



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/9
22 December 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

FIRST INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW MEETING ON THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION
FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT
FOR LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES
Montreal, Canada, 26-30 November 2001

REPORT OF 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

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	4
INTRODUCTION	6

PART ONE

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER SEGMENT.....	6
--------------------------------	---

Chapter

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING.....	6
II. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING.....	7
III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.....	8
IV. REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION, 1995-2001.....	9
V. THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION'S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN ON MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER.....	12
VI. THE PROPOSED 2002-2006 WORK PROGRAMME OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION COORDINATION OFFICE AND PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS, WITH INDICATIVE COSTS.....	13
VII. IMPROVING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION THROUGH IMPROVED OCEAN GOVERNANCE	15
VIII. BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND FINANCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES.....	18
IX. RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE FORWARDED TO THE MINISTERIAL/HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT	19

PART TWO

MINISTERIAL/HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT.....	19
X. MINISTERIAL/HIGH LEVEL SEGMENT AND MONTREAL DECLARATION ON THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION	19
XI. OTHER MATTERS.....	24
XII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING.....	24
XIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION.....	24

Annexes

I. MONTREAL DECLARATION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES	25
---	----

II.	CONCLUSIONS OF THE CO-CHAIRS FROM THE FIRST INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW MEETING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION ON THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES, MONTREAL 26-30 NOVEMBER 2001	29
III.	OUTLINE INFORMATION ON REGIONAL SEAS ACTIVITIES	35
IV.	DECLARATION OF THE GLOBAL LEGISLATORS ORGANIZATION FOR A BALANCED ENVIRONMENT (GLOBE)	41
V.	STATEMENT BY THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES	42
VI.	STATEMENT BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS	44

SUMMARY

Representatives from 98 countries, including ministers and other high-level officials, with the valued contribution of numerous United Nations bodies, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations, convened in Montreal, Canada, from 26 to 30 November 2001, to review the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities since its adoption in November 1995, and to chart the way forward. The meeting endorsed the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office's 2002-2006 programme of work with indicative costs. The meeting focused substantively on the issues of municipal wastewater, integrated coastal and oceans governance, building partnerships and financing the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

Key outcomes of the meeting included the Montreal Declaration (see annex I); conclusions of the Co-Chairs (see annex II); a declaration by the Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (see annex IV); a statement by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (see annex V); and a statement by non-governmental organizations (see annex VI).

The meeting noted steady, albeit slow, progress in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action at global, regional and national levels. The efforts of the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office to accelerate the Programme's implementation, particularly over the past two to three years, were commended. The report of the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) identified the most serious global threats as alteration and destruction of habitats and ecosystems; the effects of sewage on human health and the environment; widespread and increasing eutrophication; and altered sediment flows resulting from hydrological modification. The generic root causes identified were poverty, unsustainable consumption patterns and poorly managed social and economic development.

The meeting reviewed and welcomed the strategic action plan on municipal wastewater prepared by the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office. Extension of the methodology to cover other source categories within the Global Programme of Action was widely supported. The strong emphasis on the human health aspects of municipal wastewater was welcomed. The meeting acknowledged the need for additional funding and new funding mechanisms to address the issue of municipal wastewater, and support was expressed for alternative low-cost schemes to prevent and reduce marine pollution.

The proposed 2002-2006 work programme for the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office was described as forward-looking, comprehensive and realistic, focusing on actions rather than simply identifying problems. It was the general view that the funding level specified in the proposed work programme as "intermediate" was the appropriate level to be sought. The focus on seeking implementation through partnerships was welcomed.

The central role of national governments in implementing the Global Programme of Action was reaffirmed, and the critical role of the respective regional seas programmes in facilitating coordination was highlighted. The meeting heard reports from respective regional seas programmes (see annex III) and there was general agreement that revitalized regional seas programmes are a pillar for improving ocean governance. The requirement for new partnerships, new approaches and integrated processes to implement the Global Programme of Action in a cost effective and sustainable manner was underscored. Similarly, the urgent need to integrate coastal resource management and the requirements of coastal zone protection, with river basin management, was stressed.

The need for Governments to develop cooperative partnerships with international financial institutions, international organizations, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and other major stakeholders with a pivotal role to play in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, was emphasized. Similarly, there was general agreement that it was essential to mainstream the objectives of the Global Programme of Action into Governments' national development programmes.

The meeting observed that many countries had made strong commitments to cleaner water and pollution control, yet lacked the financial resources to follow up on those commitments. Consequently, the meeting was in agreement that there was a need to mainstream the objectives of the Global Programme of Action into the work programmes and plans of the major financial institutions, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

INTRODUCTION

1. The Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (UNEP(OCA)/LBA/IG.2/7) was adopted at an intergovernmental conference convened for this purpose in Washington, D.C., United States of America, from 23 October to 3 November 1995. In its decision 20/19 B of 5 February 1999, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) decided to undertake the first intergovernmental review of the status of implementation of the Global Programme of Action in 2001.
2. Subsequently, the Governing Council in its decision 21/10 of February 2001 requested the Executive Director to organize the intergovernmental review meeting in November 2001 with participation of Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, international financing institutions, private-sector and other stakeholders and major groups, paying due attention to the use of innovative financial instruments for implementing the Global Programme of Action and to promote the involvement of Governments, the private sector, international financial institutions and civil society in addressing this issue.

Part one

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER SEGMENT

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

3. The meeting was opened at 10.10 a.m. on Monday, 26 November 2001 by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans of Canada, Mr Herb Dhaliwal, also on behalf of Mr David Anderson, Minister of the Environment of Canada and President of the UNEP Governing Council, who was unable to attend. An opening statement was also made by Mr Donald Kaniaru, Director of the UNEP Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, on behalf of the UNEP Executive Director.
4. In his statement, Mr Dhaliwal said that the first intergovernmental review meeting offered an opportunity to reflect on past achievements under the Global Programme of Action and to look forward to what needed to be done in the future, especially as the oceans community was preparing its message to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Recalling that chapter 17 of Agenda 21 adopted at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (the Earth Summit), which had formed the background to the adoption of the Global Programme of Action in 1995, had set out a clear mandate for the protection of the marine environment, he said that experience had demonstrated the need for an inclusive approach on the part of many relevant stakeholders, including those at the international level. He also noted that support for regional efforts was key to improving the health of the oceans. In that regard Canada was a strong supporter of the Russian Arctic National Plan of Action and the associated Global Environment Fund (GEF) proposal, and would increase its annual support for that plan of action to Can \$200,000.
5. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following countries: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

6. The following United Nations bodies, specialized agencies and convention secretariats were represented: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN/DESA), United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), United Nations Secretariat, World Bank, World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA), Convention on Biological Diversity, UNEP/CAR/RCU, UNEP/Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, UNEP/East Asian Seas Regional Coordinating Unit (EAS/RCU), UNEP/Global Environment Facility (GEF) – Coordination Office, UNEP/Mediterranean Action Plan, UNEP/Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC), (UNEP)/Chemicals and (UNEP)/World Conservation Monitoring Centre.

7. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented: Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS), African Development Bank (ADB), Commission for Environmental Cooperation, OSPAR Commission for North-East Atlantic, Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, Convention on Wetlands: River Basin Initiative Secretariat, Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME), South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP), South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), and the World Conservation Union (IUCN).

8. The following non-governmental organizations and other bodies were represented: Equiterre, Global Programme of Action Coalition for the Gulf of Maine (GPAC), Globe India, Greenpeace International, Grupo Ecologista del Mayab, A.C.(GEMA), International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), International Oceans Institute (IOI), International Waters: Learning Exchange and Resource Network, Monitor International, Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa (NESDA), Secretariat of the Third World Water Forum, World Wildlife Fund – United Kingdom, E & E Solutions Inc., Pollution Probe, New Zealand Seafood Industry Council and University of Delaware, Grandvate College of Marine Studies.

II. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

A. Rules of procedure

9. Since the meeting had been convened under the auspices of the UNEP Governing Council, it was agreed that the Council's rules of procedure would apply to it mutatis mutandis.

B. Election of officers

10. Mr Herb Dhaliwal, the representative of the host Government, was elected President of the meeting by acclamation. The following were also elected by acclamation as officers of the meeting:

Vice-Chair:	Mr Magnus Johannesson (Iceland)
Vice-Chair:	Mr Boris Morgunov (Russian Federation)
Vice-Chair:	Mr Tuiloma Neroni Slade (Samoa)
Vice-Chair:	Mrs Rejoice Mabudafhasi (South Africa)
Rapporteur:	Mr Franklin McDonald (Jamaica)

C. Organization of work

11. It was agreed that the meeting should be divided into three segments: a multi-stakeholder segment from Monday 26 to Wednesday 28 November, to consider items 1 to 9 of the provisional agenda; a ministerial/high-level segment on Thursday 29 and Friday morning 30 November, to consider item 10 of the

provisional agenda; and a final segment on Friday afternoon 30 November, to consider items 11 to 13 of the provisional agenda. It was agreed that Mr Dhaliwal would preside over the ministerial segment, while Mr Johannesson and Mr Slade would share the task of chairing the multi-stakeholder segment.

12. It was also agreed that the meeting should work in plenary sessions and that an open-ended drafting group should be set up to examine the proposed Montreal Declaration, under the chairmanship of Mr Tom Laughlin (United States of America).

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

13. The Coordinator of the Coordination Office recalled the tasks of the intergovernmental review meeting, as set out in paragraph 77 of the Global Programme of Action, and outlined the proposed focus of the meeting as well as the projected outcomes. She pointed out that the non-binding character of the Global Programme of Action gave it flexibility and possibility to explore innovative solutions.

14. After considering the provisional agenda submitted by the secretariat ((UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/1), the participants adopted the following agenda for the meeting:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organization of the meeting:
 - (a) Rules of procedure;
 - (b) Election of officers;
 - (c) Organization of work.
3. Adoption of the agenda.
4. Review of accomplishments in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, 1995-2001:
 - (a) Global level;
 - (b) Regional level;
 - (c) National level.
5. The Global Programme of Action's strategic action plan on municipal wastewater.
6. The proposed 2002-2006 work programme of the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office and partner organizations, with indicative costs.
7. Improving the implementation of the Global Programme of Action through improved ocean governance:
 - (a) Multi-stakeholder platforms for generating action and better coordination;
 - (b) Improving cooperation and delivery between global and regional environmental conventions;
 - (c) Intraregional cooperation among United Nations agencies and other organizations;

- (d) Role of civil society and local governments;
 - (e) Role of river basin commissions and coastal area management.
8. Building partnerships and financing the implementation of the Global Programme of Action:
 - (a) Conditions for the successful application of appropriate financial arrangements;
 - (b) Role of Governments, private and financing sectors and civil society;
 - (c) Operationalization of appropriate financial arrangements for environmental protection.
 9. Recommendations to be forwarded to the ministerial/high-level segment.
 10. Ministerial/high-level segment and Montreal Declaration on the Global Programme of Action:
 - (a) Improving the implementation of the Global Programme of Action through improved coastal and ocean governance;
 - (b) Leveraging the necessary resources, in particular financial resources, for addressing land-based activities.
 11. Other matters.
 12. Adoption of the report of the meeting.
 13. Closure of the meeting.

IV. REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION, 1995-2001 (agenda item 4)

A. Global level

15. In its consideration of this item, the meeting had before it document UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/2 (Review of accomplishments in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, 1995-2001), as well as information document UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/INF/2 (A review of binding and non-binding agreements relevant to implementation of the Global Programme of Action).

16. The item was introduced by the Coordinator of the Coordination Office. She pointed out that the purpose of the discussion was to provide an opportunity to reflect on major achievements, address major impediments and opportunities and identify action needed, including regional action plans and protocols, with the aim of facilitating the shift from planning to action and developing the path for the future.

17. Overall, progress had been made, inter alia, through the development of regional and national action plans and the increased use of integrated coastal area management and environmental impact assessment. Legally binding agreements on land-based sources of pollution had been adopted in two regions, as well as the global conventions on prior informed consent and persistent organic pollutants. Major impediments to further progress were a lack of awareness of the Global Programme of Action, a lack of political will to implement it, a lack of financing and capabilities, and a continuing institutional divide between the communities dealing with freshwater, coastal areas and oceans.

18. The Chair of the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) summarized the major findings and recommendations of the global report on land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment. The report identified the most serious global threats as alteration and destruction of habitats and ecosystems; the effects of sewage on human health and the environment; widespread and increasing eutrophication; and altered sediment flows resulting from hydrological modification. The generic root causes identified were poverty, unsustainable consumption patterns and poorly managed social and economic development.

