



United Nations  
Environment  
Programme

Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/ICL/IG/1/5  
10 March 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



---

MEETING OF GOVERNMENT-DESIGNATED EXPERTS  
TO REVIEW AND REVISE A GLOBAL PROGRAMME  
OF ACTION TO PROTECT THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT  
FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

Reykjavik, 6-10 March 1995

REPORT OF THE MEETING

## I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The Meeting of the Government-Designated Experts to Review and Revise a Global Programme of Action to Protect the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities was convened by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in accordance with UNEP Governing Council decision 17/20 of 21 May 1993 in which the Council authorized the Executive Director to organize a structured and sequenced preparatory process leading to a two-week intergovernmental meeting in late 1995 for the purpose of adopting a programme of action for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities. The Meeting was convened as the final preparatory meeting in the process before the intergovernmental conference to be held in Washington, D.C., from 23 October to 3 November 1995. The meeting was held at the Scandic Hotel Loftleidir, Reykjavik, from 6 to 10 March 1995 at the invitation of the Government of Iceland.

2. The meeting was opened at 10 a.m. on Monday, 6 March 1995 by Mr. Peter Schröder, Director of the UNEP Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme Activity Centre (OCA/PAC).

3. The meeting was attended by experts from the following 68 countries: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Viet Nam and Zaire.

4. In addition to representatives from the United Nations Secretariat represented by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UNDOALOS), representatives from the following specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations were present: Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Maritime Organization (IMO), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank. Also represented were the following intergovernmental organizations: Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (CPPS), European Commission and Helsinki Commission.

5. Observers from the following non-governmental organizations were also present: Advisory Committee on the Protection of the Sea (ACOFS), Conseil Européen de l'Industrie Chimique (CEFIC), Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace International, The World Conservation Union (IUCN) and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). The list of participants is contained in annex I below.

6. Opening statements were made by Ms. Elizabeth Dowdeswell, Executive Director of UNEP, Dr. Ossur Skarphédinsson, Minister for the Environment of

Iceland and Mr Timothy Wirth, Under-Secretary for Global Affairs in the United States Department of State.

7. Ms. Dowdeswell welcomed the participants and expressed her gratitude to the Government of Iceland for its hospitality and for the arrangements made for the meeting. She said that it was now realized that Governments had been more preoccupied with the control of dumping and marine pollution by tanker accidents than the less visible damage resulting from land-based activities, which accounted for 77 per cent of all marine pollution. The meeting offered an opportunity to develop an integrated systemic approach to the problem, consisting of a proper mix of political, social, economic, managerial, technical, scientific, legal and institutional measures and mechanisms. She called for innovation on the part of all concerned, particularly with regard to financial resources and the participation of non-State actors and local authorities in the process. The challenge was to develop a Programme of Action that was more than just a document. UNEP would make the issue of control of land-based activities a priority and was prepared to provide the secretariat for the implementation process. She suggested that the Meeting should draft a decision for the Governing Council of UNEP to ensure that UNEP could continue supporting the process.

8. Dr. Skarphéðinsson welcomed participants to Iceland. He said that the consequences of continued and increased pollution of the oceans would have serious implications for the globe as a whole. It was also important to be mindful of the adverse socio-economic implications that degradation of the oceans had for countries that based their existence on the resources of the oceans. Pollutants were now reaching the most remote corners of the world, as, for example, assessments of the waters around Iceland clearly illustrated. That underscored the need for expedient and effective global action to reduce and eliminate pollution of the marine environment from land-based activities. Particular importance must be placed on reaching consensus on effective measures to reduce and eliminate such global threats as pollution by persistent organic compounds and contamination by radioactive substances. In that context, he noted that the Nordic countries would during the meeting introduce a proposal for the establishment of an Intergovernmental Panel on Persistent Organic Pollutants. Of equal importance was that the meeting should generate a consensus for the establishment of an international revolving fund and a clearing-house to assist primarily the developing countries to deal effectively with degradation of the oceans from land-based activities at the regional and national levels.

