoc agreements with other MEAs in areas of common interest. The UNFCCC has cooperative arrangements with CBD, UNCCD and the Ramsar Convention, but no MOUs.

77. In the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions cluster, there are also no MOUs with other MEAs. The Basel Convention has ad hoc cooperative arrangements with CITES, the Vienna Convention and it Montreal Protocol, the London Convention and its 1996 Protocol, MARPOL, the Bamako and Waigani Conventions and several regional seas conventions and their protocols. The Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions have not entered into force and, therefore, have no MOUs with other MEAs. Nevertheless, close cooperation on an informal basis is taking place between the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention.

78. As indicated earlier, some COPs and MOPs are adopting decisions calling for closer cooperation between conventions. The Helsinki Commission for the Baltic Sea in recommendation 17/2 called for harmonization of reporting schemes with ASCOBANS. The MOP of the Montreal Protocol and the COP of the UNFCCC have adopted a decision to work together on addressing substitutes of ozone depleting substances that at the same time are greenhouse gases.

G. Participation of Civil Society in the Implementation of MEAs

Participation in Meetings

79. In conventions such as the Basel Convention, CBD, CITES and the Ramsar Convention, NGOs, private industry, civic groups, local communities and indigenous groups are allowed to participate in the deliberations of the Parties. For the CBD, this does not necessarily apply to meetings that are not open-ended such as technical expert groups and liaison groups. The Meetings of the World Heritage Committee are attended by intergovernmental organizations and NGOs as representatives, observers or advisers, while representatives of local communities and indigenous groups are allowed as members of a State Party delegation or an NGO. Sometimes representatives of private industry are invited to Committee Meetings. For some biodiversity-related conventions, such as the Ramsar Convention, CMS, ACCOBAMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS, civil society representatives are primarily NGOs.

80. The MOPs of the Montreal Protocol are open to NGOs, private industry, scientists and expert organizations in the field of ozone protection as observers. NGOs, private industry, and academia are invited to the meetings of the Executive Committee of the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund and its subsidiary bodies. There are almost 400 NGOs accredited to participate as observers in the meetings of the COP, SBSTA and SBI of the UNFCCC, unless at least one-third of the Parties object, and are given the opportunity to address these meetings. They are divided into three main constituency groups: environmental NGOs, business and industry associations, and local governments and municipal authorities.

81. The Rotterdam Convention, the Stockholm Convention, the Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol have always encouraged the participation of civil society—NGOs, business and industry associations, labour unions, academia, civic groups and indigenous groups—in its meetings. The participation of civil society in the Rotterdam Convention will be decided when it enters into force. In the case of the Stockholm Convention over 300 non-state organizations, including environmental, indigenous people, industry and academia groups have been allowed to participate.

82. In the UNCCD, the participation of civil society is expected at all levels. Article 6 of the Regional Implementation Annex for Africa establishes a consultative and participatory process involving appropriate levels of government, local communities and NGOs. A Supplementary Fund has been established to support the participation of accredited NGOs from affected developing countries to attend meetings as observers

83. Given its multisectoral scope and its focus on sustainable development, the Barcelona Convention meetings are open to a broad range of civil society representatives, including NGOs, civic groups, local communities and industry as observers. Representatives of these groups can serve as members of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development and are elected by the Parties to the convention. A similar range of civil society representatives are invited as observers to the meetings of the Cartagena Convention. For SACEP, no arrangements have been made for the participation of non-state actors.

Relation of Civil Society to MEA Secretariats

84. Secretariats such as that of the CBD and the Basel Convention maintain regular contacts with civil society organizations for exchange of information and views, receipt of documentation and preparation of background papers. The CITES Secretariat works closely with civil society groups, particularly private industry. Wetlands International in the past has assisted the AEWA Secretariat in technical documents for the MOP. The Ramsar Convention Bureau maintains close working relations with NGOs and encourages the participation of stakeholders and local communities. The World Heritage Bureau receives information from representatives of civil society on the state of conservation of cultural and natural properties.

85. The UNFCCC has an IGO Outreach Officer and an NGO Outreach Officer whose roles are to maintain contact with the accredited IGOs and NGOs intra and intersessionally.

86. Civil society has been encouraged to provide inputs to the activities of the Basel Convention Secretariat. The secretariat also participates in activities organized by NGOs and industry associations. The relationship of civil society to the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat has not yet been decided. For the Stockholm Convention, the relationship is primarily limited to the exchange of information.

87. The UNCCD Secretariat is responsible for the accreditation process of NGOs and ensuring an adequate flow of information to NGOs regarding the convention. It also maintains regular contacts with them regarding activities being implemented and required follow-up.

88. The secretariats of regional seas programmes such as the Barcelona and Cartagena Conventions actively foster closer working relations with civil society, the former with its Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development and the latter primarily with biodiversity and marine pollution groups.

Participation of Civil Society in the Implementation of MEAs

89. Conventions such as the CBD and CITES recognize the involvement of all relevant stakeholders as fundamental. In the case of the CBD, particular emphasis is placed on the involvement of indigenous and local communities. In CITES civil society plays an important role in (a) providing technical knowledge, (b) awareness raising, ©assisting the secretariat in communicating with non-parties, (d) promoting implementation in the field and (e) gathering and transmitting information about possible non-compliance. ´The Ramsar Convention encourages the participation of stakeholders, local communities and NGOs in the implementation of the convention. IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM support the implementation of the convention, the first two in a formal advisory capacity and the latter in capacity building. NGOs assist CMS in developing conservation projects that support the implementation of the convention, an in some countries play very important roles in the implementation of relevant national conservation policies. Wetland International executes some projects in support of AEWA. NGOs also assist Parties to ASCOBANS, EUROBATS and AEWA in implementing these agreements at the national level.

90. For the Montreal Protocol, representatives of civil society such as the International Pharmaceutical, Aerosol Consortium (IPAC), the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy, Friends of the Earth, the Pesticide Action Network, the Stockholm Environment Institute and Greenpeace act as catalysts and protagonists for the elimination of ozone depleting substances. They also monitor progress in the implementation of the protocol, identify alternative ozone-friendly substances and propose constructive measures for phasing out ozone depleting substances for the consideration of the Parties.

91. In the Basel Convention civil society plays a central role in its implementation, largely through the provision of scientific and technical expertise. This role has yet to be decided for the Rotterdam Convention. It is expected that civil society will play a role in pressuring governments to ratify and implement the convention and to alert authorities as to possible violations of convention obligations.

92. The decisions of the Parties to the UNCCD on the design and implementation of programmes to combat desertification and/or mitigate the effects of drought are to be taken with the participation of populations and local communities.

93. In regional seas programmes such as the Barcelona Convention and Action Plan, civil society collaborates closely in the implementation of programmes and projects. In the Cartagena Convention they are active in the development of project ideas, the dissemination of information and in generating support from governments. They also assist in monitoring compliance by reporting on the governments to their constituencies.

H. Other Global Conventions Relevant to the Environment, including Regional Conventions of Global Significance

94. This is the second category of conventions, protocols and amendments referred to earlier in paragraph 19. While the first category of MEAs in Table 1 have been largely facilitated or influenced by UNEP, or have developed relations with UNEP, the second category listed in Table 4 have been developed independently of UNEP, with 45% adopted or negotiated before the creation of UNEP.