B. Regional level

Wider Caribbean Region

19. A representative of the Wider Caribbean Region presented a report on the process and lessons learned in developing and negotiating the Aruba Protocol to the Cartagena Convention Concerning Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities.

20. Several key features of the Protocol distinguished it from other instruments. For instance, the Caribbean Governments had opted for a source-specific approach, rather than a contaminant-based one, as in line with the Global Programme of Action approach.

21. The main goal for the region was the entry into force of the Protocol. At the same time, several regional activities were already being implemented, such as national planning, training in the area of domestic wastewater treatment and the identification of new and innovative techniques for pollution control.

Mediterranean Region

22. The representative of the Mediterranean Action Plan made a presentation on the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution. Twenty years previously, the Mediterranean States had set up programmes to measure and monitor the marine environment with the aim of establishing baselines for future environmental activities. A protocol on land-based sources had also been adopted 20 years previously, but had been updated following the 1992 Earth Summit and the adoption of the Global Programme of Action in 1995. Notable features were that it was extended to cover river basins and catchment areas, and that it provided for the adoption of national regulations, permits, inspections and penalties, the approval of regional strategies and schedules, and a new system of reporting to the Conference of the Parties. Substantial progress had been made under a project funded by GEF and France amongst others to produce an inventory of sources of pollution in all cities over a certain size, river-borne inputs into the Mediterranean and over 100 pollution hot spots identified.

C. National level

Brazil

23. The representative of Brazil provided a report on the preparation and implementation of his country's national programme of action on land-based activities, including strategies for its implementation.

24. The goal of the national programme of action was to set management objectives for priority problems by, *inter alia*, developing and implementing models of integration between coastal and water resources management.

25. The main mission of the national programme of action was to build a solid framework with initiatives that addressed, amongst others, the objectives of the Global Programme of Action. Brazil's national programme of action provided the appropriate framework for the implementation of cooperation at the regional level.

Canada

26. The representative of Canada reported that his country's national programme of action, which had been released on 8 June, 2000 responded to the call by the Global Programme of Action to protect the marine environment through coordinated actions at local, national, regional, and global levels. The goals of the national programme of action included protecting human health, reducing degradation of the marine environment and remediating damaged areas. For the implementation of the national programme of action, Canada had identified three principles: sustainable development, integrated management and the precautionary approach. This also involved the harmonization of integrated coastal management with river basin management and land use planning.

27. In developing its national programme of action and working to implement its priorities, Canada had learnt several key lessons, related to the Global Programme of Action methodology and how to build on existing mechanisms. It was noted that Canada had the legislation and policy basis, as well as a vast network of marine-related initiatives already in place, to provide the fundamental framework for implementing the national plan of action. Canada had also tabled its first country report outlining progress in the implementation of its national programme of action.

Russian Federation

28. The Russian national plan of action for the protection of the marine environment from man-made pollution in the Arctic region was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation, who pointed out that the region was unique in terms of its environment and its climate. The Arctic region played a key role in global oceanic and atmospheric circulation, and generally in maintaining global ecological equilibrium. Consequently non-Arctic States could not remain indifferent to the need to tackle the problems facing the Arctic region.

29. Work in drafting the Russian national plan of action had drawn on such sources as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Global Plan of Action, together with decisions jointly taken by the Arctic States through the Arctic Council.

30. In pursuit of the goal of protecting the people and the biosphere from man-made pollution, a system of monitoring and assessment of the state of pollution in the Russian Arctic will be developed in conjunction with a strengthening of legal and regulatory measures in order to shape a rational system for the use of natural resources and protection of the Arctic seas from pollution; the development of investment projects for the protection of the Arctic seas from man-made pollution; the taking of various steps in the organizational and technical fields to expand international cooperation in the protection of the Arctic environment.

31. A proposal prepared in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea relating to support for the implementation of the national plan of action was submitted to the Council of the Global Environment Facility.

32. There was general agreement from the floor that the Global Programme of Action is essential and that its implementation needed to be pursued with renewed vigour. New partnerships, new approaches and integrated processes were required to address its implementation in a cost-effective and sustainable manner.

33. The important role of international financial institutions in the implementation of the programme was recognized, and an appeal made for such institutions to take a more active role in the implementation of the programme. The point was however raised that the implementation and financing of the protection of the marine environment should in the first place be the responsibility of national Governments and the support of such external financing would supplement national investment when needed.

34. As a global action-oriented programme, the Global Programme of Action was seen as a flexible mechanism for promoting concrete action on the ground within the appropriate regional and global frameworks, cutting across several existing conventions and action plans. It was proposed that its objectives

and the outcome of the current meeting be recognized and addressed, inter alia, in the context of preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

V. THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION'S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN ON MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER (agenda item 5)

35. In its consideration of this item, the meeting had before it documents UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/4 and UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/5 (the Global Programme of Action's Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater).
36. The item was introduced by the Coordinator of the Coordination Office. She pointed out that the strategic action plan was intended to further develop the guidance contained in the Global Programme of Action and to support regional seas and other bodies in their efforts to address sewage as a priority problem, by seeking consensus on the guidance document on best practices and procedures; promoting "alternative" solutions; facilitating partnerships to apply best practices and facilitating regional cooperation to replicate best practices.
37. At the regional level, the strategic action plan was designed to provide regional annexes to the guidance document on best practices and procedures, to collect and distribute experience with best practices, and to support a number of pilot projects with emphasis on creating new partnerships applying alternative approaches.
38. During the period 2000-2001, the implementation of the strategic action plan had involved the preparation of draft guidance documents, the development of a global knowledge base and the holding of six regional workshops. Activities during the period 2002-2006 were scheduled to include production of a globally agreed guidance document, the effective sharing of experience and expertise and, most importantly, capacity-building.
39. The meeting was requested to review the approach taken to the development of the guidance and provide advice on how to proceed, as well as to review and provide guidance on the strategic action plan. Participants were invited to review the Coordination Office's focus on strengthening capacity in local and national authorities and to agree that a similar approach should be followed with respect to other source categories – in the first place, physical alteration and destruction of habitat.
40. In the ensuing discussion, participants broadly welcomed the strategic action plan and commended the Coordination Office and its partners on their effort in preparing it. The Guidance on Municipal Wastewater and its "key principles" was welcomed as a useful tool in actually addressing key issues in wastewater management. It was felt that the methodology adopted could usefully be extended to cover other source categories.
41. In view of the financial situation and the complicated nature of the problem, there was a need for additional funding and new funding mechanisms. There was support expressed for low-cost schemes to prevent and reduce marine pollution. It was noted, however, that such schemes could become costly or damaging to the environment if not properly managed. The advantages of public-private partnerships and other innovative financing mechanisms in improving efficiency were recognized, subject to effective cost recovery arrangements, but it was pointed out that they did not always meet the needs of the poorest members of society.
42. The strong emphasis placed by the strategy on the human health aspects of municipal wastewater was welcomed. It was also suggested that the issue of industrial wastewater discharge to municipal sewerage systems be addressed. Information was given on cleaner production centres, which could provide practical assistance to industry in reducing the volume and pollutant load of industrial waste discharges. Mention was made of the importance of linkages and a coordinated approach with the private sector and strengthening coordination among various agencies in the United Nations system.

43. There was a need to reach all citizens in relation to the issue of municipal wastewater, and the outreach activities carried out so far were welcomed. The link in the strategic action plan between global and local action was welcomed, as was the fact that it reflected regional differences. The need to build local capacity, especially in the key area of management skills, was recognized. It was suggested to adopt a single mechanism for capacity-building and technological cooperation to serve all the multilateral environmental agreements and programmes which had originated in the Earth Summit.

44. In recognition of the important role of cities in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action and of the need for local action and locally integrated water management, UNCHS (Habitat) was undertaking a number of important programmes in cooperation with other United Nations agencies and with the support of such funding partners as UNFIP, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Prominent among these initiatives, the Water for African Cities programme addressed both the management of freshwater resources and the treatment of wastewater. Furthermore UNCHS (Habitat) had offered to explore the possibility of more directly supporting the implementation of the Global Programme of Action with ongoing programmes that build local, broad-based and integrated environmental management capacities such as the Sustainable Cities Programme, the Best Practices and Local Leadership Programme and a joint initiative with the global associations of local authorities on city-to-city cooperation. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) had reported on the launching of its Water Campaign, designed to build a worldwide network of local governments committed to achieving tangible improvements in the availability of water and environmental sanitation services.

45. It was felt that there was a role to be played by appropriate alternatives to expensive “traditional” treatment plants, such as ponds, constructed wetlands and on-site composting, as their simple and less expensive maintenance would make them more cost-effective in the long term. There was a need to take account of countries’ capacity both to absorb new technologies and to pay for them. Conservation of water resources could be secured through the adoption of clean production techniques and other means of reducing pollution from industry.

46. Mention was made of schemes in various countries based on the “polluter pays” principle, and offers were made to share details of such experience. It was pointed out, however, that many countries faced limitations in this area since the principle required efficient means of identifying the polluter and collecting payment.

47. Support was expressed for the policy development cycle devised by the Coordination Office, comprising problem identification and assessment, programme preparation and priority-setting, formal adoption of the selected programme or action and funding mechanisms, and implementation of adopted programme or action. It was felt that a fifth step – monitoring and evaluation of adopted programmes and actions – should be added to feed back into the initial stage of the cycle.

48. The issue of sewage management was a major concern in many countries, but although the innovative and appropriate technologies for dealing with it were available, dissemination of information can be improved. It was suggested that the Coordination Office should develop and disseminate a practical guidance document on how to conduct assessments of sewage management needs and make appropriate cost-effective choices.

VI. THE PROPOSED 2002-2006 WORK PROGRAMME OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION COORDINATION OFFICE AND PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS, WITH INDICATIVE COSTS (agenda item 6)

49. In its consideration of this item, the meeting had before it documents UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/3 and UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/6 and Add.1, as well as information documents UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/INF/5 and UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/INF/6.

50. The item was introduced by the Coordinator of the Coordination Office, who invited the participants to review the accomplishments of the Office during the period 1995-2001, before turning to the work programme for the coming years.

51. Assessments carried out during the period included the GESAMP reports, which had already been mentioned, and 10 regional assessments. Nine regional programmes of action had been or were being developed. Noteworthy examples of regional cooperation were to be found in the Mediterranean, the north-east Pacific and the Russian Arctic. Voluntary agreements had been drawn up, as had national plans of action. GEF had made a substantial contribution to financing the work of the Office. The clearing house, though very resource-intensive, had many achievements to its credit. The Office's partners included the UNEP regional seas programmes, its regional offices and various divisions, the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Train-Sea-Coast programme of the United Nations Department of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, the International Ocean Institute, and other United Nations agencies.

52. Under the auspices of the Sub-Committee on Oceans and Coastal Areas of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, significant progress had been made in introducing the integrated approach to coastal management in the past decade. Achievements by agencies in the United Nations system included the development of guidelines, principles, standards and networks, marine ecosystem projects to a value of \$200 million, development of the principles of integrated coastal fisheries management, the use of geographical information systems for fisheries management, provision of meteorological and oceanographic data, analyses and forecasts, a clearing house and marine climatological databases. In the field of marine environmental protection, the two main innovations noted were the extensive adoption of the precautionary approach and the introduction of the ecosystem approach to management, despite problems associated with boundaries and lack of definition of the approach. The complex problems involved necessitated significant capacity-building and institutional change at the national level.

53. The GEF Coordination Division of UNEP had a portfolio of international waters activities costing \$165 million in over 120 countries, most of which were of direct relevance to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. A number of demonstration projects link freshwater catchment area management with the associated coastal areas. As GEF was to be the interim financial mechanism for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), a small portfolio of projects had been developed to assist countries to address POPs-related issues.

54. In addition, the GEF Council had adopted a specific policy and strategy in response to the adoption of the Global Programme of Action. Under its programmes on international waters, water bodies and land and water, it funded projects targeting shared water bodies and addressing the major transboundary problem of land-based activities. An evaluation of GEF support to water-related agreements had shown that support for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action occupied the largest place, through 34 projects in over 120 countries for a total commitment of over \$200 million, excluding leveraged finance but including support for biodiversity projects. A project of major global relevance was being funded in the Russian Arctic, targeting land-based activities of a transboundary nature, while other projects involved support for Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA) and IW:Learn, through which GEF activities were linked by means of the Internet.