9. Mr. Wirth said that his country was looking forward to hosting the Intergovernmental Conference in Washington, D.C., in November 1995. He said that today the world was threatened by global environmental degradation. The same approach had to be taken as that in the Cold War era where risks had to be evaluated carefully and possible responses measured, together with their cost and effectiveness. Then a decision could be taken whether investment could be made to prevent disaster. The task was to follow the same careful, realistic and scientifically sound approach as had been applied on such issues as population and the protection of the ozone layer. The problems of degradation of the marine environment were outstripping the earlier efforts that had been made to combat them. The United States stood ready to work as a

partner, to share its experience, to commit its talents and resources, to cooperate on technologies and to seek help and advice on common problems. He hoped that the Meeting could achieve the following four specific and tangible goals: development of a methodology to assist Governments and regional organizations to identify approaches and prioritize actions to deal with land-based activities; development of a clearing-house to link expertise, programmes and resources with needs and requests; development of an outline of policy guidance for the important and rapidly evolving funding institutions, such as the Global Environment Facility and the World Bank; and, finally, a careful approach to the troubling issues raised by certain persistent organic pollutants.

## II. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

### A. Rules of procedure

10. The Meeting decided to apply the rules of procedure of the Governing Council of UNEP mutatis mutandis to the conduct of its proceedings .

### B. Election of officers

11. The Meeting elected by acclamation the following officers:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. M. Johannesson	(Iceland)
<u>Vice-Chairmen:</u>	Mr. T. Neroni Slade	(Samoa)
	Mr. T.L. Laughlin	(United States)
<u>Rapporteurs:</u>	Ms. E.D. du Preez	(South Africa)
	Lt. Cdr. M. Zuñiga Fernandez	(Chile)
	Mr. D. Stanislawski	(Poland)

12. In his opening statement, the Chairman observed that a surmountable task had to be accomplished during the course of the meeting and reminded the experts that it was the last intergovernmental preparatory meeting before the Washington Conference. He added that the Meeting would not be finalizing the Programme of Action for adoption at the Meeting, but that it would adopt the results of its deliberations. He expressed the wish that the Meeting would work efficiently and progressively towards its goal as set by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro almost three years ago.

13. It was agreed to establish two Working Groups and that Mr. Slade (Samoa) would serve as Chairman of Working Group I and Mr. Laughlin (United States) as Chairman of Working Group II. During the meeting, Ms. E.D. du Preez (South Africa) acted as Rapporteur for the plenary sessions and Lt. Cdr. M. Zuñiga Fernandez (Chile) and Mr. D. Stanislawski (Poland) acted as Rapporteurs for Working Group I and Working Group II, respectively.

### C. Organization of work

14. The representative of the secretariat introduced a proposed programme of work for the Meeting. The proposed programme was adopted with amendments.

/...

### III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

15. The representative of the secretariat presented the provisional agenda as contained in document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/1. The meeting adopted the agenda as proposed by the secretariat (see annex II below), with the understanding that under agenda item 5, the provisional agenda for the Washington Conference would be discussed and the drafting of a decision for the eighteenth session of UNEP Governing Council would be considered.

### IV. REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE DRAFT GLOBAL PROGRAMME TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

16. In considering agenda item 4, the Meeting had before it the draft Global Programme of Action to protect the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/2). It also had before it a number of information documents (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.1-INF.27/Rev.1) (see the list of documents in annex III).

17. The draft Programme of Action was introduced by the Director of OCA/PAC at the 1st plenary session of the meeting.

#### A. General Discussion

18. In the ensuing general discussion of the draft Programme, statements were made by experts from 45 Governments, as well as by several observers from United Nations and other intergovernmental bodies and two non-governmental organizations.

19. During the general discussion, some experts stated that the late receipt of documents for the meeting meant that a full discussion of the issues involved could not be organized or completed at the required ministerial levels in their countries. As a result, they would have to reserve their position with regard to the outcome of the meeting. The Chairman acknowledged that fact and concluded that, as a consequence, the results of the meeting would be adopted ad referendum.

20. There were varying opinions regarding the nature of the document to be adopted at the forthcoming meeting to be held in Washington, D.C. Many experts stated that their governments were in favour of the elaboration of a global legally-binding instrument on the prevention of marine pollution from land-based activities. Some experts felt that the threat to coastal and marine resources posed by the degradation of the marine environment called for a legally binding instrument. A number of experts stated that the lack of success with the 1985 Montreal Guidelines could be attributed to their non-legally binding status.