95. Despite numbering nearly 100 international legally binding instruments, they are neatly divided into 6 clusters. The first consists of the 25 marine pollution conventions, protocols and amendments that are under IMO. The second cluster is comprised of the global oceans-related conventions, such as UNCLOS, that with one exception are under the UN General Secretariat. The third and largest cluster is made up 35 conventions, agreements and protocols on fisheries, of which all but 4 are regional in scope. Unlike the first two clusters, there is no dominant organization that provides the secretariats for these agreements. FAO provides the secretariat for 5 of the regional fisheries bodies and 1 global agreement. The UN General Secretariat serves as the secretariat for two of the most important global agreements—the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas and the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and High Migratory Fish Stocks. The remaining regional agreements, which make up the bulk of the cluster, have independent regional fisheries bodies as their secretariats. A fourth but small cluster of plant conventions, with one exception, has secretariats provided by FAO. The fifth cluster is the 10 occupational hazards conventions that all fall under ILO. The sixth cluster is the nuclear-related conventions and protocols that with few exceptions are under IAEA.

96. To different degrees these clusters interact with the clusters of the core environmental conventions and related agreements. The strongest interaction, which has been described above in different sections, is between the IMO marine pollution conventions and the regional seas conventions and action plans. The two sets of protocols of the regional seas programmes on marine pollution from oil and hazardous substances and on marine pollution from dumping by ships and aircraft were negotiated in consultation with IMO and are fully complementary to the global marine pollution agreements.

97. To a lesser degree there has been interaction between the regional seas conventions and the UN oceans conventions. In fact, the regional seas programmes were developed as complimentary instruments to UNCLOS. While the legal office of the UNCLOS Secretariat has played an advisory role in the development of regional seas conventions and protocols, this support has unfortunately been sporadic in recent years.

98. There has been irregular and very limited interaction between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the regional fisheries conventions and agreements. The regional seas conventions and the regional fisheries bodies in the Baltic Sea have had cooperation. In one unique case, the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS), serves as the secretariat for the Lima Convention and Action Plan for the Southeast Pacific and the corresponding regional fisheries agreement, which is not listed in Table 4. Otherwise, the interaction between the two sets of agreements is practically non-existent. However, efforts are underway to change this. UNEP and FAO in July 2000 began collaboration in the preparation of a paper entitled "Ecosystem-based management of fisheries: opportunities for collaboration between regional seas conventions and regional fisheries bodies". The paper was presented to the Third Global Meeting of Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans convened by UNEP in Monaco in November of 2000 and its recommendations for cooperation between the two sets of agreements were endorsed and expanded. After being revised to reflect the changes recommended in Monaco, the paper was presented to the Second Meeting of FAO and NON-FAO Fisheries Bodies convened by FAO in Rome in February 2001. Unlike the Monaco meeting, which endorsed specific actions for promoting collaboration, the Rome meeting only accepted in principle the need for collaboration between the two sets of agreements. UNEP and FAO will consult on the follow-up required.

99. The collaboration between the plant conventions under FAO with the cluster of biodiversity-related conventions has been restricted primarily to CBD which is addressing the sustainable use of biodiversity and its components which includes species and their genetic resources, as well as ecosystems.

Table 4

Global Conventions Relevant to the Environment, including Regional Conventions of Global Significance

MEA[1]	Date adopted	Secretariat/ responsible body
Marine Pollution Conventions[1]		
1. International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil (amended in 1962 and 1969)	1954	IMO
2. International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (amended 1976, 1981, 1984)	1969	IMO
3. International Convention Relating to Intervention in the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties	1969	IMO
4. Amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, Concerning Tank Arrangements and Limitation of Tank Size	1971	IMO
5. Amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, Concerning the Protection of the Great Barrier Reef	1971	IMO
6. International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage (amended 1976, 1984, 1994)	1971	IOPCF
7. Convention Relating to Civil Liability in the Field of Maritime Carriage of Nuclear Material	1971	IMO
8. Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft (amended 1983, 1989 and again in 1989)	1972	IMO
9. Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (amended)	1972	IMO
10. Protocol Relating to Intervention in the High Seas in Cases of Marine Pollution by Substances Other than Oil	1973	IMO
11. International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL)	1973	IMO
12. Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims	1976	IMO
13.Protocol to the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage	1976	IMO
14. Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), 1973	1978	IMO
15. Amendments to Annexes to the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter Concerning Incineration at Sea	1978	IMO
16. Agreement for Cooperation in Dealing with the Pollution of the North Sea by Oil and Other Harmful Substances	1983	IMO
17. Protocol to Amend the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage.	1984	IMO
18. International Convention on Salvage	1989	IMO
19. International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation	1990	IMO
20. Protocol of 1992 to Amend the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1969	1992	IMO
21. Protocol of 1992 to Amend the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution	1992	IMO

Damage		
22. 1996 Protocol to the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, 1972	1996	IMO
23. Protocol of 1996 to amend the Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims, 1976	1996	IMO
24. International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea	1996	IMO
25. Protocol to the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, 1972	1996	IMO
Oceans-related conventions		
26. Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone	1958	UN
27. Convention on the High Seas	1958	UN
28. Convention on the Continental Shelf	1958	UN
29. Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (amended 1970 and 1975)	1964	ICES[2]
30. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea	1982	UN
31. Agreement Relating to Implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea	1994	UN
32. Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and High Migratory Fish Stocks	1995	UN
Fisheries Conventions[3]		
33. International Convention on the Regulation of Whaling	1946	IWC
34. Agreement for the Establishment of a General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean	1948	FAO
35. Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission	1949	IATTC
36. Agreement for the Establishment of a General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean (amended 1963 and 1976)	1949	FAO
37. Protocol Amending the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean (1952)	1978	NPAFC
38. Protocol to the International Convention on the Regulation of Whaling	1956	IWC
39. Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas	1958	UN
40. Convention Concerning Fishing in the Black Sea	1959	
41. Agreement concerning Co-operation in Marine Fishing	1962	
42. Agreement on the Protection of the Salmon in the Baltic Sea	1962	
43. Fisheries Convention	1964	
44. International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (amended 1984 and 1992)	1966	ICCAT
45. Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic	1967	
46. Agreement Establishing the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center	1967	
47. Convention on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the South-East Atlantic	1969	FAO
48. Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources in the Baltic Sea and Belts	1973	IBFSCS
49. South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency Convention	1979	SPFFA
50. Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the North-East Atlantic Fisheries	1980	Canada
51. Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources	1980	CCAMLR

52. Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in North-East Atlantic Fisheries[5]	1980	NEAFC
53. Convention for the Conservation of Salmon in the North Atlantic Ocean	1982	NASCO
54. Amendments to the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources in the Baltic Sea and the Belts	1982	IBFSCS
55. Eastern Pacific Ocean Tuna Fishing Agreement	1983	Council
56. Protocol relating to Modification of the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas	1984	
57. South Pacific Fisheries Treaty	1987	
58. Agreement on the Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia and the Pacific	1988	FAO
59. Convention for the Prohibition of Fishing with Long Drift Nets in the South Pacific	1989	SPFFA
60. Convention on Fisheries Cooperation among African States bordering the Atlantic Ocean	1991	FAO
61. Agreement of Cooperation in research, Conservation and Management of Marine Mammals in the North Atlantic	1992	NAMMCO
62. Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean	1992	NPAFC
63. Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna	1993	CCSBT
64. Agreement for the Establishment of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission	1993	FAO
65. Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas	1993	FAO
66. Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea	1994	ICCAT
67. Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and High Migratory Fish Stocks	1995	UN
Plant conventions		
68. International Plant Protection Convention (text revised in 1979 and 1997)	1951	FAO
69. Plant Protection Agreement for Asia and the Pacific Region (amended 1967, 1969, 1979, 1983, 1983 and 1990)	1956	FAO
70. Convention Placing the International Poplar Commission within the Framework of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	1959	FAO
71. International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (amended 1972, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1991)	1961	IUPNVP
72. Amendment of the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific Region	1967	FAO
73. Amendment to the Convention Placing the International Poplar Commission with the Framework of FAO	1967	FAO
ILO occupational hazards conventions		
74. Convention Concerning the Protection of Workers against Ionizing Radiations	1960	ILO
75. Convention Concerning Protection against Hazards of Poisoning Arising from Benzene	1971	ILO
76. Convention Concerning Prevention and Control of Occupational Hazards Caused by Carcinogenic Substances and Agents	1974	ILO
77. Convention Concerning the Protection of Workers against Occupational Hazards due to Air Pollution, Noise and Vibration	1977	ILO
78. Convention Concerning Occupational Safety and Health and the Working Environment	1981	ILO
79. Convention Concerning Occupational Health Services	1985	ILO

80. Convention Concerning Safety in the Use of Asbestos	1986	ILO
81. Convention Concerning Safety in the Use of Chemicals at Work	1990	ILO
82. Convention Concerning the Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents	1993	ILO
83. Convention Concerning Safety and Health in Mines	1995	ILO
Nuclear-related conventions[6]		
84. Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy (amended 1964, 1968, 1982)	1960	OECD
85. Convention Supplementary to the Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy (amended in 1964, 1974 and 1982)	1963	OECD
86. Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage	1963	IAEA
87. Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water	1963	
88. Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof	1971	
89. Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material	1979	IAEA
90. Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident	1986	IAEA
91. Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency	1986	IAEA
92. Joint Protocol relating to the Application of the Vienna Convention [on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage] and the Paris Convention [on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy]	1988	IAEA
93. Convention on Nuclear Safety	1994	IAEA
94. Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty	1996	
95. Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management	1997	IAEA
96. Protocol to Amend the Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage	1997	IAEA
97. Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage	1997	IAEA

[1]There is a total of 34 conventions, protocols and Amendments related to IMO. Not all are listed here.
[2]Established in 1902.
[3]As in the case of the regional seas conventions and action plans, the regional fisheries conventions form a global mosaic of agreements that focus on the development and management of fisheries. Unlike the multisectoral regional seas programmes, regional fisheries agreements can be very species specific.
[4]The convention was initially adopted in 1951.
[5]Superseded the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Convention, 1959.
[6]There are a total of 12 conventions and protocols related to IAEA. Not all are listed here.

100. Interaction between the core environmental conventions and the cluster of ILO occupational hazards conventions has been limited for the moment to the Basel Convention on the issue of occupational health. However, opportunities for cooperation between the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions and the ILO conventions should be examined more systematically.

101. Some interaction has taken place between the core environmental conventions and related agreements and the IAEA nuclear-related conventions, but very little. One exception has been the Basel Convention, which cooperates closely with IAEA, in particular in the development of IAEA's Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, as well as on the development of technical guidelines by the Technical Working Group. One regional seas convention, the Lima Convention, has a protocol on nuclear contamination. Radionuclides are one of the 9 land-based sources of pollution addressed by the GPA. IAEA is responsible for the provision of information in the GPA Clearing-house related to this source pollutant.

II. Review of Strengths and Weaknesses of Existing Arrangements

102. The synthesis of strengths and weaknesses of existing arrangements as regards MEAs is based on the responses to the questionnaire provided by the secretariats in Annexes 1 to 20.

A. Strengths

Clustering and Opportunities for Synergies

103. The core environmental conventions within each cluster have much in common and opportunities exist for closer cooperation. Opportunities for collaboration appear strongest for those MEAs within the cluster of biodiversity-related conventions. In this regard, the secretariat of CMS recommended closer involvement in the cluster with IWC. The MEAs within the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions cluster are also open to increasing cooperation, as are those in the regional seas cluster.

104. Opportunities for collaboration along functional rather than substantive cluster lines also exist. Because they are trade-related instruments conventions such as CITES, the Montreal Protocol, the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention have much in common: implementation and enforcement issues, identification of materials in the Harmonized System of the World Customs Organization, and training and capacity building.

105. On programmatic issues of a crosscutting nature that MEAs could collaborate on, the following were proposed:

- Implementation and compliance at the country level;
- Common problems of the trade-related MEAs
- Capacity building for state of the environment assessment, risk assessment and subsequent decision-making, including a better link between science and policy

106. The dialogue between MEAs, particularly those that are trade-related instruments, and WTO needs to continue.

107. Opportunities exist for MEAs to work together in capacity building programmes related to the development of national legislation that supports the implementation of conventions and protocols at the country level. On cross-cutting issues such as the prevention and combating of illegal traffic, MEAs should cooperate with other international organizations like Interpol and the World Customs Organization.

Opportunities for Scientific Cooperation

108. The opportunity exists for closer cooperation among the scientific bodies of MEAs. One MEA secretariat felt that the chairs of these bodies should meet periodically to maximize the benefits of the limited human and financial resources available for their functioning and operation. It went further in proposing that a comprehensive report integrating the findings of the different scientific assessments should be issued on a biennial basis. This would facilitate the work of governments both locally and globally.

109. Problematic issues between MEAs need cooperation where there exists scientific commonality, such as linked issues in ozone protection and climate change. This is also true for used ozone-depleting substances traded under the Montreal Protocol and exempted from treatment as hazardous waste under the Basel Convention.

110. Opportunities for collaboration at the scientific level among biodiversity-related conventions and among the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions was viewed positively by several MEAs. It was felt the exchange of scientific data and information should be encouraged.

Increase in Arrangements for Cooperation among Conventions

111. The rise in MOUs between MEAs in recent years described in chapter I concretely demonstrates a growing political will and commitment by MEAs, particularly within the biodiversity-related conventions cluster and the cluster of regional seas conventions and related international agreements, to work together in a more integrated manner. In several cases, this is leading to the development of joint programmes of work in areas of common interest, such as between CBD and the Ramsar Convention, CBD and CITES, CBD and the regional seas conventions and action plans, and CBD and the GPA. The development of MOUs and other cooperative arrangements are being endorsed and supported by the decisions of the COPs of some of these agreements. A joint work programme between CMS (as lead partner for migratory species) and CBD is under development and it is hoped that it will be ready for endorsement at the COPs of the two conventions in 2002.

B. Weaknesses

112. Cooperation among conventions within clusters may be hampered by differences in stages of implementation, variety in scope, speed of development and different memberships. However, this might present opportunities for the more developed agreements to assist the less developed as has been the case with the twinning arrangements between regional seas conventions.