55. It was noted that the goals of the GIWA were to identify linkages between issues affecting the transboundary aquatic environment and their causes, so that GEF would be better placed to intervene to resolve the problems in a sustainable and cost-effective manner, and to implement environmental and socio-economic impact assessments in 66 subregions, including both marine and freshwater systems. The project stood ready to contribute to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action by facilitating the exchange of experience among expert groups in the 66 subregions, sharing assessment results associated with land-based activities and providing assessment of the societal causes of the identified regional issues and problems, including the impacts on the economy and on human health and welfare.

56. In the ensuing discussion, the Coordination Office was congratulated on its achievements during the period 1996-2001. Information was provided on some regional projects which had benefited from an input from the Office.

57. The participants took note with appreciation of the report on the Office's activities (UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/3), and thanked the Office and its partners for their reports on their activities.

58. The Coordinator then introduced the proposed work programme for the period 2002-2006 (UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/6 and Add.1). She pointed out that the year 2002 would constitute a transition phase, building on past achievements, preparing for implementation of the recommendations of the review meeting, and strengthening links with the private sector and financial institutions at the regional and national levels. Subsequently, moving from planning to action, the Office would seek innovative approaches to problems, new partnerships and new and additional financing. Experience was available, but needed to be disseminated widely.

59. The Coordinator invited participants to provide guidance on the proposed work programme, particularly in relation to the 10 clusters of activity suggested - which were presented in a modular structure, to allow for expansion as resources grew, and the three estimated levels of funding.

60. The European Union, represented by Belgium, expressed its strong commitment to the Global Programme of Action as a flexible and action oriented programme which cut across several existing conventions and action plans. It was convinced that the Global Programme of Action was a proper and instrumental tool to improve the governance between ocean related conventions, including strengthening the respective regional seas conventions and protocols. The European Union underscored the requirement for new partnerships, new approaches and integrated processes to implement the Global Programme of Action in a cost effective and sustainable manner. Similarly, the European Union stressed the urgent need to integrate coastal resource management and the requirements of coastal zone protection, with river basin management. The European Union stated that financing the protection of the marine environment should in the first place come from the countries own resources, supplemented where needed with incoming financing.

61. The proposed work programme was described as comprehensive and realistic, with its focus on actions rather than on simple identification of problems. The clarity and transparency of the programme were also welcomed. It was the general view that the funding level tabulated under "Intermediate" in document UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/6 was the appropriate level to be sought, as the amounts under "Minimum" were in fact deemed to be inadequate. It was also noted that the work programme would be monitored and evaluated for the second intergovernmental review.

62. The focus on seeking implementation through partnerships was welcomed and some descriptions were given of undertakings which could complement Global Programme of Action activities. While cooperation and coordination among different agencies and organizations were desirable, such organizations had differing structures and specific mandates, which needed to be taken into account. There was much support for the programme's linking of the freshwater and marine environments and suggestions were made regarding additional types of pollution on which the Global Programme of Action could concentrate. The Coordinator assured the meeting that such areas would be studied in due course, but that with finite resources, priorities had to be set.

VII. IMPROVING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION THROUGH IMPROVED OCEAN GOVERNANCE (agenda item 7)

63. In its consideration of this item, the meeting had before it document 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 improved coastal and ocean governance).

64. The item was introduced by the Coordinator of the Coordination Office, who presented its main themes. Basing her remarks on document UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/7, she said that it was hoped to have a multi-stakeholder discussion which would feed into not only the ministerial discussions but also the Montreal Declaration, the discussions on intergovernmental environmental governance and the World Summit on Sustainable Development. A primary task was to determine how to translate the global discussion on intergovernmental environmental governance into concrete and feasible action at the regional level within the framework of the Global Programme of Action. It was proposed that the discussion should be structured around five topics: multi-stakeholder platforms for generating action and better coordination; improving cooperation and delivery between global and regional environmental conventions; intraregional cooperation among the United Nations agencies and other organizations; the role of civil society and local governments; and the role of river basin commissions and coastal zone areas management.

65. The Director of the UNEP Division of Environmental Conventions explained that intergovernmental environmental governance was currently at the heart of the work of UNEP. Pursuant to Governing Council decision 21/21, the Executive Director had been charged with convening an open-ended group of environmental ministers and their representatives, to consider the issues of intergovernmental environmental governance and how to improve it. That had become necessary in the light of the proliferation of international environment-related conventions and agreements, which now numbered more than 500. With myriad different focal points responsible for the various topics, there was a need to undertake a bottom-up process of coordination. That would involve clustering the many conventions and agreements, either thematically, functionally, or regionally. In the case of the regional seas conventions, for example, there were several cases of horizontal cooperation, involving either a more advanced programme assisting a less developed one, or alternatively cooperation between adjacent areas. The process of coordination involved focusing on particular strengths, avoiding or eliminating duplication of effort, recognizing which body should have the lead, and establishing regional facilities to support numerous different instruments. All of those steps had to be pursued on a voluntary basis, as any attempt at enforcement would be quite unrealistic.

66. The representative of the Convention on Biological Diversity pointed out that the Convention and the Global Programme of Action shared common interests with respect to the sustainable use of marine and coastal living resources and the prevention of physical degradation and destruction of habitats. Almost 50 per cent of the world's coasts were currently threatened by development-related activities. With approximately 66 per cent of the world's population living within 80 kilometres of the coast, the resultant intense pressures on marine and coastal ecosystems required serious commitment and preventive action at all levels. Recognizing the importance of the marine and coastal environment, the Parties to the Convention had adopted the Jakarta Mandate in 1995, together with a programme of work comprising five main thematic issues, namely integrated marine and coastal area management, sustainable use of marine and coastal living resources, marine and coastal protected areas, mariculture, and alien species and genotypes.

67. The Convention secretariat and the Coordination Office had signed a memorandum of cooperation in September 2000, intended to ensure harmonization of implementation at the national, regional and global levels. A joint programme of work had been established, and many of its activities had already been successfully implemented. The main outcome was an action plan for addressing physical alterations and destruction of habitats. Efforts had already begun to create linkages between the Convention and the Global Programme of Action's clearing-house mechanisms, and to ensure coordination of national reporting. Such activities could be viewed as a step towards improving global environmental governance, and provided an example of how a global convention and a non-binding global programme could be mutually supportive.

68. The representative of IUCN said that the ongoing implementation of the Global Programme of Action already reflected several useful contributions to improved ocean governance and improved intergovernmental environmental governance, such as the use of the Coordination Office to mobilize support for concerns and priorities defined at national and regional levels; devising a consultative process to evaluate good practice options and guidance for decision-makers; drawing on worldwide expertise as well as specialized concerns in each area, for example municipal wastewater; or building partnerships with intergovernmental organizations.

69. There were several challenges to be faced: coordination and cooperation at global level among international bodies to develop guidance on appropriate and environmentally sound technical and policy options for each sector and each activity; cooperation, coordination and priority-setting at national and regional levels among sectors or activities; the large number of relevant international legal instruments and agency programmes. The IUCN representative suggested that the Global Programme of Action should develop additional tools to help Governments at national level to coordinate and prioritize multi-sectoral programmes within and across source categories. Attention was drawn to an IUCN initiative in Brazil, the Guanabara Bay project, which was intended to help decision makers examine options and set priorities for controlling pollution at local level.
70. Emergency preparedness and response was another cross-cutting area where the Global Programme of Action might provide guidance and support. Where transboundary concerns arose, it might be useful to ensure that there was adequate provision for consultation and joint approaches. Also useful would be an international institutional roadmap showing the global and regional conventions applicable to each source category. Opportunities should be explored for regional collaboration with river basin authorities, regional fisheries management, and so on; or for collaboration among international conventions and programmes in waste management, including waste reduction and recycling. There was also ample scope for the Global Programme of Action to develop further the approach to “areas of concern” as defined in the Global Programme of Action to ensure that coastal and marine protected areas, important habitat for fisheries and habitat for species protected under international instruments were integrated with national and regional planning. Regular multi-stakeholder meetings at national and regional level could provide the impetus to overcome some of the barriers identified in the documents for the present meeting.
71. The participants were also provided with information on the mandate of and functions performed by the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, especially in respect of issues falling under the Global Programme of Action, and its links with other agencies operating in the same area. The representative of the World Bank also provided information on Bank financing of \$4 billion for projects related to the Global Programme of Action, in a wide range of areas, noting that such initiatives would have had wider impact if potential synergies had been exploited, underlining the need for greater coordination.
72. During the ensuing discussion, it was agreed that the Global Programme of Action must reach out to other multilateral environmental agreements, and that the clustering approach offered many benefits.
73. There was general agreement that revitalised regional seas programmes were the pillar for improved ocean governance, and that cooperation and coordination between them, as well as between United Nations agencies at the regional level, should be enhanced. Countries wishing to ensure harmonization at the regional level should ensure prior policy coordination at the national level.
74. A higher profile for the Global Programme of Action should be secured in the United Nations informal consultations on oceans and the law of the sea. A link should be made with the governance process under way in UNEP, and also with consideration of oceans initiatives at the World Summit on Sustainable Development.
75. The integrated multi-stakeholder approach of the Global Programme of Action could serve as a trigger to bring the different stakeholders together, especially at the regional level, through, amongst others, such mechanisms as regional seas and regional ocean assemblies.
76. There was a need for regional coordination centres or virtual technology centres to service a range of multilateral environmental agreements.
77. The five topics (referred to in paragraph 59) proposed by the Coordination Office should not be tackled piecemeal but systematically, using a “bottom-up” approach, starting with one or two regions.

78. The need for increasing awareness of the major role of cities in the degradation of coastal and marine ecosystems and the need to actively engage city and municipal authorities in the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements was pointed out as an opportunity for the Global Programme of Action.

79. The conferences of the parties of the regional seas programmes should consider broadening their representation, to foster a multi-stakeholder approach and improved coordination with other regional bodies.

80. Capacity-building and public awareness campaigns were vital for improved ocean governance, from the community to the regional level. The involvement of civil society and the private sector was vital in ensuring multisectoral management of projects and possible access to new sources of funding.

VIII. BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND FINANCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES (agenda item 8)

81. The item was introduced by the Coordinator of the Coordination Office, who described it as an important step towards removing the impediments to an action-oriented programme of work. She drew attention to the outline of the issues contained in document UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/8, as well as to an information document reporting on a World Bank/UNEP Workshop on Innovative Financial Arrangements held in June 2001. She said that once again it was hoped to have a multi-stakeholder discussion which would feed concrete input to the ministerial discussions and the Montreal Declaration, as well as the World Summit on Sustainable Development and possibly also the United Nations Conference on Financing for Development to be held in Mexico in March 2002. Stressing that the present meeting was not a financial pledging session, she suggested that the conditions for financing included the availability of options (technical, financial and administrative); confidence among all stakeholders; and a stable investment climate. Also important was proper valuation of environmental resources, showing the degree of economic loss caused by inaction. There was a need for a sound regulatory framework; for development of policy packages; for a capacity for enforcement; and for capacity in local and national governments to identify sound projects and negotiate innovative financing arrangements.

82. Additionally, there was a need to mainstream the objectives of the Global Programme of Action into the work programmes and plans of the major financial institutions including the private banking institution. Domestic financing would probably continue to be the main source of investment in water and other related sectors. There could well be room for public-private partnerships. Such arrangements, however, should be approached with caution and the decision-making should be reserved for Governments. The Coordinator also listed some of the possibilities for innovative financing, such as water funds, mixed funds, water markets, pollution trading or pollution permits, as well as microfinancing to provide seed money for innovations at the local level.

83. In the subsequent discussion, the representatives of a number of international financial institutions described the assistance that they had given to activities related to the Global Programme of Action in the past, their plans for providing assistance in the future, and some of the constraints on the provision of assistance. Where an institution's primary mandate was the alleviation of poverty, projects related to the Global Programme of Action which sought international financial assistance should be presented in a framework of long-term development and poverty alleviation. Additionally, some mandates were restricted to transboundary projects, with strictly national ones being excluded. It was also stressed that the Global Programme of Action had to be firmly integrated into countries' development programmes, to ensure that related projects received adequate priority within the international financial institutions.

84. A number of developing country and non-governmental representatives called for debt relief for the poorer countries. It was suggested that their debt repayments might be re-channelled into projects related to the Global Programme of Action. There were calls for the developed countries to provide 0.7 per cent of gross domestic production in overseas development assistance, and for a relaxation of the conditionalities

imposed on assistance from the international financial institutions. There were also calls for application of the “polluter pays” principle, and for a halt to investment in polluting industries, together with a concentration on clean production in the many industries where that was now possible. Some representatives, however, felt that it was not always feasible to apply the “polluter pays” principle in the area of normal domestic sewage. On the other hand, dealing with domestic sewage was much less complicated and capital-intensive than dealing with industrial wastes.