21. However, some experts pointed out that the forthcoming Washington Conference had been called to discuss a global programme of action, not a global convention, and that language with binding connotations should be avoided. Others noted that a legally binding instrument would be of little value to countries which had already enacted legislation to control pollution and enforce standards at the national level. It was further stated that problems differed from region to region. Therefore, priorities and existing laws should be brought into harmony, to match national and regional needs and

problems. The attention of the Meeting was also drawn to the need for a time-bound programme of action at global, regional and national levels in a cooperative framework rather than through legally-binding instruments. A definite and effective programme for capacity-building, funding mechanism and non-commercial technology transfer should be put in operation to enable developing countries to meet their obligations.

22. Some experts pointed out that they could not enter into negotiations of a document of a legally binding nature and suggested that such a discussion could take place only at the Washington Conference. The terms of reference of the Governing Council decision 17/20 should be borne in mind and the meeting could, although the intent was not to create a binding instrument, certainly launch a process to develop such an instrument. Some experts stressed that the Washington Action Programme would not be legally binding, although later consideration in that direction would not be precluded. In this regard, several experts felt that an international agreement needed much more detailed consideration and consultation, but that non-binding guidelines might be an alternative.

23. During the discussion, a number of experts pointed out that land-based activities were the predominant cause of marine pollution and that action should be taken to eliminate pollution at source. The issue was a global one. However, several experts stressed that there was no need for a global convention; emphasis should be laid on regional agreements and regional action. Some experts gave examples of the arrangements that had been made at regional and subregional levels, which they felt were effective.

24. Several experts pointed out that in some countries every economic sector would be implicated at a time when declining resources and faltering economies would not make the task an easy one.

25. The Meeting was reminded of the fundamental importance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea for the development of an effective Global Programme of Action, as already recognized by Agenda 21 itself. The significance of the Convention in that respect was further underlined by its entry into force on 16 November 1994.

26. One expert, supported by a number of others, appealed for attention to be paid to the provisions of Agenda 21, which contained an action plan, and urged the meeting to build on the work of the Montreal meeting held in June 1994, bearing in mind that its purpose was to identify objectives, agree on a timetable containing targets and make recommendations, both of which would be of assistance to States, and would provide guidance to international financing institutions to direct their programmes.

27. With regard to the issue of the funding of the actions to be taken as well as the transfer of technology required for their implementation, several experts emphasized that States responsible for pollution should bear the cost of such actions. One expert said that States should not permit the export of banned products, or pollutants prohibited in their own country, and should remember that such products eventually found their way into the global environment and could therefore affect human health. Many experts agreed that there was a need to control persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in view

of the threat they posed to the global environment. Several also pointed out that transboundary transfers were usually related to toxic substances and radionuclides, which were a source of global contamination.

28. A number of experts stressed the need to involve land-locked States, particularly those whose inland waters emptied into the seas or oceans. One expert said that the draft Programme of Action mentioned land-locked States only briefly, and that the relevant sections could be expanded. Several experts said that pollution control should start at the source of pollution and that assistance had to be given to countries so that they could take the appropriate action, mindful of the political and economic situations of such countries and their sustainable development needs. Some other experts said that funding and/or assistance should also be provided to economies in transition which, for various reasons, were facing the same difficulties as developing countries. A number of experts made special mention of the needs of small island developing States in view of the degree to which they were exposed to transboundary pollution.

29. Some experts emphasized the role of public awareness programmes, without which little progress would be made at the national level.

30. The observer for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), referring to her Agency's statement in document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.16, indicated that the IAEA General Conference had, in 1993, adopted a resolution regarding the development of a Convention on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management. The first meeting to draft the Convention had been held in February 1995. She urged that the Programme of Action be consistent with the IAEA Convention and other safety standards and guides provided by the Agency.

31. The observer for the World Health Organization (WHO) explained that by far the majority of remedial measures would be taken on land, which underscored the importance of including consideration of drainage basins in marine action plans. He said that it would be easier to proceed if global issues were separated from national issues. There was also a need to emphasize economic analysis as a part of the Programme of Action, as well as to concentrate on what could actually be done rather than what was simply desirable.