Reluctance of some MEAs to Cooperate with Others

113. One convention secretariat felt that considerable lip service is paid to the synergies paradigm, but when it comes to implementation, many conventions continue to be inward looking and are reluctant to share or give away part of what they perceive as their "sovereignty".

Inadequate Attention to the Harmonization of National Reporting among MEAs

114. Greater attention needs to be given to the harmonization of national reporting among MEAs. Little has been done in this area. The joint secretariat of the Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol and the secretariat of the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund have had some success in streamlining the reports of Parties to the Montreal Protocol and Parties that are beneficiaries of the Multilateral Fund. However, in the case of the Montreal Protocol the specificity of the reporting requirements do not allow for harmonization with the national reports of other MEAs. A new initiative supported by UNEP has been launched for the streamlining of national reporting of the 5 global biodiversity-related conventions (CBD, CITES, CMS, Ramsar Convention and World Heritage Convention) and 2 regional seas conventions with biodiversity-related protocols (the Barcelona Convention and the Cartagena Convention), and will be implemented in a pilot project involving voluntary Parties. Attention needs to be given on harmonizing the reporting of trade-related MEAs in areas of common interest, such as work linked to customs and port authorities.

Inadequate Implementation and Coordination of MEAs at the National Level

115. Although coordination among MEAs has focused on cooperation among MEA COPs and MOPs, secretariats and their subsidiary bodies, insufficient attention is being given to the more critical issue of coordinating implementation of MEAs at the national level. Moreover, the implementation of some conventions is often spread out among different national institutions, sometimes resulting in conflicting priorities in national governments. Oftentimes, human and financial resources at the national level are inadequate for implementation of a convention, protocol or related agreement.

Inadequate Compliance and Enforcement

116. On the issue of enforcement and compliance, some such as the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund felt there was inconsistency at the national level. Some agreements (Montreal Protocol and Ramsar Convention) lack verification mechanisms. The Ramsar Convention and the Barcelona Convention secretariats felt that weak and ineffective national focal points constitute the main impediment for the implementation of their conventions. The Basel Convention's Legal Working Group is looking into the establishment of a mechanism for implementation and compliance.

117. The CITES Secretariat presented strong views on the issue of enforcement and compliance. It felt that a holistic approach is required that emphasizes adequate financial resources, the establishment of specialized teams, access to technical expertise and the development of core skills. Multi-agency and multi-level task forces need to be established at the national level and template supportive legislation needs to be developed. The role of non-State actors such as NGOs and he private sector in relation to compliance and enforcement needs to be clearly defined. Verification mechanisms are required to analyze the reasons for and responses to compliance and enforcement problems. Examples of successful compliance and enforcement need to be identified and shared with other MEAs, including analysis of the key operational skills that led to success.

118. Closely related to the need for a holistic approach is the concern of the Barcelona Convention secretariat that within the biodiversity cluster, including the biodiversity protocols of regional seas conventions, there often is a disjointed approach by 4 to 5 conventions to the conservation and management of the same species. This can result in an incoherent compliance and enforcement regarding a particular species.

119. Inadequate funding for some conventions such as CMS and ASCOBANS was perceived as a major obstacle for instituting effective compliance and enforcement mechanisms.

120. Once convention secretariat proposed the establishment of an inspection mechanism on enforcement and compliance under UNEP.

Lack of Environmental and Performance Indicators for Measuring the Effectiveness of an MEA

121. The overwhelming majority of MEAs do not have scientifically or technically based indicators for appraising the performance of the MEA in improving the quality and sustainability of the environment. The Montreal Protocol has environmental and performance indicators for measuring its effectiveness in stabilizing the concentration of ozone depleting substances in the upper stratosphere. The first looks at the stabilization of the upper stratosphere and the latter at compliance by each Party. Perhaps more than any other MEA, the Barcelona Convention through its Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development has adopted the most comprehensive and practical indicators comprised of a set of 130 national and regional indicators, covering a range of subjects such as marine pollution, economic activities such as tourism and demography, among others. CITES uses the Significant Trade Review process in assessing its effectiveness in bringing about the sustainable use of biotic resources. The UNCCD through its Committee on Science and Technology (CST) continues to work on the development of benchmarks and indicators. Through its Global POPs Mónitoring Network and the POPs Master Plan, the Stockholm Convention will have the baseline for performance monitoring. The Ramsar Convention has also worked on the development of indicators, but it has proven difficult to devise an agreed suite of indicators that can be readily applied in all circumstances and in a globally consistent manner. Likewise, its Parties are required to have in place the use of indicators the levels of reporting are very inadequate. In several of its 5 thematic programmes—marine and coastal biodiversity, agricultural biodiversity, forest biodiversity, inland waters biodiversity and dry and sub-humid lands—the CBD is promoting the development of indicators. The Basel Convention is currently exploring the development of hazardous waste indicators and to this end is collaborating with the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

Issues that are not Being Addressed Effectively by MEAs

122. According to the MEA secretariats, there are significant gaps in terms of issues not being addressed effectively. Among these are:

- Control of new ozone-depleting substances
- Impact of climate change on migratory waterbirds
- Commercial fishing from an environmental perspective
- The impact of high seas fisheries on marine species such as mammals and birdlife
- Lack of sites on the World Heritage list nominated for their marine values
- Coastal zone management
- Information policies
- Impact of population, poverty and urbanization on coastal resources
- Forests
- Tropical timber trade
- Freshwater resources
- River ecosystems
- Minimization of the production of wastes, including hazardous wastes
- Prevention and combating of illegal traffic in substances, animals and plants covered by MEAs
- The role of poverty and corruption in relation to environmental management practices
- The failure to identify and make available alternatives to bad environmental practices
- The failure to quantify and publicize the economic benefits from good environmental practices
- Economic instruments and incentives
- Practical indicators for measuring performance of MEAs
- Compliance and enforcement

Inadequate Funding for Selected MEAs

123. Some MEAs, including the Ramsar Convention, CITES, CMS, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS and several regional seas conventions and action plans, strongly feel that inadequate funding hampers the effective implementation of their agreements, including the required support needed by many developing countries. This includes inability or difficulties on the part of some to access support from the GEF. Particularly affected by inadequate funding are the development of synergies and cooperative activities among conventions. Cooperation among all MEAs and international organizations such as the World Bank and the World Intellectual Property Organization in the field of transfer of new technologies to developing countries and countries with economies in transition could increase dramatically the level of implementation of MEAs.

C. The Role of UNEP in Preparing a Consolidated Overview of the Effectiveness of Implementation of MEAs

124. Some MEA secretariats such as the Basel Convention, the Barcelona Convention and the GPA felt that UNEP should have as one of its mandates the monitoring of the implementation of MEAs. One expressed the view that UNEP should periodically report on this subject to the Governing Council, its Committee of Permanent Representatives and annually to the UN General Assembly. This, however, would need to be done in close cooperation with the various MEAs and should be done through an open and wide-ranging consultative process. Another felt that a comparative analysis of MEA implementation should be undertaken by UNEP with a view to identifying concrete lessons that could assist MEAs in their work. In evaluating the overall implementation of MEAs, CMS, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS felt that special emphasis should be placed on crosscutting issues that go beyond the responsibilities and competence of any single agreement, thus acting on behalf and in the interest of a multitude of MEAs and their respective Parties. The ACCOBAMS Secretariat felt that any such overview by UNEP should be used to identify subjects for synergies, overlapping and gaps with a view to improving coordination at the thematic level. The World Heritage Convention was of the view that UNEP should facilitate exchange of information among MEAs, in addition to playing a coordinating role.