85. It was also urged that stress should be laid on the health implications of water-related projects. While it might be difficult to gain funding priority for specialized issues such as ecological integrity, the attention of Governments and investors could be caught by statistics on the thousands of illnesses and deaths caused by exposure to polluted waters and eating contaminated seafood. Similar awareness-raising was also needed among coastal communities.

86. It was pointed out that many of the countries which had made strong commitments to cleaner water and pollution control lacked the financial resources to follow up on those commitments. In particular, small island States would not be able to cover the cost of pollution control from their own resources or from user fees.

87. A number of developed country representatives described the assistance that their Governments had provided or were about to provide to projects related to the Global Programme of Action, with several of them calling for a major increase in the forthcoming replenishment of GEF. Other representatives described how their countries funded their own projects.

88. Reservations were expressed over the idea of pollution trading, described as an approach whose implications needed to be thought through very carefully. Several innovative funding mechanisms were mentioned including the possibility of a tourism tax and user fees related to the global commons.

89. The meeting was supportive of the concepts and directions indicated by the discussion paper and in particular of its emphasis on public private partnerships and stakeholder dialogue. The Coordinator in responding to the discussion indicated that the secretariat would continue to work with parties in the financial sector to develop innovative financing mechanisms including microfinancing and “seed” funding. She noted the view of the international financial institutions that national programmes of action would be useful first steps in attracting their financial support but also noted that such national programmes of action needed to be formally adopted by Governments. The need to link national programmes of action to ongoing initiatives to improve quality of life, human health status and poverty alleviation was also endorsed.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE FORWARDED TO THE MINISTERIAL/HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT (agenda item 9)

90. At the plenary meeting on the afternoon of 28 November, the meeting heard progress reports on the work of the drafting group, the preparation of the Chair’s summaries to be attached to the report of the meeting, and the preparation of the draft report itself.

Part two

MINISTERIAL/HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT

X. MINISTERIAL/HIGH LEVEL SEGMENT AND MONTREAL DECLARATION ON THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION (agenda item 10)

91. The President said that the high-level segment of the meeting had three main objectives: to discuss ways to improve the Global Programme of Action through improved oceans governance; to discuss how to build partnerships and finance the Global Programme of Action; and ultimately to adopt the Montreal Declaration.

92. Important proposals on a number of issues had been made during the course of the multi-stakeholder segment, and it was to be hoped that they could be incorporated in the Montreal Declaration. For Canada, oceans governance was perhaps the most important issue. Oceans management needed to be designed to ensure shared decision-making by all stakeholders. For that reason, Canada strongly supported integrated management and stewardship at all levels, including in transboundary contexts. Canada had been a strong advocate of a regional programme of action for the Arctic, of which a key component was the Russian national programme of action for the Arctic. Canada was also a strong supporter of UNEP's regional seas programme and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission as two helpful approaches to inter-agency and intergovernmental cooperation. The commitment to working together had to apply globally: the oceans belonged to the world, and they had to be managed and protected by countries working as a global community.

93. Another important issue to be reflected in the Montreal Declaration was the issue of financing. Domestically and internationally, the need for adequate resources to implement the Global Programme of Action was a key challenge. Rather than creating new or additional management levels to implement the Global Programme of Action, in its national programme of action Canada had made use of what already existed, strengthening partnerships at all levels and leveraging resources. However, in some cases, there would be a need to seek new and alternative financing. Canada supported the partnership funding approach for the Russian Arctic programme, with new sources of funds being explored with the private sector and international funding organizations.

94. Also very important to Canada was the issue of municipal wastewater. Pollution prevention was a key focus of many of the 90 initiatives developed under Canada's national programme of action. Preventive measures were far preferable to, and much more economical than, corrective actions. Canada saw the need to consider the oceans and freshwater as an interconnected system, and consequently supported the overall approach of the Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater. There was a need both for a checklist of tools and concrete measures and for sufficient flexibility to ensure that municipalities and nations could choose the tools which worked best in their own specific circumstances.

95. Canada also indicated that it hoped to see a reference in the Montreal Declaration to state-of-the-oceans reporting. That would enable countries to know what challenges other countries were facing, offering an excellent way for all nations to better coordinate their oceans activities. Incorporating such key issues, and others, into the Montreal Declaration would be an excellent way to prepare the collective oceans message to the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

96. The Executive Director of UNEP welcomed the delegations to the high-level segment. Noting that Canada had long been active in environmental matters – hosting two convention secretariats in Montreal, providing the present President of the UNEP Governing Council in the person of Mr David Anderson, Minister of the Environment, and playing a pivotal role in environmental negotiations - he thanked the Government of Canada for hosting the meeting and for providing financial support. He also thanked the Government of the Netherlands for hosting the Coordination Office, and the Governments of Belgium, Finland, Iceland, Norway and the United States of America for their financial support, and expressed his appreciation to those intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, private-sector bodies and international financial institutions which had contributed actively to the preparation of the meeting, as well as to the representatives who had been working during its multi-stakeholder segment.

97. The adoption of the Global Programme of Action in 1995 had been a great first step towards tackling the problems of pollution in the marine environment, and much progress had been made, for example in the adoption of the Aruba protocol on pollution from land-based sources to the Cartagena Convention, but there was still much to be done. There were four areas where urgent action was required: the problems of developing countries; adoption of an integrated and responsible approach; governance; and transboundary initiatives.

98. Governance and finance, two of the major topics addressed in the current meeting, were closely interlinked. The cross-sectoral and integrated nature of the Global Programme of Action made it the ideal tool to bring about regional improved governance in the context of the regional seas, cutting as it did across sectors, Governments, private bodies, financial institutions and civil society, as well as across freshwater, coastal water and marine environments. Financing was the other side of the equation. Some innovative financial arrangements had been addressed during the multi-stakeholder segment. Partnerships were key in such an approach, not only between public and private sectors, but also between different ministries and local communities.

99. The real question was how to make the concept of partnership actually work in practice. The Coordination Office proposed to continue to develop partnerships by working together on concrete problems, in the first place municipal wastewater issues. Gearing the discussions on governance and financing to practical problems, such as municipal wastewater, would make it possible jointly to develop concrete action plans crossing institutional and sectoral mandates.

100. For perhaps the first time in history, mankind had the technology, knowledge and resources to address the most urgent problems related to marine degradation. Governments had to respond with political will. They had indicated their strong wish to move from planning to action through the expeditious implementation of the Global Programme of Action. What was needed now was the political commitment to turn that will into action, and the words of the Montreal Declaration into deeds. However, the objectives of the Global Programme of Action would have to compete with other urgent needs, such as education, infrastructure and transport. The political will to put the Global Programme of Action high on the agenda of national resource allocation and investments was what would ultimately turn the Montreal Declaration into reality.

101. Mr Jan Pronk, Minister of the Environment of the Netherlands, in the keynote address, recalled that the Rio Summit in 1992 had created a number of successful offspring, including the various environmental conventions. Progress on environmental issues was slow, but was being made steadily. One thing that would help it was greater awareness of environmental issues, and of the Global Programme of Action in particular. He pointed out that at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the environment and poverty alleviation were going to be central issues. The two were inextricably linked, and both had to be addressed. In view of the increasing human, social and economic losses caused by environmental degradation, it was necessary to reduce the pressure on the environment to a level that the ecosystem could stand. At present, resources such as fish stocks, fresh water and forests which ought to be renewable were being exploited beyond the point at which they could recover.

102. Governance and finance were also inextricably linked. Looking at options for achieving improved governance, he called for greater emphasis on regional cooperation, within the regional seas system. There was also a need for better intersectoral coordination: for example, the bodies responsible for supplying clean water had to coordinate their efforts with those responsible for dealing with sewage resulting from the consumption of that water.

103. Additionally, there was a need for coordination among all of the environmental conventions. Each of them dealt with a specific topic - desertification, climate change, and so on - but it was also essential that they should be mutually reinforcing. In the marine area, it was the Coordination Office of the Global Programme of Action that was providing the necessary driving force, acting as the broker among national, regional and global initiatives and laying down guidelines for those initiatives. Its work should be reinforced. He indicated that the Government of the Netherlands was pleased to be the host country for the Office, and was preparing a new host country agreement for the coming five years.

104. Finance was needed for a lasting partnership. Many interesting options for financing had been discussed during the multi-stakeholder segment of the meeting; these included fiscal mechanisms, the "polluter pays" principle and cost recovery schemes. The quality of water was a multi-responsibility issue: environment, planning, water supply, finance, etc. requiring the support of many line ministries. It was thus

necessary to eliminate compartmentalization, which led to rigidity, both between national government departments and between different international instruments.

105. The World Summit on Sustainable Development should be the engine behind implementing existing environmental conventions and also future ones. He pointed out that the fuel for the engine was political will, and urged that delegations present support the political process.

106. During the ensuing discussion, support was expressed for the programme of work of the Coordination Office, which had been presented during the multi-stakeholder segment of the meeting. Sufficient funding should be raised to allow the programme of work to go forward. Particular emphasis was placed on the strategic action on municipal wastewater. The Office's move from planning to action was welcomed. The strategic directions adopted by the Office were endorsed, and the need to pursue the development of the clearing house was emphasized.

107. Many speakers described initiatives taken at both national and regional levels to implement the objectives of the Global Programme of Action or to promote awareness of it.

108. At the national level, the ecosystem approach would ensure policy coherence. Prevention and the precautionary approach were cost-effective, and economic instruments should be more widely used. Developing countries should take measures to promote cleaner production and mobilize resources for pollution control. Institutional cooperation between freshwater and coastal and marine agencies should be strengthened. Cooperation between the Global Programme of Action and global freshwater initiatives should also be encouraged.

109. There were calls for improved cooperation and coordination among regional bodies, for example between regional seas programmes and fisheries bodies. Support was expressed for the underlying concept of the regional seas agreements, described as an excellent mechanism for achieving improved ocean governance, and a means of implementing the Global Programme of Action at the regional level. The development of regional agreements had been helped by the process of implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The older regional seas agreements were strongly commended as examples which could be replicated in other regions. Twinning arrangements between regional seas agreements were commended. Partnership would be a key instrument for further implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The organization of coordination meetings among regional seas programmes was welcomed. It was suggested that the secretariats of the regional seas agreements should carry out assessments of pollution levels in their respective regions. That would give a baseline, from which an action programme could be developed, comprising specific programmes, priorities and time-frames. It was noted that such an undertaking would require political will, financial resources and a strengthening of the funding provided to UNEP.

110. The need was emphasized for cooperative partnerships with international financial institutions, international organizations, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and other major stakeholders with a pivotal role to play in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The Coordination Office was urged to cooperate with global and regional multilateral environmental agreements.

111. The importance of international and regional cooperation was stressed, as the only way to tackle the issues involved in the marine environment, many of which were transboundary in nature and were complex and interdependent. There was a need to address the protection, management and sustainable development of the marine environment in an integrated manner, and raise the level of participation by United Nations agencies in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

112. The system of governance in the areas of freshwater and the marine environment should be strengthened, through the international environmental governance process. Improvements in governance should be at a level appropriate to the problem. There was a need to target funds on countries and regions that demonstrated effective governance. Good governance called for transparency among all stakeholders and a multi-stakeholder approach. Earlier discussions of governance had recognized the importance of

streamlining and harmonization of activities, especially as regards the implementation of regional and global agreements. Clustering of convention implementations along thematic, functional or regional lines should be encouraged.

113. States were urged to ratify the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and work for wider acceptance of multilateral environmental agreements generally. The plethora of legal instruments covering the marine environment was pointed to as a constraint on meeting the requirements of all of them. Simplifying and streamlining the regulatory framework was required to improve governance and implementation. The Global Programme of Action should be requested to provide a template to assist in assessing and reporting on regional seas programmes.

114. Information was provided on specific activities undertaken by the World Bank to address threats to the coastal and marine environment from land-based sources, and on policy changes adopted by the Bank to support the implementation of an integrated approach to management of marine resources.

115. It was pointed out that official development assistance had an important role to play in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, as a complement to national efforts. Some countries announced that they would be raising the portion of their gross domestic product devoted to development assistance in order to meet the commitments of Agenda 21. An increase in official development assistance was necessary, but had to be accompanied by action to incorporate the objectives of the Global Programme of Action into national activities. Support was expressed for the idea of debt relief for developing countries to generate funds for activities related to the Global Programme of Action.