32. The observer for the International Maritime Organization (IMO) said that IMO administered a number of global conventions related to sea-based sources of marine pollution. Many of the implementation strategies were, however, regional, subregional or national. He offered the assistance of his organization, where possible, for the implementation of the Programme of Action in view of the experience it had gained at those levels.

33. The observer for the United Nations Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea (DOALOS) drew attention to the General Assembly resolution 49/28 by which the Assembly recognized that it was the forum responsible for monitoring the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). By the same resolution, the Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report in 1996 on the impact of the entry into force of UNCLOS on related proposed or existing instruments

and programmes. The Programme of Action would be included in the report as one such instrument.

34. The observer for the European Commission recalled that, as expressed officially in the framework of the recent implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to which the European Community was a contracting party, its member States (which, as of 1 January 1995 numbered 15) had transferred competencies to the European Community concerning, inter alia, certain aspects of agriculture and fisheries and of the protection and preservation of the marine environment. As a result, the European Community had participated in certain regional agreements (i.e. the Paris, Barcelona and Helsinki Conventions, and the countries on the Rhine and the Elbe) and in a series of Community directives related to the issue. The Commission would therefore participate actively in the efforts towards achieving as much progress as possible in the current meeting, although there had been a lack of time for adequate preparation.

35. The observer for the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM), referring to his Commission's statement in document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.17, indicated that a large part of the Commission's work dealt with marine pollution from land-based activities. The Baltic Sea States had committed themselves to take measures in the entire drainage area of the Baltic Sea. He mentioned also the Baltic Sea Joint Comprehensive Environmental Action Programme (JCP) which particularly aimed at the elimination of the major sources of pollution of the Baltic Sea area. The work involved international financial institutions, i.e., the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the European Investment Bank, the Nordic Investment Bank, the Nordic Environment Finance Corporation and the World Bank. Apart from the parties to the Helsinki Convention, including the European Commission, Norway and four land-locked states, as well as non-governmental organizations, also participated in the implementation of the programme.

36. The observer for the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS) said that since 1983 the countries of the region had a Protocol for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the South-east Pacific Against Pollution from Land-based Sources. CPPS had held a coordinating meeting on the draft Global Programme of Action, which had resulted in the agreed regional position contained in documents UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.15 and UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF 19. The latter also reflected the position of Costa Rica and Cuba.

37. The Meeting was informed about the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution from Land-based Sources, which had been adopted by the Mediterranean countries in 1980 and was currently under review. Document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.9 contained an overview of the achievements and shortcomings of the implementation of the protocol and propose principles and concrete actions for the Mediterranean Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities.

38. The observer for Greenpeace International welcomed the statements of those countries who supported the adoption of global legally binding measures. Persistent organic pollutants, especially organohalogenes, and artificial radionuclides that were transported over long distances once they

/...



reached the environment were two cases in point, justifying the adoption of binding global measures aiming at their elimination. He further indicated that the elimination of nuclear reprocessing would be a feasible, effective measure to prevent marine pollution by radioactive wastes.

39. The observer for the Advisory Committee for the Protection of the Sea (ACOPS) said that local authorities must be more involved in the process, especially as the protection of coastal and marine environment would play an important part in the preparations for Habitat II. There could be no commitment at the national level without ministerial consultations to ensure support for the Programme of Action from all concerned ministries. Finally, he said that it was crucial that the global discussions benefited from the experience of the regional seas programmes, particularly in terms of funding and transfer of technology, and the many land-based sources protocols under the various regional seas conventions.

40. The meeting noted also the valuable information provided by various regional bodies, describing their activities relevant to the protection of the marine and coastal environment against pollution from land-based activities as contained in the relevant information documents (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.5,9,11,13 and 14).

#### B. Review of the proposed outline

41. The Meeting reached consensus that the outline of the Programme as contained in section A of document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/2 could be used as a basis for further discussion of the draft Programme of Action by the Meeting.

#### C. Review and further development of the proposed Programme of Action

42. The Meeting decided that chapters II-IV of the draft Programme of Action would be considered in Working Group I and chapter V would be taken up in Working Group II. Chapter I would be considered in plenary.