125. One agreement—ACCOBAMS—felt that for UNEP to effectively perform the above functions it needs to strengthen its work in promoting collaboration among MEAs and in providing strategic support to their implementation.

126. Four representatives of convention secretariats felt that UNEP should not have this role unless invited by the Conference of the Parties.

III. Financing International Environmental Governance: the Situation of MEAs

127. Information in this chapter is mainly based on the responses to the questionnaire on international environmental governance provided by the secretariats of the 20 MEAs listed in Table 5. Their completed questionnaires are found in Annexes 1- 20. These conventions and agreements are all classified in the same category, i.e. as core environmental conventions and related agreements of global significance, and represent fifty percent of the forty in that category (Table 1).

A. Sources of Funding for MEAs

128. Although the priorities of MEAs differ, strengthening the capacity of Parties or member states to meet their obligations and commitments through financial assistance ranks as a high priority for all MEAs. MEAs must also find ways to finance the operation of their Secretariats and their programmes of work, special projects, and other activities. This is mainly accomplished through the use of traditional mandatory and voluntary trust funds, one or more of which may be established by an MEA, some for specialised purposes. Other sources of funding are also accessed, such as the formal multilateral financing mechanisms intended to address specific subject areas, (the Multilateral Fund for the Montreal Protocol (MLF), the Global Environment Fund (GEF), and the Kyoto Protocol climate-related mechanisms). The World Bank and Regional Development Banks, and bilateral arrangements with donor countries, foundations such as the UN Foundation, private sector donors, and NGOs, provide other financing opportunities.

129. Most MEAs have financial mechanisms in place, either on a permanent or interim basis. The GEF is the principal financial mechanism on an interim basis for the CBD and the Stockholm Convention, and the designated financial mechanism for the UNFCCC. The financial mechanism of the Stockholm Convention will not be determined before their first COP. Some MEAs, such as ACCOBAMS, UNCCD and GPA, have not yet established their financial mechanisms, and therefore are largely or totally dependent on voluntary contributions. Financing opportunities for MEAs can be divided into the following groups:

Traditional Mandatory and Voluntary Trust Funds

130. Most MEAs have trust funds supported by contracting or concerned Parties for funding secretariat operations and the implementation of work programme activities. Traditional trust funds are financed either by mandatory or voluntary contributions from Parties, or both [see Table 5 [and Table 6]]. Generally only developed countries and Countries with Economies in Transition (CEITs), are required to make mandatory contributions, while voluntary contributions can come from any Party. A high percentage of the voluntary contributions to MEAs is provided by a small number of donor countries. Competition for external funds among MEAs, as well as UNEP, should be avoided. Voluntary contributions may be on a one-time basis or recurring, and frequently are earmarked for specific purposes.

131. Voluntary contributions are rare and increasingly difficult to obtain. Donor countries have made several voluntary contributions to AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, Ramsar and the Stockholm Convention "POPs Club". UNF recently allocated US$ 40 million for natural World Heritage sites with a biodiversity component. The Barcelona Convention receives voluntary contributions from the European Union and subsidies for specific programmes of work. Parties may contribute to other activities such as assistance in hosting of meetings. Some projects are financed through external and multilateral funds such as GEF, LIFE, and the Mediterranean Economic Development Assistance (MEDA).

132. Member states of the Cartagena Convention give extraordinary contributions to the Caribbean Trust Fund. Other parties can co-finance projects or activities with grants or other forms of participation (e.g., "in-kind"). The Co-ordination Unit receives voluntary contributions from the States Parties to the Convention and from any other country. Individual agencies of regional and extra-regional governments (e.g., US AID, SIDA) are contributors to the Programme. The Unit also has successfully acquired GEF and UNEP resources and different bilateral development organisations (e.g., Inter-American Development Bank) for specific projects.

133. The Secretariat of the Basel Convention receives regularly voluntary contributions from a non-Party, and is exploring possible financial mechanisms, such as contribution by companies or foundations, access to GEF Funding (through UNEP), enlargement of the Technical Cooperation Trust Fund (BD Trust Fund) of CBD, regional development banks, green funds and other new equity funds being established by private banks.

134. Some MEAs determine the rate of both mandatory and voluntary contributions on the basis of the UN scale of assessment, modified as required to suit their individual needs. The final assessment rates are subject to approval by Parties. Generally an upper limit on assessed contributions has been established, and this has been frequently set at 25% following the UN rules. In some cases a lower limit on assessed contributions has also been set, defined either in absolute or fixed percentage terms. One MEA, the World Heritage Convention, receives assessed contributions based on 1% of Parties' UNESCO dues. Another MEA, SACEP uses the SAARC scale of assessment, which specifies a maximum assessment rate of 35% and a minimum of 5%.

The Global Environment Facility (GEF)

135. Global Environment Facility (GEF): GEF was created in 1991, to promote international cooperation and foster actions to protect the global environment. Earth Summit in 1992, in Agenda 21, recognized GEF as a means to achieve sustainable development by providing funding to developing countries and countries with economies in transition for project activities targeting global benefits in one or more of four focal areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters and ozone layer protection. Land degradation, particularly deforestation and desertification activities, as they relate to the four focal areas are also eligible for funding. Therefore not all MEAs are eligible for GEF funding. According to the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility of 1994, the three implementing agencies (World Bank, UNDP and UNEP) are accountable to the GEF Council for their GEF-related activities and for the implementation of operational policies, strategies, programmes and decisions of the Council within their respective areas of competence. Countries with Economies in Transition, which are not eligible to receive Multilateral Fund assistance, may apply to the GEF for such assistance.

The Multilateral Fund for the Montreal Protocol

136. The Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol was established by the London Amendment to the Protocol which was adopted in June 1990 and which entered into force in August 1992. The Fund has been in operation since 1 January 1993 and was preceded by the interim Multilateral Fund that was in operation from 1 January 1991 to 31c December 1992. The Multilateral Fund provides resources to enable compliance with the control measures of the Protocol and its amendments by Parties, mainly classified as developing countries which meet specific criteria under Article 5 of the Protocol, commonly referred to as Article 5 countries. The Fund is financed by contributions made by industrialized developed countries on the basis of the United Nations scale of assessments. It is mandated to meet the incremental costs of Article 5 countries' compliance with the control measures on a grant or concessional loan basis based on an "Indicative List of Categories of Incremental Costs" and other decisions of the Parties as well as policies and guidelines adopted by the Fund's Executive Committee. Financial assistance totaling over US$1.1 billion has been provided to 123 developing countries. Contributions to the Fund have been received at a rate of 85 percent of the pledged levels. The initial Fund of US$240 million for the period 1991-1993 has been replenished three times--US$455 million (1994-1996), US$466 million (1997-1999) and US$440 million (2000-2002).