116. Reference was made to proposals for the establishment of a very large fund to be used to bring the developing countries out of poverty, similar to the Marshall Plan which had brought the countries of Europe out of the ruins of the Second World War.

117. Speakers welcomed the focus on creating partnerships for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, especially with the private sector and non-governmental organizations, with broader stakeholder involvement. Innovative financing arrangements were indicated as especially important, in particular, through public-private partnerships and incentive schemes.

118. Wide support was expressed for the provision of increased allocation to activities under the Global Programme of Action in the forthcoming replenishment of GEF. The funding agencies were called on to recognize the special problems faced by small island developing States. It was also suggested that UNEP would be in a better position to plan its work over the long term if it benefited from stable and predictable funding, possibly through the institution of negotiated assessed contributions.

119. There were calls to the international financial institutions to relax the conditionalities on the loans which they provided to developing countries, so that more resources would become available to be devoted to environmental remediation activities.

120. It was stressed that attention should be given in the Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater to performance standards and environmental guidelines that were applicable and appropriate in the context of small island developing States. Wastewater treatment plants and sewage systems were generally not environmentally friendly in such States and the capital costs were generally beyond their means. It was also urged that developing countries should not continue to be used as dumping grounds for sub-standard and out-of-date technologies, nor should standards applicable in developed countries be applied in developing countries, where the costs greatly outweighed the social, economic and environmental benefits. It was pointed out that the Strategic Action Plan was biased towards countries which had become or were becoming industrialized, and it was recommended that UNEP and the Global Programme of Action should foster and support research into alternative and innovative waste management methods that were appropriate to traditional rural communities.

121. It was suggested that a regime might be established under which industries from developed countries operating in developing countries should be compelled to comply with the environmental standards applicable in their countries of origin.

122. It was pointed out that even landlocked countries could have a responsibility for the marine environment, if their rivers were carrying pollution to the oceans. It was also pointed out that where marine pollution resulted from ship-breaking, the ships themselves might have come from any country in the world, but the pollution entered the water in the country where the ship-breaking took place.

123. Following a further exchange of views on ways of improving the Global Programme of Action, the high-level segment of the meeting considered the draft Montreal Declaration, together with the amendments tabled by various delegations and adopted it as amended. The Montreal Declaration, as adopted, is contained in annex I to the present report.

XI. OTHER MATTERS

124. No other business was raised for discussion.

XII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

125. The meeting adopted its report on the basis of the draft report contained in documents UNEP/GPA/IGR.1/L.1 and L.1/Add.1, which had been circulated, as amended, and on the understanding that finalization of the report would be entrusted to the Rapporteur, working in conjunction with the Coordination Office. The outline information on regional seas activities would be attached to the report as annex III, with the declaration by the Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE) as annex IV, the statement of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) as annex V, and the statement by non-governmental organizations as annex VI.

XIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

126. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 1.30 p.m. on Friday, 30 November 2001.

Annex I

MONTREAL DECLARATION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE
MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

1. We, the representatives of 98 Governments, with the valued support and concurrence of delegates from international financial institutions, international and regional organizations, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, other stakeholders and major groups, meeting in Montreal, Canada, from 26 to 30 November 2001, for 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, agree as follows:
 2. We are concerned that:
 - (a) The marine environment is being increasingly degraded by pollution from sewage, persistent organic pollutants, radioactive substances, heavy metals, oils, litter, the physical alteration and destruction of habitats, and the alteration of timing, volume and quality of freshwater inflows with resulting changes to nutrient and sediment budgets and salinity regimes;
 - (b) The significant negative implications for human health, poverty alleviation, food security and safety and for affected industries are of major global importance;
 - (c) The social, environmental and economic costs are escalating as a result of the harmful effects of land-based activities on human health and coastal and marine ecosystems and that certain types of damage are serious and may be irreversible;
 - (d) The impacts of climate change on marine environments are a threat to low-lying coastal areas and small island States due to the increased degradation of the protective coastal and marine ecosystems;
 - (e) Greater urgency is not accorded to taking action at the national and regional levels for meeting the objectives of the Global Programme of Action.
 3. We are concerned also about the widespread poverty, particularly in coastal communities of developing countries, and the contribution that the conditions of poverty make to marine pollution through, for example, lack of even basic sanitation; and how marine degradation generates poverty by depleting the very basics for social and economic development.
 4. We acknowledge that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and Agenda 21 provide the key framework for implementing the Global Programme of Action.
 5. We declare that implementation of the Global Programme of Action is primarily the task of national Governments. Regional seas programmes also play an important role in implementation and both should include the active involvement of all stakeholders.
 6. We shall cooperate to improve coastal and ocean governance for the purpose of accelerating the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, by mainstreaming, integrating coastal area and watershed management, and enhancing global, regional and national governance processes.
 7. We shall also cooperate to identify new and additional financial resources to accelerate the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, by building capacity for effective partnerships among Governments, industry, civil society, international organizations and financial institutions, and by making better use of domestic and international resources.

Mainstreaming of the Global Programme of Action

8. We commit ourselves to improve and accelerate the implementation of the Global Programme of Action by:

(a) Incorporating the aims, objectives and guidance of the Global Programme of Action into new and existing activities, action programmes, strategies and plans at the local, national, regional and global levels and into sectoral policies within our respective jurisdictions;

(b) Strengthening the capacity of regional seas organizations for multi-stakeholder cooperation and action, including through participation in partnership meetings focused on concrete problem identification and solution;

(c) Supporting the ratification of existing regional seas agreements and development of additional ones, as appropriate, and promoting collaboration between existing regional seas organizations, including through twinning mechanisms;

(d) Calling on the United Nations agencies and programmes and international financial institutions to incorporate, where appropriate, the objectives of the Global Programme of Action into their respective work programmes, giving priority in the period 2002-2006 to addressing the impacts of sewage, physical alteration and destruction of habitats and nutrients on the marine environment, human health, poverty alleviation, food security and safety, water resources, biodiversity and affected industries;

(e) Calling upon regional seas programmes in light of assessments of their marine environment to:

(i) Identify priorities with particular regard to those set out in paragraph 8 (d) above;

(ii) Prepare action plans to address the implementation of those priorities and work, as appropriate, with national authorities to implement those plans;

(iii) Produce interim reports on the carrying out of these action plans with a view to completing full reports at the time of the next Global Programme of Action review.

Oceans and coastal governance

9. We further commit ourselves to improve and accelerate the implementation of the Global Programme of Action by:

(a) Taking appropriate action at the national and regional levels to strengthen institutional cooperation between, inter alia, river-basin authorities, port authorities and coastal zone managers, and to incorporate coastal management considerations into relevant legislation and regulations pertaining to watershed management in particular transboundary watersheds;

(b) Strengthening the capacity of local and national authorities to obtain and utilize sound scientific information to engage in integrated decision-making, with stakeholder participation, and to apply effective institutional and legal frameworks for sustainable coastal management;

(c) Strengthening regional seas programmes to play a role in, as appropriate, coordination and cooperation:

(i) In the implementation of the Global Programme of Action;

(ii) With other relevant regional organizations;

(iii) In regional development and watershed management plans;

- (iv) With global organizations and programmes relating to implementation of global and regional conventions;
- (d) Supporting this new integrated management model for oceans and coastal governance as an important new element of international environmental governance;
- (e) Improving scientific assessment of the anthropogenic impacts on the marine environment, including, *inter alia*, the socio-economic impacts;
- (f) Enhancing the state-of-the-oceans reporting to better measure progress towards sustainable development goals, informing decision-making (such as setting management objectives), improving public awareness and helping assess performance;
- (g) Improving technology development and transfer, in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly.

Financing of the Global Programme of Action

10. We commit ourselves to improve and accelerate the implementation of the Global Programme of Action by:

- (a) Strengthening the capacity of local and national authorities with relevant financial and other resources to identify and assess needs and alternative solutions to specific land-based sources of pollution; and to formulate, negotiate and implement contracts and other arrangements in partnership with the private sector;
- (b) Calling on international financial institutions and regional development banks and other international financial mechanisms in particular the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility, consistent with its operational strategy and policies, to facilitate and expeditiously finance activities related to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action at regional and national levels;
- (c) Giving due consideration to the positive and negative impacts of domestic legislation and policies, including, *inter alia*, fiscal measures, such as taxation and subsidies, on land-based activities degrading the marine and coastal environment;
- (d) Taking appropriate action at the national level including, *inter alia*, institutional and financial reforms, greater transparency and accountability, the development of multi-year investment programmes and providing an enabling environment for investment.

Other provisions

11. We welcome the Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater and urge the United Nations Environment Programme to finalize this document as a tool for implementing the objectives of the Global Programme of Action.

12. We call upon Governments to ratify the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the 1996 Protocol to the London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter and other relevant agreements in particular regional conventions, such as the 1999 Aruba Protocol to the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region and protocols dealing with the prevention of pollution of the marine environment as a means of implementing the Global Programme of Action. We also stress the need for increased international cooperation on chemicals management.

13. We welcome also the work done by the Global Programme Coordination Office, commend its 2002-2006 work programme to the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme and encourage it to implement the programme at a strengthened level, subject to availability of resources.

14. We note the outcome of the first Intergovernmental Review of the Global Programme of Action as a valuable contribution to the implementation of Agenda 21. We request that the next Global Ministerial Environment Forum endorse this outcome. We commend the outcome to the attention of the Monterey International Conference on Financing for Development, as well as of the Third World Water Forum to be held in Kyoto, Japan in 2003. We request the preparatory process of the World Summit on Sustainable Development to take full account of the outcome of this meeting and the objective of the Global Programme of Action as it considers measures on protection of the marine environment.

15. We request the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to convene the second Intergovernmental Review Meeting in 2006 and seek support for organizing the meeting.

Adopted by the Intergovernmental Review Meeting
on the Implementation of the Global Programme of
Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment
from Land-based Activities at its first meeting on
Friday, 30 November 2001

Annex II

CONCLUSIONS OF THE CO-CHAIRS FROM THE FIRST INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW
MEETING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION ON THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION
FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM
LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

MONTREAL 26-30 NOVEMBER 2001

Introduction

1. In pursuance of decision 21/10 of February 2001 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), government representatives, international financial institutions, international organizations, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, other stakeholders and major groups, have met from 26 to 30 November 2001, in Montreal, Canada, for 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.
2. We are honoured to co-chair this important event and have prepared these conclusions as part of the proceedings of the meeting. We are pleased to recommend the following conclusions as an accompaniment to the Montreal Declaration and commend them for the consideration of Governments in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in Johannesburg, South Africa, in September 2002 and all other forums at which activities relating to the goals of the Global Programme of Action are dealt with.
3. The 2001 report prepared by the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection - 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 – highlighted the alarming conclusion that “on a global scale marine environmental degradation has continued and in many places even intensified”.
4. The productive capacity and ecological integrity of the marine environment, including estuaries and near-shore coastal waters, continue to be degraded for a variety of reasons, including pollution from sewage, non-point source runoff from agricultural and urban areas, the physical alteration and destruction of habitat nutrients, sediment mobilization and chemicals. The negative implications for coastal and marine industry, human health, poverty alleviation, food security and safety are continuing, in many cases, unabated.
5. The social, environmental and economic costs to society are escalating as a result of disproportionately low levels of action to mitigate the harmful effects of land-based activities on coastal and marine environments and associated freshwater systems. Some types of damage are serious and irreversible. Indeed, the massive negative implications for human health, particularly as a result of pathogen laden sewage pollution of bathing beaches and shellfish harvesting areas have been seriously underestimated and neglected by the world community. A study by the World Health Organization has shown that such pollution results in millions of cases of disease and thousands of deaths annually.

A. Accomplishments of the Global Programme of Action

6. Since the inception of the Global Programme of Action, its implementation has witnessed considerable progress, and there has been continuing progress in integrated coastal zone management and oceans governance.
7. Many countries have prepared national programmes of action or have integrated the goals of the Global Programme of Action into their national strategies, policies, programmes and legislation.