43. At the start of the discussion of chapter I in plenary, the expert from Colombia introduced some proposed amendments to the chapter as contained in document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.19 submitted by Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Panama and Peru. After some discussion, the Meeting decided to defer its consideration of the chapter until a later stage in the proceedings.

44. After informal consultations the Chairman submitted a working paper as a basis for discussion in plenary. The working paper was adopted with amendments and incorporated into the revised draft Programme of Action as chapter I.

45. Working Group I held 7 meetings from 6 to 10 March to consider chapters II-IV of the draft Programme. It presented its report to plenary

together with the amended text of those chapters at the closing session of the Meeting, on 10 March 1995 (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/L.3/Rev.1).

46. Working Group II held 7 meetings from 6 to 10 March 1995. It too presented its report to plenary, together with the amended text of chapter V, at the closing session of the Meeting (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/L.4 and Add.1).

47. Some experts expressed their concern over the unavailability of the reports of the Working Groups in French and Spanish. The representative of the Secretariat explained that this was due to time constraints in view of the fact that the Working Groups had finished their deliberations too late to enable translation of their English reports into other languages.

48. The Meeting requested UNEP to provide the Washington Meeting with information relevant to the clearing house and revolving fund proposed in chapter IV "International Cooperation", in particular, pointing out other options and the need for and financial implications of such institutions.

49. The Meeting also established a special working group on persistent organic pollutants to consider paragraphs 66-70 of the draft Global Programme of Action and paragraphs 85-91 of chapter V of the draft Programme as prepared by Working Group II (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/L.4). The Working Group submitted an alternative text for paragraphs 66-70 (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/L.5), which was approved with amendments by the Meeting for inclusion in the revised draft Programme. The meeting also approved the working group's suggestion that, as a consequence, paragraphs 91 (e) and (f) of chapter V as prepared by Working Group II should be deleted.

#### V. PREPARATIONS FOR THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE TO PROTECT THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

##### Statement by representatives of the United States of America

50. At the invitation of the Chairman, the representative of the United States made a brief statement on the arrangements for the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, to be held in Washington, D.C. from 23 October to 3 November 1995. A number of events were being organized to coincide with the Conference, including a technology forum. An information package would be sent to participants either with the letter of invitation or under separate cover. His Government was looking forward to receiving the participants at the Conference.

51. Another representative of the United States described in more detail the technology forum that would be held in conjunction with the Conference. He said that the forum would focus on pollution prevention and reduction as well as low-cost easily available and easily maintainable technologies. The forum would have four main thrusts: technology; capacity-building; public education and outreach; and funding.

52. The representative of the secretariat informed the Meeting that the report of the Meeting, together with the draft Programme of Action as

produced by the Working Groups and adopted by the Meeting, would be finalized in two weeks' time and sent to the Chairman of the Meeting and the two Chairmen of the Working Groups for comments. Upon receipt of the Chairmen's clearance, the documents would be produced in English and sent to UNEP's Conference Services for translation by mid-April 1995. The Secretariat further indicated that the report and draft Programme of Action could be sent to all participants of the Meeting (in English only) as soon as finalized, but their translated versions (in all United Nations languages) would be sent out to all Governments in their respective languages as soon as possible, but, well in advance of the six-week deadline prior to the Washington Conference. Any proposals or submissions relevant to the Washington Conference should reach the secretariat by 1 July 1995, to allow their inclusion in the documentation of the meeting.

Statement by the observer for the Advisory Committee for the Protection of the Sea (ACOPS)

53. The observer for the Advisory Committee for the Protection of the Sea (ACOPS) reported on preparations for a conference that ACOPS was planning to hold in Rio de Janeiro from 18 to 22 June 1995 as a contribution to the process leading to the Washington Conference. The Conference would be attended by Ministers of the Environment from developing countries and Eastern Europe drawn from eleven regional seas, as well as overseas aid and foreign affairs ministers and high-level officials from developed countries. The primary purpose of the ACOPS meeting was to seek political consensus and to ensure that there was a degree of cabinet debate in the countries whose ministers would be attending.