137. The Multilateral Fund is managed by an Executive Committee that is comprised of 14 parties to the Protocol, 7 from industrialized (non-Article 5) countries and 7 from developing (Article 5) countries with equal voting powers. The Executive Committee is charged with the development of operational policies, guidelines and criteria for project eligibility, approval of implementing agencies' business plans and work programmes, approval of industrial conversion projects, allocation of resources, and monitoring and evaluation of performance. The Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund assists the Executive Committee in the discharge if these functions.

138. The Multilateral Fund Secretariat's mandate includes the development of the three-year plan and budget, resource allocation, review and assessment of all funding requests, monitoring and evaluating activities of implementing agencies, elaboration of policy papers and reports for the Executive Committee and providing liaison between the3 Committee, Governments and implementing agencies. The Secretariat is located in Montreal with the Government of Canada bearing the incremental costs and staff salary differential (between Nairobi and Montreal) in addition to its assessed contribution, as part of a hosting agreement.

139. Projects and activities supported by the Multilateral Fund are implemented by four international agencies: the World Bank, UNEP, UNDP and UNIDO. Up to 20 percent of a donor's total contribution may be used for bilateral cooperation with Article 5 countries. Hence some bilateral donor agencies also develop projects and activities for approval by the Executive Committee for implementation as bilateral cooperation and the costs of the project are credited against the contribution of the donor country.

Joint Implementation (JI)

140 Joint Implementation is project-based activity under the Kyoto Protocol in which one country can receive emission reduction credits when it funds a project in another country where the emissions are actually reduced. Specific modalities and rules for the operation of JI are yet to be discussed and agreed. Given the complexity of the issues involved, considerable time would be required before its operationalization.

Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)

141. The purpose of the CDM is to assist Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that are not included in its Annex I of the UNFCCC (developing countries) in achieving sustainable development and in contributing to the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC, which is to "stabilize the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system". At the same time CDM should assist the countries in Annex I (developed countries and countries with economies in transition) in achieving compliance with their quantified emission limitation commitment under the Kyoto Protocol. CDM will be carried out as joint clean development projects between Annex I and non-Annex I countries. The operational details of CDM, such as procedures for verification and certification of emission reduction, and modalities and procedures for operationalizing the CDM, are being worked out by the Parties to the UNFCCC, and proposals will be discussed and eventually agreed by the Conference of the Parties. According to some estimates, the net value of CDM market in 2010, or the net gain of non-Annex I countries, is estimated to be in the range of $US 200 million to 2.5 billion. According to several estimates, the net carbon emission reduction would be between the range of 67 to 200 million tonnes in the year 2010.

B. Administration of MEA Funds

142. Traditional trust funds are generally administered by the international organizations that provide the Secretariats. These organizations have the responsibility of effectively managing the resources of the MEAs, and may assist them in programming, budgeting, accounting and meeting all their financial reporting requirements. The programming and budgeting may entail firstly assisting the Secretariats with the preparation, review and justification of the respective programmes presented to their Conference of Parties. Secondly, the Secretariats may be assisted with the design and revision of projects to implement the objectives of their MEAs. The guidelines for project design and the approval process may be those laid down by trust fund administrators, or by the parties themselves.

143. Most MEAs have agreed financial rules adopted by the Parties, and financial rules and regulations are strictly applied to trust funds. Trustees are able to provide guidelines for the transactions and accounts of the conventions and agreements, including systems and facilities that allow them to undertake their programmatic activities effectively. Budgets for MEAs' proposed activities should be in line with the contributions to their trust funds. The accounts and finances of the MEAs and their Secretariats are audited and reported.

144. For UNEP-administered conventions such as the Basel Convention, CBD, CITES, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), the Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol, the Barcelona Convention (Mediterranean), the Cartagena Convention (Wider Caribbean) and the Nairobi Convention (East African regional seas), UNEP serves as the Trustee. For international agreements such as the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities, UNEP as the Secretariat of the GPA administers the trust fund for financing the operations of the secretariat in The Hague.

C. Funding MEA Secretariats, Programmes and Activities

145. Budgets are proposed by the Secretariats, both for the operations of the Secretariat itself, and for the programme of work. Budgets are negotiated and agreed to at meetings and conferences of Parties. An exception is the Montreal Protocol, where the total funding for each triennium is negotiated at Meetings

of the Parties. Annual budgets from the triennium replenishment for the MLF and work plans for each year are then approved by the Executive Committee (EXCOM) for the Multilateral Fund for the Montreal Protocol, and then ultimately approved by the Meeting of the Parties. Budgetary periods of two or three years are common, with the fiscal year equating to the calendar year in all cases.

146. Conferences and meetings of Parties are financed either through Secretariats core budgets, or through separate budgets earmarked for this purpose. In most cases, the host country will cover most or all of the costs of meetings when volunteering to host meetings. Special meetings and activities are financed either with core funds, voluntary contributions, private sector contributions, or funds secured from international financial institutions. Part or all of the cost of operating an MEA Secretariat may be covered by the host country, under terms, which are specified in a legally binding host-country agreement.

147. Developing countries are the recipients of programme funds to enable them to implement their MEA obligations. In some cases funds are allocated on either a grant or a concessional loan basis. Concessional loans are loans made under favourable conditions, such as low interest rates or long pay pack periods. Essentially all trust fund money that has been allocated by MEAs to date for programme work has been allocated on a grant basis.

148. Table 5 shows the budgets of MEAs including funds for secretariat costs and programme activities (including meetings and funds for developing country participation), for the years 2000 and 2001. No analysis of the information in table 5 will be done until the Table is further refined.

Table 5: Budget of MEAs (millions US$) for years 2000 and 2001, showing secretariat and programme costs from the different financial mechanisms[1]

(m) = mandatory contributions, (v) = voluntary contributions, (av)=Agreed voluntary

MEA	Financial Mechanism	Secretariat Budget		Programme Budget		Totals		Notes	
		2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001		
Atmosphere Conventions									
UNFCCC	• trust fund • GEF	12 (m)	12 (m)						
Vienna Convention and its Montreal Protocol	• Trust Fund for the Vienna Convention • Trust Fund for the Montreal Protocol • Multilateral Fund • GEF	3.7 (av) 3 (m)	3.7 (av)	 120 (m) 140	 120 (m)			• App figure US$3,700,000 per year • Av- US$120 million	
Totals									
Biodiversity-related Conventions									
CBD	• BY Trust Fund • Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BE) • Special Voluntary Trust Fund (BZ) • GEF • Host country		8.6 (m) 2.0 (v)		2.6 (v) 2.0 (v)				
CITES	• CITES Trust Fund		3.2 (m)		2.3 (m)			Need to see attachment for external funding	
CMS	• Trust Fund • Voluntary							Need to see Annex 9 – 2001-2 budget	
AEWA	• Trust Fund • Voluntary	0.38 (m)	0.39 (m)						
EUROBATS	• Trust Fund • Voluntary contributions		0.19 (m)	DM50,000	DM50,000				
ASCOBANS	• Trust Fund • Voluntary contributions		0.17 (m)	DM 50,000 SK100,000					
ACCOBAMS								No decisions have been taken by the Parties yet	