8. Many regions have cooperatively prepared regional programmes of action, both binding and non-binding. Many of these provide excellent examples of coordination and cooperation and demonstrate the capacity of the regional seas programmes to serve as a central platform for improving coastal and oceans governance.
9. A good example of a regional approach to the Global Programme of Action and its emphasis upon developing partnerships in financing implementation is the Russian National Programme of Action for the Arctic. Similarly, a good example of multilateral partnership is the Africa Process on Cooperation for the Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.
10. The continuing development of the Global Programme of Action Clearing-house Mechanism by UNEP, in collaboration with respective United Nations organizations has proved to be a major achievement for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. It will prove to be a valuable tool for use by local, national, regional and global stakeholders in implementing the Global Programme of Action.
11. Many Governments have made considerable contributions in support of the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office. Special recognition should be given to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, host of the Coordination Office for the very generous continued support for the Office, and the Government of Belgium for donations allowing the development of national programmes of action in several countries. Many donor countries have also contributed significant funds in support of projects related to the Global Programme of Action in developing nations and regional programmes.
12. With regard to multilateral financing, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has allocated substantial resources to projects relevant to the objectives of the Global Programme of Action. The World Bank has also provided substantial support for projects that address objectives of the Global Programme of Action.
13. The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, adopted at the Conference of Plenipotentiaries in May 2001, is a major binding instrument which directly addresses one of the pollutant source categories identified in the Global Programme of Action.

B. Opportunities and barriers

14. The first Intergovernmental Review Meeting provided Governments and other stakeholders an opportunity to consider the barriers and opportunities associated with the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. The Global Programme of Action is a suitable means of improving governance under ocean-related conventions, including strengthening the regional seas conventions and protocols. It can serve as an effective global harmonizing mechanism to improve coordination and cooperation among these regional conventions and relevant global conventions.
15. The need for international cooperation and for a coordinated approach at the national level to address the problems of fresh water as well as coastal and marine pollution from land-based activities is stressed. Bringing together the many different economic sectors contributes invaluablely to poverty alleviation, food security and peace.
16. Globally, the impact of sewage, physical alteration of coastal and marine ecosystems and high nutrient levels merit the highest priority for action. Addressing these priorities cannot be achieved in isolation of the broader objectives of sustainable development. The causative relationship between poverty, human health, unsustainable consumption and production patterns, poorly managed social and economic development, and environmental degradation must be emphasized when implementing the Global Programme of Action.
17. There is an urgent need to integrate coastal resource management and the requirements of coastal zone protection with river basin management. In this regard, the potential of institutional partnerships to ensure an integrated and holistic approach to coastal zone management, catchment or watershed management, and land-use planning is recognized.

C. The Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater

18. The Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater expands on what is provided in the Global Programme of Action with the aim of seeking consensus, promoting alternative solutions, and facilitating partnerships and regional cooperation. The three-pronged functional approach outlined in the Strategic Action Plan is widely supported but a number of issues could be expanded upon. Examples include:

- (a) Provision of guidance on implementing new financial mechanisms;
- (b) Giving adequate attention to alternatives to large and costly treatment facilities;
- (c) Consideration of the impact of small industry on sewage systems;
- (d) Role of water conservation measures in reducing demand for water treatment;
- (e) Monitoring and evaluation.

19. The Draft Guidelines on Municipal Wastewater, developed by the Coordination Office as a critical element of the Strategic Action Plan, provide valuable guidance to manage urban wastewater worldwide, in accordance with national policies and plans.

20. The transfer of technology and expertise is critical to the global implementation of the Global Programme of Action, and in particular, with regard to management of municipal wastewater. A shortage of adequately trained personnel with technical skills to manage new facilities, or administrative skills to develop management schemes is holding back the implementation of the Global Programme of Action in some parts of the world.

21. Initiatives concerning technology transfer should be compatible with local environmental and cultural circumstances. In this context, it is noted that a high percentage of coastal communities in developing countries suffer from a lack of basic sanitation services. There is no doubt that initiatives related to the Global Programme of Action in such communities can contribute towards efforts to address this situation.

22. Capacity-building initiatives related to the Global Programme of Action require consistent attention at the local and national levels, and deserve attention within the framework of national development plans.

23. The “polluter pays” principle provides a significant catalyst for changing attitudes and facilitating the wise use of water. It is being used successfully in a number of countries and has the combined effect of raising revenue and discouraging pollution. In implementing this principle, however, there is a need to appropriately consider the social costs and its impact on the poorest members of society. There may also be considerable costs associated with identifying the polluters and establishing a payment scheme. The “polluter pays” principle may also discourage some development and should therefore be balanced with positive economic incentives for reducing pollution.

24. Finally, it would be valuable to further develop the Strategic Action Plan on Municipal Wastewater in cooperation with international financial institutions.

D. The work programme of the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office for the period 2002-2006

25. The focus of the programme of work is to move the implementation of the Global Programme of Action from the planning to the action phase by developing toolkits, facilitating partnerships, and initiating demonstration and capacity-building projects. In this regard, it aims to:

- (a) Facilitate the mobilization of financial resources;

- (b) Further involve the private sector and civil society;
- (c) Establish stronger working links with the freshwater community;
- (d) Expand capacity-building by enhancing the Global Programme of Action Clearing-house Mechanism;
- (e) Strengthen cooperation with United Nations agencies.

26. The programme of work could be further enhanced through the development of performance indicators, specific targets, and the incorporation of monitoring and assessment. These activities should build upon existing and ongoing programmes and efforts should be made to link the programme of work with those of other United Nations agencies, especially at the regional level, while avoiding duplication and overlapping. The cost-effectiveness of initiatives within the programme of work should also be analysed.

27. Opportunities also exist for achieving efficiencies by combining the efforts of United Nations agencies in cross-cutting issues, such as clearing-house mechanisms, capacity-building, technology transfer, indicators, and monitoring. Specifically, in relation to the clearing-house mechanism, stronger links could be made with the non-governmental organizations community and academia. Furthermore, the meeting was reminded that in many developing countries, access to the Internet is severely limited, especially for local practitioners.

28. Expanding the links with the freshwater community to also incorporate land-use planning would also significantly enhance the programme of work. In all aspects of the programme of work, however, the central role of Governments in setting priorities and ensuring compliance must be emphasized.

29. Many United Nations agencies and other international organizations have initiated activities that complement the proposed programme of work. Significant examples include the regional virtual centers for technology transfer being developed by the International Oceans Institute, and the Coastal Cities Network being developed by the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives.

E. Oceans and coastal governance

30. Recognizing the central authority of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and the guidance of Agenda 21, the implementation of the Global Programme of Action can be both a catalyst for, and a beneficiary of, improved coastal and oceans governance. It provides an excellent framework for harmonizing the activities of coastal and marine institutions and mechanisms at the local, national, regional and global levels, and for producing efficiencies by bringing stakeholders together from different sectors, both public and private, to address common objectives. For example, at the international level, the Global Programme of Action could serve as a harmonizing mechanism for the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Its active implementation at the local, national and regional levels will contribute to the protection of human health, food security, economic development and environmental protection.

31. Improvements in coastal and oceans governance should be at a level commensurate with the problem of coastal and marine degradation. However, the harmonizing capacity of the Global Programme of Action is especially relevant at the regional level and the regional seas programmes provide an excellent and existing vehicle for implementing the Global Programme of Action. They are a fundamental pillar for improved coastal and oceans governance.

32. The utilization of twinning arrangements involving information sharing, capacity-building and technology transfer between selected or contiguous regional seas programmes, can also strengthen coastal and oceans governance.

33. The objectives of the Global Programme of Action are complementary to many other multilateral environmental agreements, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, and institutional mechanisms such as the respective regional fisheries management organizations. Consequently, efforts should be made to integrate the Global Programme of Action into these initiatives in a more systemic manner. In this context, coordinating capacity-building amongst multilateral environmental agreements will improve efficiency and expand their reach and positive impacts. To facilitate this process, the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office should take active steps in collaboration with the regional seas programmes to reach out to other United Nations agencies. Consideration should be given to organizing a meeting of all regional seas programmes to coordinate a strategic approach to this effect, and to consider the possible role of the regional seas programmes as a platform for multi-stakeholder participation.

34. At the global level the Coordination Office should explore the potential for memoranda of understanding with multilateral environmental agreements, such as the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, to coordinate their initiatives. Similarly, there is a need to ensure the currency of the Global Programme of Action in the United Nations Oceans Consultative Process.

35. The importance of regional and global efforts to implement the Global Programme of Action should not undermine the importance of national action. Indeed, a bottom-up approach to improving global oceans governance is also needed. In this regard, in many countries there is a need for capacity-building and institutional strengthening to improve the governance of coastal and ocean resources at the national level. Similarly, there is a need to better understand the oceans while supporting the economic development of the oceans.

F. Financing the Global Programme of Action

36. Financing appropriate action to implement the Global Programme of Action should, in the first place, come from a country's own resources. It is therefore important to engineer a country-driven demand for implementing the Global Programme of Action amongst decision makers, industry, academia and the community.

37. The lack of adequate resources is a major impediment to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. Innovative approaches must be adopted to attract new finances for implementation of the Global Programme of Action. Such approaches should be tailored to national and local needs, including the needs of municipalities and local government entities, and solutions must encapsulate appropriate lower cost alternatives. Lower cost solutions should, however, be assessed for their total economic, social and environmental costs and impacts which may not be immediately apparent in some cases.

38. It is essential to integrate Global Programme of Action related activities into national development strategies and development assistance frameworks in order to facilitate interventions by international financial institutions, regional development banks and the donor community.

39. In implementing the Global Programme of Action increased emphasis should be given to the issues of poverty alleviation, human health and food security. Emphasizing the effect of projects related to the Global Programme of Action on these issues will attract political will, media attention, and the interest of international financial institutions. In this context, the goals of the Global Programme of Action should be incorporated into national development programmes and sustainable development strategies. Similarly, efforts should be directed towards building the capacity of Governments to assess the economic value of coastal and marine resources, and to fully engage the private sector and community groups in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

40. The development of financial partnerships, including public-private partnerships, will benefit the Global Programme of Action by increasing the level of participation in and awareness of, the Global Programme of Action and by opening new financial opportunities. For example, Governments could take

action to facilitate wider application of microfinancing and enterprise financing mechanisms, involving the private sector and financial institutions. Similarly, stakeholders of the Global Programme of Action could contribute to national, regional or global studies related to the development of economic instruments, such as water markets and pollution reduction trading mechanisms, and to studies on the need and feasibility of multi-stakeholder water funds.

41. Learning partnerships with organizations such as the World Bank Institute should also be developed by the Coordination Office as an avenue to build national and regional capacity.

42. Finances for the Global Programme of Action can also be obtained indirectly. For example, by requiring the best available techniques in both existing industries and new investment in potentially polluting industries, Government can stem the increasing demand for spending related to the Global Programme of Action. Similarly, the introduction of the “polluter pays” principle will provide both economic disincentives for pollution, and economic incentives for cleaner production. Appropriate debt relief is yet another option for freeing much needed financial resources so that they can be directed towards the Global Programme of Action.

43. Finally, it is imperative that the Global Environment Facility continue to address the priorities and objectives of the Global Programme of Action, especially in relation to the current replenishment process and within established rules and modalities.

Mr. Tuiloma Neroni Slade
Ambassador/Permanent Representative
Permanent Mission of Samoa
to the United Nations

Mr. Magnús Jóhannesson
Secretary-General
Ministry for the Environment
Iceland

Annex III

OUTLINE INFORMATION ON REGIONAL SEAS ACTIVITIES

1. On the margins of the Intergovernmental Review Meeting, four sessions were held on the regional seas programmes. At these sessions, brief presentations were made describing experience in the development and implementation of the Global Programme of Action in relation to programmes in 12 regional seas areas.
2. The objectives of these sessions were to contribute to mobilization of technical and financial resources at the regional and global levels for regional implementation, to show real progress in addressing pollution and degradation problems regionally, and to illustrate regional leadership through Government-driven projects, based, among others, upon relevant regional and/or national programmes of action on land-based activities.
3. The following is a brief account of the main thrust of each of these presentations, together with highlights of the major issues related to the Global Programme of Action which have been addressed in the context of these regional seas programmes.

Caribbean

4. In 1999 in Aruba, the Parties to the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean adopted a Protocol Concerning Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities. This Aruba Protocol broke new ground as the first new regional treaty, negotiated after the adoption of the Global Programme of Action and incorporating a source-specific approach modelled on the Global Programme of Action. Over the next few years, Governments will concentrate on its ratification and entry into force and the implementation of the Protocol's regionally specific effluent guidelines.
5. The main features of the current programme of work for the Caribbean Environment Programme are projects intended to prevent, reduce and control land-based pollution, with priority being given to domestic waste-water and agricultural non-point sources. Currently the emphasis is on reducing pesticide run-off to the Caribbean Sea, integrating coastal area planning for Central America and small island developing States and addressing sewage treatment needs while identifying appropriate innovative means of tackling the problem. Funding partners include GEF and Governments of the United States of America and Sweden.
6. The proposed work plan for the period 2002-2006 will include work on domestic waste-water, the establishment of a clearing-house node and enhancement of the marketability of waste-water infrastructure. The clearing-house node is intended to be a regional Internet-based clearing-house mechanism on pollution from land-based activities, which will be linked to other databases. A further future activity will focus on the financing of waste-water infrastructure in the Wider Caribbean region, through identification of options, convening of partnership meetings on financing and the demonstration and monitoring of the effectiveness of new technological and financial approaches. Some of the smaller Caribbean countries have endorsed a series of principles governing environmental sustainability as a cross-cutting issue. There is a clear need to involve the private sector in the mobilization of much needed funds for projects, as public funds and status quo of funding arrangements are not sufficient to meet the great need in the Wider Caribbean.