Draft decision on the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities for submission to the Governing Council of UNEP at its eighteenth session

54. In accordance with the understanding reached during the adoption of the agenda (see paragraph 13 above), a conference room paper was circulated containing a draft decision on the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities, which a number of Governments participating in the Meeting intended to introduce into the preparations for a decision on the issue by the Governing Council of UNEP at its eighteenth session. The Meeting took note of the intention of those Governments to make such use of the draft decision.

Provisional agenda for the Intergovernmental Conference to adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities

55. The Meeting approved with amendments the draft provisional agenda proposed by the secretariat for the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities, to be held in Washington, D.C., from 23 October to 3 November 1995.

56. The draft provisional agenda, as approved, is contained in annex IV to the present report.

VI. OTHER MATTERS

Intergovernmental Panel on Persistent Organic Pollutants (IPPOP): Nordic proposal

57. Under this item, the expert from Iceland, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, introduced the Nordic proposal on the establishment of an Intergovernmental Panel on Persistent Organic Pollutants (IPPOP), which had been circulated as document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.25. He also drew the Meeting's attention to the position paper of the Nordic countries on global measures on persistent organic pollutants (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.3). He said that the Nordic countries were proposing that an Intergovernmental Panel on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) be established to address the growing problem and threat posed by POPs and to develop proposals for a concerted global means for reducing and/or eliminating their emissions, discharges and losses to the environment.

58. All experts who took the floor in response to the Nordic proposal expressed concern over the question of persistent organic pollutants and found that some type of international action was necessary. Some felt that further scientific assessments were called for but believed that it might be possible to carry out the necessary work in other forums, such as the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety. Others, however, believed that scientific knowledge already at hand was sufficient for immediate action to be taken and expressed concern at the possibility that the panel could delay such immediate international action, as well as at the expense involved in its establishment.

59. One expert, supported by several others, called for the initiation of an intergovernmental negotiating committee process aimed at a global, legally binding instrument for eliminating emissions and discharges of POPs, with priority on PCBs and organohalogen compounds in general.

60. One expert called for inviting the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) to undertake a preliminary assessment of the sources, transport, fate and effects of POPs in the marine environment so as to assist the Washington Conference in its deliberations.

61. Many experts expressed concern about the difficulties facing developing countries, for whom the alternatives were neither cost-effective nor practical. Several of those experts favoured a step-by-step, time-bound ban, which would give the developing countries time to resolve the practical questions. One of those experts suggested that a United Nations mechanism should be established to provide grants to developing countries for the purchase or manufacture of alternatives.

62. One expert observed that the development of the work on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) should take account of any relevant work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety.

63. Following the discussion, the Meeting established a special working group under the chairmanship of Mr. A. Simcock (UK) to consider the Nordic

proposal. The final text produced by the group was adopted unanimously with a few amendments and incorporated into the draft Programme of Action (see paragraph 44 above).

Mechanism for attaining coordinated policies with international financing organizations

64. The expert from Honduras drew attention to a document entitled "General observations on the draft Global Programme of Action to protect the marine environment from land-based activities" submitted by Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Honduras, Kenya, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Sierra Leone, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania (UNEP/ICL/IG/1/INF.26). Those countries believed that the draft Programme of Action, as well as other commitments undertaken, were often at odds with international financial policies and requested UNEP to look for mechanisms for attaining coordinating policies with international financial organizations in order to avoid such contradictions.

65. After a brief discussion, in which all experts who took the floor expressed their support for the document, the Meeting requested UNEP to investigate the possibility of setting up such a mechanism.

Mechanism for channelling resources towards management and treatment of waste water

66. Several experts expressed concern over the public health problems and ecological degradation caused by inadequate disposal of waste waters in coastal areas. These experts requested that mechanisms be studied to channel additional resources to developing countries for addressing this problem.

VII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

67. The meeting adopted its final report on 10 March 1995 on the basis of the revised draft report contained in document UNEP/ICL/IG/1/L.1/Rev.1.

VIII. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

68. After the customary exchange of courtesies and expression of thanks to all involved in the organization and conduct of the meeting, the Chairman and the Director of UNEP-OCA/PAC declared the meeting closed at 10.35 p.m. on 10 March 1995.