Ramsar	• Core budget	SF 3m (m)	SF 3m (m)	3m (v)	3m (v)			Average for each is given as core:SF3.1 million - need to split to secretariat and programme costs;	
World Heritage Convention	• Trust Fund • World Heritage Fund • Extrabudgetary resources • UNF • UNDP • Parties • Private sector	1.9		0.53 5.6 (m&v) 3.8				US$40 million allocated by UNF to a project on natural world heritage sites with a BD component	
Totals									
Chemicals and Hazardous Wastes Conventions									
Basel Convention	• Trust Fund for the Implementation of the Basel Convention • Technical Coop. Trust Fund	4.2 (av)	4.2 (av)	0.3 (m) 1.9 (v)	0.3 (m) 2.1m (v)	4.5 2.6 (v)	4.5 2.1 (v)	Technical cooperation trust fund assists developing countries and other countries in need of assistance to implement the convention.	
Rotterdam Convention	• Trust Fund	2.3 (v)	2.3 (v)					Total for 2001 is mentioned as 2.4m	
Stockholm Convention	• Trust Fund "POPs Club" • GEF – interim financial mechanism • Others	3.5 (v)	3.5 (v)					Year1 is mentioned as 3.6m and year2 and onwards, 3.5m	
Totals									
Land Conventions									
UNCCD	Trust Fund Special Trust Fund No access to formal financial mechanism			6.8 (m) 4.4 (v)	6.8 (m)			Total programme budget for 2000-1 is mentioned as 13.7m	
Totals									
Regional Seas Conventions and Related Agreements									
Barcelona Convention	• Med. Trust Fund • Voluntary • GEF,LIFE,MEDA	1.3 (m) 0.4 (v)	1.3 (m) 0.4 (v)	0.9 (m)	0.9 (m)	0.22 (v)	0.22 (v)		

Cartagena Convention	• Caribbean Trust Fund • Extraordinary contributions • Co-financing of projects	1 (av)	1.4 (av)	0.92 (av)	0.54 (av)				
South Asian Seas	• South Asian Seas Trust Fund • Voluntary for projects	0.09 (av)							
GPA	• Trust Funds and counterpart contributions	0.97 (v)	0.97 (v)	0.7 (v)	0.3 (v)				
Totals									

[1]This table has not been finalized and will be subject to further revisions based on inputs received from MEA secretariats.

IV. Issues and Options

149. As was stated in the Introduction, this paper has focused on the status of environmental conventions and related agreements. In other words, this paper is meant to be descriptive and not prescriptive concerning international environmental governance as it relates to MEAs. It has relied largely on information provided by MEA secretariats in response to the questionnaire agreed upon at the 9th Meeting on Coordination of Conventions The 9th Meeting agreed on a process for involving MEAs in the follow-up to UNEP Governing Council decision 21/21, including a meeting of MEAs immediately following the first meeting of the Intergovernmental Group of Ministers that would review this paper in New York on 18 April 2001. Consequently, the elaboration of options concerning improved international environmental governance were to be addressed more appropriately in subsequent drafts or papers. Nevertheless, in responding to the questionnaire, views were presented that lead to some general recommendations for improving international environmental governance. . A Third Consultative Meeting of MEAs was convened through a teleconference on 4 July, 2001 and some of the comments received from MEA secretariats are also reflected in this chapter.

150. Most proposals for enhancing international environmental governance focused on coordination among MEAs on substantive grounds and not along restructuring at the institutional level.

A. Clustering of MEAs

151. Several of the secretariats felt that that closer cooperation and opportunities for synergies should be promoted at the cluster level. This is particularly so for the chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions, the biodiversity-related conventions, and the regional seas conventions and related agreements clusters. The secretariats of the multi-sectoral regional seas conventions and action plans with their biodiversity-related and hazardous substances protocols and annexes are particularly keen to be involved in mutually supportive activities within the biodiversity-related conventions and chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions clusters.

152. Other secretariats felt that opportunities for cooperating and synergies on specific non-cluster thematic and functional issues also exist and should be further developed. The Montreal Protocol Secretariat, for example, feels that beyond the obvious interlinked issues in ozone protection and climate change, there is a strong linkage with the Basel Convention on the issue of ozone-depleting substances traded under the Montreal Protocol that are exempted from treatment as a hazardous waste under the Basel Convention. The Basel Convention secretariat is ready to work with the Rotterdam Convention, the Stockholm Convention, the Montreal Protocol and CITES on implementation and enforcement issues, the development of a harmonized customs code system, and training and capacity building activities. CITES supports promoting practical synergies among the other trade-related MEAs: the Montreal Protocol, the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention. The Rotterdam Convention secretariat feels that consideration should be given to the exchange of experiences and lessons learned on the prior informed consent/advanced informed agreement schemes of the Rotterdam Convention, the Basel Convention and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety of the CBD. Others, such as the Barcelona Convention secretariat feel that MEAs need to work together on the important crosscutting issues of compliance and enforcement and liability and compensation. The UNCCD secretariat strongly supports the strengthening of synergies at the field level and that this can be best accomplished through enhanced coordination on programmatic matters among the national focal points of different MEAs.

153. At the Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG (New York, 18 April 2001), it was felt that the clustering of MEAs for promoting closer collaboration should not be limited to sectoral programmatic areas such as chemicals and hazardous wastes conventions or biodiversity-related MEAs, but should also be based along functional lines such as the trade-related conventions. In this context, it was subsequently noted that some MEAs have similar procedural arrangements such as the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure of the Rotterdam Convention and the advance informed agreement (AIA) procedure of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

154. The Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG also agreed on the need to promote the clustering of conventions at the regional level. The role of the multisectoral regional seas conventions and action plans as instruments for supporting the implementation of global conventions in their respective regions was also recognized.

In addition to the obvious merits of strengthening collaboration among MEAs at the regional level along sectoral programmatic lines, the opportunities for collaboration along functional lines need to be further developed, particularly in areas such as capacity-building, information exchange, assessments, development of supportive national legislation and compliance and enforcement. It was noted that designing joint programmes and matching work plans at the regional level demonstrates to Governments the benefits of regional cooperation, which also attracts the attention of donors.

155. The Second Consultative Meeting concluded that clustering of MEAs for promoting collaboration and coordination should be carried out at (a) the sectoral programmatic level, (b) the functional level and (c) the regional level.

B. Scientific and Technical Cooperation

156. Several secretariats feel that greater cooperation among conventions at the scientific and technical level was desirable (Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, CITES, Ramsar Convention, World Heritage Convention, Cartagena Convention). The Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol proposed that the chairs of assessment panels of different conventions and protocols should meet periodically to maximize the benefits of the limited human and financial resources available for their functioning and operation. An attempt should be made to prepare a comprehensive biennial report providing a synopsis of the reports of the panels of different but related MEAs, which would also help promote interlinkages and synergies. Some such as CMS, AEWA and ASCOBANS focussed on the need for improved exchange of scientific data and information among the biodiversity-related conventions.

157. Some convention secretariats such as CITES and the Barcelona Convention proposed that there needs to be a holistic approach to compliance and enforcement of MEAs.