East Asia

7. The East Asia regional seas programme is not a convention, but an Action Plan. It carries out activities in the context of the Global Programme of Action. It has commissioned a report on the socio-economic effects of sewage, including the economic opportunities offered by sewage.

8. A workshop on protection of marine and coastal ecosystems from wastewater was held, involving 40 participants from 10 countries and funded by the Global Programme of Action and the Government of Japan. The workshop recommended that a Steering Group, comprising a representative from each member country, should be convened to further implement the Global Programme of Action within the broader East Asian region. The mandate of the Steering Group is to develop regional guidelines for the East Asia and North-West Pacific regions, in order to provide a framework for Global Programme of Action activities. Each individual country will then identify ways to implement the regional framework, taking into account its own regulatory, institutional and statutory arrangements. Further roles of the Steering Group are to facilitate the application of technical practices in waste-water management, to manage information on innovative technologies and practices, to facilitate the development of pilot projects, and to develop further partnership approaches, incorporating capacity-building.

9. Among the activities proposed in the Global Programme of Action East Africa Seas Action Plan for the period 2002-2006, there are three activities that will be integrated into demonstration sites of the UNEP/GEF project “Reducing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand”:

(a) Develop methods and criteria for determining carrying capacity for sediments and nutrients on three habitats – mangroves, coral reefs and sea-grass;

(b) Identify “hotspots” of pollution in the East Asian Seas and choose one or two sites at which to reduce pollution. Stakeholders, users and governments will be involved in the identification;

(c) Establish demonstration and trial sites for low cost, community or household level sewage treatment and trial forests, crops and wetlands for using water and nutrients from wastewater.

Eastern Africa

10. The Convention for the Protection, Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region (Nairobi Convention) was signed in 1985 and ratified in 1996. It has nine member states: Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Reunion (France), Seychelles, Somalia and the United Republic of Tanzania. South Africa has been invited to join.

11. Complementary instruments are two protocols, one concerning protected areas and wild fauna and flora and the other concerning cooperation in combating marine pollution in cases of emergency, and an action plan.

12. The work programme covers four areas: assessment, management, coordination and cross-cutting issues. The assessment component covers fragile ecosystems such as coral reefs, mangroves and sea-grass beds, shoreline changes, land-based sources of pollution and social and economic issues. Management deals with coral reefs and associated ecosystems; shoreline changes; land-based sources of pollution; and marine sources of pollution. The component dealing with coordination and legal aspects covers review of the Convention and its protocols; strengthening of programme coordination structures; and coordination with other conventions and partners. The cross-cutting subcomponents are information dissemination and exchange and emerging issues.

13. The Convention’s implementation strategy is to collaborate with the Global Programme of Action, other United Nations agencies, sister regional seas programmes through “twinning”, development partners and other interested parties for sourcing of funds; to collaborate with the Global Programme of Action for the development of management tools; and to engage the private sector and non-governmental organizations for the implementation of pilot projects.

Kuwait Action Plan area

14. Within the framework of its objective of promoting environmental management, protecting the marine environment and promoting the conservation and sustainable use of marine resources, the Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment (ROPME) is implementing a regional programme of action on land-based activities to address the negative impacts of waste-water discharges. This includes demonstration or pilot projects on municipal wastewater, regional regulation of waste discharges, guidelines on sea water quality, guidelines and criteria for the treatment of industrial effluents, including their joint treatment with domestic sewage, and guidelines for environment impact assessment. A manual on the implementation of the regional protocol on land-based sources explains its legal, institutional and technical aspects in simple language for all stakeholders. A river basin management programme for Shatt-al-Arab has been initiated in cooperation with UNEP. There is a need for a comprehensive action plan to monitor the region's wetlands, current changes and their impacts on the quality of water and marine life. External funding is needed for many planned activities.

Mediterranean

15. The principal problem arising in the Mediterranean area is that of high population density in coastal areas, which is expected to increase. Pollution hot spots have been identified in all parts of the region. The Barcelona Convention was adopted in 1975 to address the problems of an area containing a resident coastal population of nearly 150 million which is visited by over 200 million tourists each year. In 1980, a protocol to combat land-based pollution was adopted. In response to subsequent developments, including the decisions of the Rio Summit and the adoption of the Global Programme of Action in 1995, many changes have been made in the instruments, and the protocol on land-based sources was substantially amended in 1996, marking a real step forward in pollution control. Major features of the amended protocol are the fact that it now covers the hydrological basin of the Mediterranean, the inclusion for the first time of provision for sanctions in cases of non-compliance, and the development of a reporting system. It is expected to enter into force in 2002.

16. In addition, a strategic action programme was adopted in 1997 and is now in its operational phase. GEF has agreed to fund 50 per cent of a \$12 million project for the implementation of the programme, paving the way for practical actions on the ground. It covers two main areas – the urban environment and industrial development – and its coverage coincides with that of the Global Programme of Action. The target dates stipulated are also those of the Global Programme. Outputs will include regional guidelines, pre-investment studies for pollution hot spots, analysis of pollution-sensitive areas, training and capacity-building, measures to ensure public participation, economic instruments and a strategic action programme for biodiversity.

17. The MEDPOL programme for continuous monitoring of the status of and trends in marine pollution constitutes a notable example of implementation of the objectives of the Global Programme of Action at the regional level. The Mediterranean programme has greatly benefited from the adoption of the Global Programme of Action and has made good use of the example it has set. It stands ready to cooperate with organizations in other regions which are embarking on the same process.

North-east Pacific

18. The participating countries in the north-east Pacific regional seas programme are Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama; the United States participates as an observer. Since this was the first regional seas convention to be negotiated following the adoption of the Global Programme of Action at the Washington conference, the Global Programme of Action forms an integral part of it. It also differs from earlier regional seas conventions in taking a sustainable use approach from its onset: whereas the earlier ones focused primarily on marine pollution, this programme also covers issues such as food security, environmental security, poverty alleviation, ecosystem-based management of fisheries and sustainable management of marine and coastal resources.

19. Three meetings of high-level government-designated experts were held to negotiate the convention and plan of action. The Conference of Plenipotentiaries for signature at ministerial level is to be held in Guatemala in February 2002, followed immediately by the first intergovernmental meeting on the plan of action, at which the focus will be on institutional and financial arrangements, as well as the strategy for securing ratification of the convention and implementation of the plan of action. Other major achievements of the negotiating process were a regional diagnostic study of the impact of land-based activities on the marine and coastal environment and associated freshwater systems, and a work programme for 2001-2006 on land-based activities, covering 17 main areas for action.

20. Mobilization of financial support will be critical to the successful implementation of the plan of action and the land-based activities work programme, which will be implemented with the active engagement of civil society, including private industry, non-governmental organizations and local authorities, and in close cooperation with international and regional organizations.

North-west Pacific

21. The North-West Pacific Action Plan, which is not legally binding, was adopted in 1994 and covers areas of the Sea of Japan and the Yellow Sea under the jurisdiction of China, Japan, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation. Efforts are under way to add the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the participants. UNEP acts as the secretariat; a regional coordinating unit is in the process of establishment. An agreement on land-based sources of pollution is under discussion, and a proposal will be submitted to GEF. Member States of NOWPAP have provided \$150,000 for this project proposal that is being developed by UNEP in cooperation with ACOPS. The institutional arrangements are being revised, and a forthcoming meeting will examine a proposal to reorganise the regional activity centres to include one to deal with land-based activities.

North-east Atlantic

22. The OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic region, which was a merger between the Oslo and Paris Conventions on dumping and land-based pollution respectively, was adopted in 1992 and its scope extended to include biodiversity and human activities. The Convention was established for protection of the marine environment of the north-east Atlantic region and its main features include a general obligation to take all possible measures to prevent and eliminate pollution and to protect the region against the adverse effects of human activities. The Convention is currently guided by five strategies and an action plan dealing with hazardous substances, radioactive substances, eutrophication, offshore oil and gas industry, marine biodiversity and habitats, as well as assessment and monitoring.

23. Biodiversity is the integrating feature of the Convention and in that context the OSPAR Commission, which was established by the Convention, reviews impacts of candidate lists of human activities to see where action would be justified and what measures would be needed. In the area of hazardous substances, for instance, a review is carried out of the chemicals that are known to be on the market and a list established for priority action, through a dynamic selection and prioritization mechanism.

South Asian Seas

24. The South Asian Seas Programme is a relatively recent programme whose priority action areas include integrated coastal zone management and land-based sources of marine pollution. Under the Global Programme of Action, several activities have been undertaken, such as the South Asian Seas Workshop on the Global Programme of Action, and the development of pilot national programmes of action for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities. The priority issues are solid waste generation and management; sewage contamination; industrial waste general and management; agricultural runoff; oil pollution; ship breaking operations; sediment transport and physical alteration of habitats. In the coming year, the South Asian Seas Programme will focus on the promotion and facilitation of non-binding

regional agreements, regional assessments and analyses for action and capacity-building. This will include work on the development of its own clearing-house mechanism and the building of capacities for implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

25. As part of its work programme for the period 2002-2003, the South Asian Seas Programme hopes to be able to approve draft national action plans prepared by national consultants for which it seeks external financial assistance. It will also assist in the implementation of the project on physical alterations and destruction of habitats, by helping prepare guidelines for actions and determine the role of stakeholders.

South-east Pacific

26. The Plan of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Areas of the South-East Pacific was adopted in 1981 together with a convention and various complementary agreements, including protocols on oil pollution emergencies, the conservation and management of marine and coastal areas and protection against radioactive contamination, signed by Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Panama. They have the same features as other UNEP regional seas programmes. Regional coordination is provided by the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS), backed up by national focal points and national institutions. The Plan of Action is viewed as a sound basis for international cooperation to address land-based activities, and, together with the protocol on land-based activities, as an appropriate mechanism for implementation of the Global Programme of Action at the regional level.

27. A regional diagnosis of land-based sources of pollution has shown the main sources to be domestic and industrial wastewater, wastewater from mining and the oil industry, insecticides from farming and livestock-raising, and high and rising population density in the coastal strip. Within the overall objective of protecting the marine and coastal environment, specific objectives are to support compliance with the Global Programme of Action, to strengthen national and regional capacity to deal with land-based sources, and to promote the application of national environmental policies, the dissemination of information, training, environmental education programmes, and technical and financial arrangements, including best practices, and to support evaluation and monitoring systems.

South Pacific

28. The work carried out by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) is set out in its Action Plan which covers four key areas: nature conservation; pollution prevention; climate change and variability; and economic development. A number of activities have been carried out under the auspices of the Global Programme of Action such as the preparation of the Regional Framework for Action on Waste-water, the guiding principles of which include appropriate national waste-water management policies.

29. The programme is intended, *inter alia*, to review legislation, encourage research on traditional practices and cultural attitudes, while ensuring integration with emergency and disaster planning. There are, in addition, some related activities that are not driven by the Global Programme of Action, such as the POPs and hazardous waste management project under which an inventory of stockpiles and contaminated sites has been completed.

30. At the national level, there are also a number of ongoing activities: the upgrading of sanitation and solid waste systems in Kiribati; a new landfill/waste management facility in the Cook Islands; and a pilot project demonstrating the usefulness of public/private partnerships in solid waste management, in Samoa.

31. The South Pacific Regional Environment Programme has one of the best track records in the regional seas programme, in spite of the enormous physical challenges facing it, thanks in part to the periodic and transparent review of its work programmes.

West and Central Africa

32. Coastal cities in West and Central Africa (WACAF) have been the main point for industrial development. Migration of workers from inland rural areas to the coastal industrial centres has led to increasing threats of degradation to the coastal and marine environment. The sanitary infrastructure suffers from inadequate financial investments, irregular maintenance, and a lack of control and enforcement. Assessment and effective management of these sources of pollution are the priorities in the WACAF region. Under the Abidjan Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region, a work programme for the reduction of pollution from land-based activities in the region has been established covering two themes: assessment and management. Priority actions have been identified including socio-economic studies and assessment of discharges and emissions.

33. The general objective of the programme is to enhance awareness in order to ensure sustainable use of coastal zones. One of the specific goals under the “assessment” theme is to assess the capacities at national level to develop policies and strategies related to waste management in order, *inter alia*, to produce a status report on capacity development needs at the national level. A further activity planned is to minimize impacts from municipal and industrial discharges and waste disposal. Already partners have been identified for the activities proposed, both within and outside the region, including possible twinning arrangements with other conventions.

34. All the priorities have been established on the basis of regional source categories such as pesticides and use of fertilizers in agriculture, solid waste and marine litter and atmosphere pollution. The major hurdle to their implementation, however, remains the lack of necessary funds.

Annex IVDECLARATION OF THE GLOBAL LEGISLATORS ORGANIZATION FOR A
BALANCED ENVIRONMENT (GLOBE)

The Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE) was founded in 1989 to enhance international cooperation between parliamentarians on global environmental issues. GLOBE has over 800 members, in more than 100 countries, including all of the G8 countries. We have joined our colleagues in Montreal to discuss the implementation of the Global Programme of Action and role of legislators in its mandates.

WE, the Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE), express our deep concern with the degradation of the marine environment, particularly from land-based activities and declare support for our Governments to take the lead on implementing the Global Programme of Action,

WE are concerned that the social, environmental and economic costs to society are escalating as a result of disproportionately low levels of action to mitigate the harmful effects of land-based activities on coastal and marine environments,

WE emphasize the need for cooperative partnerships with international financial institutions, international organizations, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and other major stakeholders who have a pivotal role to play in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

WE declare our firm commitment to actively and cooperatively improve coastal and ocean governance through a local, national, regional and international approach.

WE will seek to ensure the availability of the resources necessary for the development, coordination and implementation of Global Programme of Action mechanisms within our nations by making better use of domestic and international resources.

WE welcome the efforts of the UNEP Global Programme of Action Coordination Office's effort and declare our continued support of the Memorandum of Understanding that was reaffirmed between GLOBE and UNEP in November 2000.

WE call upon the Governing Council of UNEP, concerned Governments and relevant regional and other governing bodies to endorse the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office work plan and provide the necessary resources to implement it.

WE urge our Governments to commit to the full implementation of the Global Programme of Action by mainstreaming the aims, objectives and guidance of the Global Programme of Action into new or existing activities, programmes, strategies, or plans and including the integration of watershed and coastal as well as marine ecosystem management at the local, national, regional and global levels.

In conclusion, GLOBE members will seek to continue to support efforts to strengthen municipal wastewater legislation, address land-use planning legislation to prevent the destruction of coastal habitats and to work with our partners in exploring additional domestic and international finance mechanisms to protect marine and coastal environments.

GLOBE members will do what they can to support participant Governments in these efforts as peace, development and environmental protection are interdependent and indivisible.

Annex V

STATEMENT BY THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES

1. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) is the international environmental agency for local governments.
2. Founded in 1990, ICLEI's mission is to build and serve a worldwide movement of local governments to achieve tangible improvements in global environmental and sustainable development conditions through cumulative local actions.
3. More than 400 cities, towns, counties, and their associations worldwide, comprise ICLEI's membership. They, and hundreds of other local governments, are engaged in ICLEI's international campaigns and regional projects. Through its campaigns, ICLEI helps local government generate political awareness of key issues, build capacity through technical assistance and training and evaluate local and cumulative progress toward sustainable development.
4. ICLEI serves as an information clearinghouse on sustainable development by providing policy guidance, training and technical assistance and consultancy services to increase local governments' capacity to address global challenges.
5. ICLEI, a democratic association of local governments, serves as an advocate for local government before national and international bodies in order to increase understanding and support for local environmental protection and sustainable development activities. ICLEI maintains a formal association with the International Union of Local Authorities (IULA) and has official consultative status with the United Nations, through which it advocates the interests of local government before international bodies.
6. ICLEI supports the efforts of the UNEP Global Programme of Action and we therefore declare our continued support of the memorandum of understanding that was agreed to between ICLEI and UNEP in June 2000.
7. ICLEI affirms its ongoing willingness to assist the Global Programme of Action in implementing strategic action on municipal wastewater by working with local governments.
8. ICLEI will contribute to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action work programme through the provision of targeted capacity-building and information sharing activities. ICLEI will form a network of coastal cities based on the Global Programme of Action regional seas programmes to support local authorities in improving integrated coastal zone management in their communities and will pay particular attention to the focal area of the Global Programme of Action, such as municipal sanitation.
9. As part of the Global Programme of Action, ICLEI will implement the Coastal Cities Network (CCN), a five-year project designed to use decentralized cooperation to increase the environmental planning and management capacity of local governments in the area of integrated coastal zone and water resources management. The main outcome of this programme will be the establishment of a network of cities working together to implement integrated coastal zone and water resources management. The long-term impact of the Coastal Cities Network includes improved quality of marine and freshwater environments and improved public health.
10. In recognition of the need for local action and locally integrated water resources management planning ICLEI has created the Water Campaign, launched in June 2000. This campaign seeks to build a worldwide movement of local governments and their stakeholders who together are committed to achieving tangible improvements in the sustainable use of freshwater resources by protecting and enhancing local watersheds, reducing water pollution, improving the availability and efficiency of water and environmental sanitation services and improving public health.

11. ICLEI's Water Campaign is an Associated Programme of the Global Water Partnership (GWP).

12. ICLEI recognizes that the Local Government Water Code (The Lisbon Principles) plays a significant role in the Water Campaign by emphasizing the moral and ethical components of local water management. The Local Government Water Code was approved by ICLEI in June 2000. ICLEI encourages local councils around the world to adopt the Local Government Water Code.

Annex VI

STATEMENT BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Non-governmental organizations have long been a primary impetus for civil and governmental actions directed at addressing significant environmental issues on a local, national, regional and global scale. Their major strengths in this role are derived from their expertise and experience in implementing on-the-ground projects, networking, capacity-building and advocacy. Non-governmental organizations also have a long history of identifying and facilitating practical, cost-effective, timely and innovative programmes and projects for preventing, reducing, controlling or otherwise alleviating activities resulting in the degradation of the coastal and marine environment and its associated river basins, often in the face of substantial financial, technical, institutional and regulatory barriers.

2. Accordingly, the non-governmental organizations representatives participating in the first Intergovernmental Review of the Global Programme of Action joined the representatives from Governments, intergovernmental organizations, and other major stakeholder groups meeting in Montreal to discuss the status of implementation of the Global Programme of Action since its inception in 1995, to assist in planning its work through 2006, and to provide recommendations regarding the timely and effective implementation of the Global Programme Action.

3. In doing so, the non-governmental organizations wish to reiterate their deep concern over the continuing degradation and destruction of the coastal and marine environment and associated watershed systems, particularly from land-based activities, and urge Governments to take the lead in implementing the Global Programme of Action consistent with their commitment in endorsing the Global Programme of Action in Washington, D.C. in 1995

4. The non-governmental organizations are equally concerned that the social, environmental and economic costs to address marine pollution and degradation continue to escalate as a result of inadequate funding and action by Governments to mitigate the harmful effects of land-based activities on the coastal and marine environment and associated watersheds.

A. General recommended actions to expedite implementation of the Global Programme of Action

5. To help expedite implementation of the Global Programme of Action:

(a) The non-governmental organizations call on Governments, the regional seas programmes and the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office to take a much more proactive role in encouraging active participation and partnerships with non-governmental organizations, in order to take advantage of their scientific, technical and policy expertise, and to enhance public awareness and political commitment;

(b) The non-governmental organizations call on the Coordination Office to significantly increase the emphasis, priority, and resource allocation given to awareness-building and public outreach, as a main activity in the 2002-2006 Global Programme of Action work programme;

(c) The non-governmental organizations support periodic, multi-stakeholder dialogues at local, national and regional levels, and in future regional and global-level reviews of the status of implementation of the Global Programme of Action;

(d) The non-governmental organizations expect the Coordination Office to monitor the status of investments in programming and activities directed to all the pollutant-source categories in the Global Programme of Action, as a means of tracking progress over time in achieving the goals of the Global Programme of Action;

(e) The non-governmental organizations call upon Governments, international financial institutions and donors, United Nations agencies and other intergovernmental bodies, and the private sector to substantially increase their financial and human resource investments in local, national and regional programmes for achieving the goals of the Global Programme of Action, particularly in providing additional support to community-based organizations to address pollution from land-based activities;

(f) The non-governmental organizations urge all Governments of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that have committed to overseas development assistance of 0.7 percent of their gross domestic product prior to 2006 to expeditiously honour their commitments, and to specifically incorporate the Global Programme of Action objectives within their respective programmes of official development assistance, including supporting activities at the local level.

B. Specific recommended actions for national Governments to expedite implementation of the Global Programme of Action

6. To facilitate achievement of the goals of the Global Programme of Action, the non-governmental organizations urge Governments to:

(a) Exercise the political will necessary to achieve the goals of the Global Programme of Action, through identifying specific and quantitative goals for reducing adverse impacts from land-based activities from all nine source categories identified in the Global Programme of Action, and adopting appropriate, preferably binding, measures for achieving these goals;

(b) Expand the pollutant-source categories in the Global Programme of Action to take into account all hazardous substances that are persistent, bioaccumulative or have the potential to cause endocrine disruption;

(c) Endorse and finance the work programme of the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office, and its emphasis on assisting countries and regions to develop action-oriented national and regional programmes, with a minimum budget of \$60 million for the period 2002-2006, to be funded from UNEP resources and additional country contributions;

(d) Ensure that all development and management plans for river basins draining to coastal areas explicitly include protection of the marine and coastal environment and its living resources among their goals, thereby providing for the freshwater needs of river basin inhabitants and ecosystems, as well as achievement of the goals of the Global Programme of Action, in a holistic and integrated manner;

(e) Give greater attention and financial support to alternatives to large-scale sewers and municipal wastewater treatment plants as one measure of addressing sewage pollution of coastal areas and associated river basins. Non-structural alternatives such as small-scale constructed wetlands and on-site treatment systems can offer better solutions in many locations to addressing the problems of human waste on a local scale, and the necessary materials are typically simpler, less expensive, require less maintenance and may be more effective over the long term;

(f) Implement a coastal restoration agenda focusing on a zero-loss policy, as one measure for addressing the alteration and destruction of habitats in coastal areas;

(g) Give a high priority to identifying and implementing appropriate, cost-effective programmes and measures to address point and nonpoint sources of nutrients, including expeditiously phasing out subsidies for nitrogen- and phosphorus-based fertilizers;

(h) Implement the principle of substitution to less hazardous and non-hazardous substances and processes in developing their national programmes of action for the Global Programme of Action;

(i) Ensure national and regional programmes of action for the Global Programme of Action are consistent with the basic principles of precaution, transparency, public awareness and participation, integrated approaches, equity and polluter pays;

(j) Identify and implement time tables to phase out subsidies for all materials and practices that are destructive to the coastal and marine environment and associated river basins;

(k) Ratify all multilateral environmental agreements and related protocols relevant to achievement of the goals of the Global Programme of Action as rapidly as possible.

C. Specific actions for non-governmental organizations

7. To assist Governments in implementing the Global Programme of Action, the non-governmental organizations shall:

(a) Continue to utilize their scientific, technical and policy expertise and experience to identify and highlight degradation and destruction of the marine and coastal environment and associated river basins from land-based activities, and will continue their advocacy role in identifying solutions to these problems and the means of overcoming obstacles to their implementation;

(b) Continue to actively promote citizen participation in implementing the goals of the Global Programme of Action, particularly at the local and regional levels;

(c) Continue to promote and participate in significant partnerships with the public and private sector, civil society, academia, the media and other major stakeholders in the Global Programme of Action;

(d) Introduce Global Programme of Action concerns, especially the freshwater-coastal-marine linkages, into international environmental forums, including the International Freshwater Conference (Bonn), World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg), and the Third World Water Forum (Kyoto), emphasizing the freshwater-coastal-marine linkages and the need to protect the coastal and marine environment and associated river basins as a unified ecological and hydrologic unit;

(e) Identify and test innovative technologies and promote community-based approaches for reducing pollution from land-based activities and from human and industrial wastes;

(f) Endeavour to enhance communication and collaboration between environmental non-governmental organizations in programmes and activities in support of the Global Programme of Action, and between environmental and other non-governmental organizations involved in activities (e.g., gender, micro-financing) relevant to achievement of the goals of the Global Programme of Action.