C. Coordination of MEAs at the National Level

158. Some conventions proposed that much greater attention needs to be given to enhancing coordination among MEAs at the national level (Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, CITES, Ramsar Convention, World Heritage Convention). This issue was further discussed at the Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG. Consequently, the issue is further addressed in the following two documents: "A Policy Paper for Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion" and "Proposal for a Systematic Approach to Coordination of Multilateral Environmental Agreements.

159. Ultimately it is national Governments that are parties to MEAs who are responsible for COP and MOP decisions. To a large degree, the lack of coherence in the overall policy making process of MEAs is a reflection of the fact that the focal points for different MEAs come from different national ministries that do not communicate with each other. Quite commonly the focal points for CITES come from Agriculture; for CBD, from Environment or Foreign Affairs; for the Basel Convention, from Health; for regional seas programmes, from Foreign Affairs or Maritime Authorities; for chemical conventions, from Industry or Agriculture; and so on. Quite commonly, as in the case of the UNFCCC, the chemicals conventions and the regional seas programmes, the national focal points to one MEA can come from four or five different ministries. A smaller agreement such as AEWA has national focal points from either the Ministry of Environment or the Ministry of Agriculture. Add to the equation the fact that the focal points for the GEF as a financial mechanism for CBD, UNFCCC and the Stockholm Convention come from the Ministries of Finance. It is a common occurrence for a country to adopt different positions at different MEA meetings due to lack of policy coordination at the national level. This has become an obstacle to promoting and facilitating coordination among conventions when the focal points from a country to CBD and CITES come from different ministries. This occurs in both developed and developing countries. Few countries have established national coordination committees on MEAs that aim at (a) coordinating the policy positions that they present at MEA meetings and (b) implementing MEAs at the national level in a

coordinated manner.. The Third Consultative Meeting of MEAs suggested that improvements at the decision-making level should come through better coordination at the national level since the decision making forums consist of governments, and therefore there is a need for more emphasis on national coordination. Regional mechanisms are also important in supporting implementation of global agreements.

D. Co-location of MEA Secretariats

160. On the issue of co-location of secretariats, this is applicable principally to the global MEAs. Most that are not co-located do not feel that their geographic location has adversely affected their operations (Montreal Multilateral Fund, UNFCCC, and CBD). CITES, the Ramsar Convention and Basel Convention secretariats strongly feel that their location in Geneva and nearby Gland contributes to closer collaboration with other co-located conventions, including the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention, as well as UN organizations such as WTO, UNEP's Trade and Environment Unit and nearby NGOs such as IUCN and WWF. The Rotterdam Convention and Stockholm Convention interim secretariats strongly support the co-location of the chemicals and hazardous wastes secretariats for purposes of collaboration and promoting synergies. While they do not see co-location with non-cluster convention secretariats as essential, they do believe that it is helpful since there are many administrative benefits to co-location. The Ramsar Convention secretariat would welcome the establishment of other MEA secretariats in Geneva. The CMS secretariat and three of the CMS Agreements secretariats are co-located in Bonn, but beyond this no further advantages to co-location with MEAs in general were cited. Some secretariats (AEWA, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS) felt that co-location with other biodiversity-related conventions such as Ramsar, CBD and the relevant regional seas programmes would have a positive effect on their activities. The GPA secretariat sees advantages to being co-located with the CBD or the Basel Convention secretariats. While half of the MEA secretariats recognized the benefits of co-location to different degrees, for the other half the co-location of MEA secretariats is considered a non-issue.

E. Towards a Systematic Approach for Promoting Collaboration and Coordination among MEAs

161. Recognizing the difficulties and obstacles for improving international environmental governance, the Ramsar Convention secretariat proposes that the best approach may be for incremental improvements based on an analysis of needs and global benefits, rather than on new mechanisms that may not be practical to operationalize in the short term.

162. Some of the convention secretariats underlined the importance of UNEP in promoting, facilitating and nurturing thematic and programmatic cooperation among MEAs and between MEAs and UNEP. As indicated earlier in the report, some MEA secretariats feel that UNEP should have as one of its mandates the monitoring of the implementation of MEAs.

163. At the Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG, the Executive Director of UNEP requested the MEA secretariats for their support in the preparation of a 5 page policy paper on "negotiable items" on governance, which he would like to present in early fall for discussion and subsequently to the next meeting of the Global Ministerial Environmental Forum (MEF) in February 2002. Regarding the issue of coordination of conventions, this should be presented in the policy paper as an evolutionary process, opening new avenues of cooperation

164. The Second Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG also agreed that there is the need for a systematic approach to coordination, and secretariats may have to consider taking this issue to contracting Parties as necessary, with some secretariats having more leeway given to them on this matter by their COPs than others. Clear recommendations and options are needed, based on the responses of the Secretariats to the questionnaire, taking into account the opportunities for clustering at the sectoral, functional and regional levels, and the need to develop an overall plan on how to promote collaboration. The plan should be as specific as possible, and secretariats need to come up with a systematic approach on how we can improve and make a major contribution to international environmental governance. UNEP was to prepare a paper setting out a proposal for such a systematic approach for further consideration by MEA secretariats.

165. The Third Consultative Meeting of MEAs on IEG (teleconference, 4 July 2001) reviewed the following two documents, which correspond to the papers referred to in the two preceding paragraphs: "A Policy Paper for Improving International Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Negotiable Terms for Further Discussion" and "Proposal for a Systematic Approach to Coordination of Multilateral Environmental Agreements". The second paper bases itself largely on the terms proposed in the first paper.

166. While the preceding summary of proposals reflects the views of the secretariats of core environmental conventions and related international agreements, thought has to be given to the enhancement of collaboration with the conventions relevant to the environment that are listed in Table 4 (see papers referred to in the previous paragraph). As stated in section H of chapter I, most of these conventions have secretariats provided by basically 5 organizations of the UN system: (a) IMO for the 25 marine pollution conventions, protocols and amendments; (b) the UN General Secretariat for the 6 oceans-related conventions and agreements plus the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of UNCLOS Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and High Migratory Fish Stocks; (c) FAO for several (7) regional fisheries agreements and conventions and for 5 plant conventions, agreements and amendments; (d) ILO for the 10 occupational hazards conventions; and (e) IAEA for the 8 nuclear-related conventions and protocols. Of the 41 core environmental conventions, protocols and related international agreements in Table 1, UNEP provides the secretariat for 22. It also promoted and facilitated the negotiations for 13 other conventions and agreements. With these 13 and the remaining 6 conventions and agreements, UNEP maintains a working relationship, albeit at different degrees of support. In short, UNEP is the principal organization providing secretariats to the core environmental conventions and with working relationships with all the core environmental conventions. This means that there are basically six UN organizations that play an important role in supporting MEAs and conventions and protocols relevant to the environment. Thought could be given to the establishment of an interagency mechanism for promoting and facilitating collaboration among these agreements that would be comprised of these six organizations. Already, as indicated earlier, there is a very close collaboration between the regional seas conventions and action plans and the IMO marine pollution conventions, protocols and amendments promoted jointly by UNEP and IMO.

167. The problems being faced by conventions are reflected in the priorities of a functional nature listed in paragraph 22 and are further reflected in Chapter II, "Review of Strengths and Weaknesses of Existing Arrangements". The proposals in "A Policy Paper for Improving international Environmental Governance among Multilateral Environmental Agreements" are aimed at improved international environmental governance and addressing the problems more effectively.