



Earth Negotiations Bulletin

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Vol. 5 No. 44 Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) Monday, 4 March 1996

REPORT OF THE CSD AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON SECTORAL ISSUES 26 FEBRUARY - 1 MARCH 1996

The Commission on Sustainable Development's (CSD) *Ad Hoc* Open-Ended Working Group on Sectoral Issues opened on Monday, 26 February 1996 at UN Headquarters in New York. During the course of the week-long session, delegates discussed reports from the Secretary-General on Chapters 17 (oceans) and 9 (atmosphere) of Agenda 21, which will be considered by the CSD at its fourth session in April 1996. During the first three days of the meeting, delegates discussed the contents of reports from the Secretary-General, and created a drafting group to consider a draft UNEP proposal regarding implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities, drafted at the November 1995 Washington Conference. The last two days of the meeting focused on discussion of the Chair's Draft Report. The Working Group was unable to complete consideration of the Draft Report, and sent some of it to the CSD's upcoming meeting as discussed text and some as the Chair's summary of delegates' comments.

OPENING SESSION

Delegates began the session by electing Svante Bodin (Sweden) as Chair of the Working Group. In his introductory statement, Bodin suggested that, due to the current intensive work on conventions and concurrent meeting of the main subsidiary bodies of the Convention on Climate Change, the intersessional group concentrate on matters not covered by existing conventions.

Nitin Desai, Under-Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development, stated that the issues of oceans and atmosphere were some of the most difficult issues in Rio. They are at the cutting edge of discussions on sustainable development and require an international response. He expressed hope that the expert character of the intersessional meeting would be reflected in its output.

Delegates then adopted the agenda, as contained in document (E/CN.17/ISWG.I/1996/1), Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.

PROTECTION OF OCEANS

The Task Manager, Serge Garcia (FAO), introduced the report of the Secretary-General on Agenda Item 2, Protection of the oceans, all kinds of seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and coastal areas and the protection, rational use and development of their living resources (Agenda 21, Chapter 17), as contained in E/CN.17/1996/3 and Add.1. The report suggests action regarding integrated coastal area management, marine pollution, living marine resources, critical uncertainties, and international cooperation and coordination.

Fritz Schlingemann (UNEP) introduced document E/CN.17/ISWG.I/1996/Misc.2, Institutional arrangements and implementation of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities (LBA), which was drafted following the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities, held in Washington, D.C., from 23 October to 3 November 1995 (Washington Conference). The report assumes that implementation will be primarily at the national level with broad participation of institutions, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector, and that UNEP will play the role of overall

IN THIS ISSUE

Opening Session	1
Protection of the Oceans	1
Protection of the Atmosphere	4
Chair's Draft Report	6
A Brief Analysis of the Session	9
Things to Look for before the CSD	10

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*© <enb@econet.apc.org> is written and edited by Pamela Chasek, Ph.D. <pchasek@pipeline.com>, Daniel Putterman, Ph.D. <dputterman@igc.apc.org> and Lynn Wagner, A.B.D. <grund@usc.edu>. The Managing Editor is Langston James Goree VI "Kimo" <kimo@pipeline.com>. The sustaining donors of the *Bulletin* are the International Institute for Sustainable Development <iisd@web.apc.org> and the Pew Charitable Trusts through the Pew Global Stewardship Initiative. General support for the *Bulletin* for 1996 is provided by the Overseas Development Agency (ODA) of the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the Swedish Ministry of Environment, the Swiss Federal Office of the Environment, and the Ministry of the Environment of Iceland. The authors can be contacted at their electronic mail addresses or at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are automatically sent to e-mail distribution lists (ASCII and PDF format) and can be found on the gopher at <gopher.igc.apc.org> and in hypertext through the *Linkages* WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/> on the Internet.

coordinator. The report outlines a two-track plan for implementation, to commence with a series of regional technical workshops.

JAPAN called delegates' attention to the Kyoto Declaration drafted at the International Conference on the Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security, held in Kyoto from 4-9 December 1995, co-sponsored by the Japanese Government and FAO. The Kyoto Declaration: acknowledges fisheries in ensuring food security; urges respect for socio-cultural and economic differences in using marine resources; suggests harvest at multitrophic levels and multispecies management; and calls for assistance to developing countries.

The CHAIR then opened the floor for general comments. Delegates noted a number of achievements and endorsed several existing agreements and conventions, including the Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (Straddling Stocks Agreement), the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas (Sea Compliance Agreement), and the FAO Global Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries (FAO Code of Conduct). Many stressed the need to implement existing agreements. Delegates supported further development of integrated coastal area management (ICAM) strategies and regional cooperation. Differences of opinion emerged on the question of the global decision-making process.

ITALY, on behalf of the European Union (EU), suggested that the CSD provide impetus in three areas: improving existing international institutions for decision-making; consolidating the progress made on fisheries; and implementing the Washington Conference GPA. The NETHERLANDS expanded upon this, urging States to: coordinate on ICAM; implement the GPA as a priority; develop a legally-binding instrument on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs); address sea-based activities such as oil and gas drilling; recognize the importance of coastal and marine biodiversity; and support development of a global ocean observing system.

ICELAND emphasized: the need for public education on ocean protection; the effect of marine pollution on human health; and the importance of POPs. He proposed creating a separate drafting group to facilitate debate on the UNEP report. SWEDEN observed that: overfishing and marine pollution threatens the livelihoods of millions of poor people worldwide; mariculture and stock enhancement activities can lead to loss of marine biodiversity; and ICAM can address these problems.

CANADA stressed the importance of finding an institutional means to express national priorities on marine and coastal issues. She highlighted national activities for coastal area and marine management, including an Oceans Act and development of a code of conduct for responsible fisheries that goes beyond that of the FAO. She supported use of the precautionary approach. The UK noted that a workshop it recently sponsored called for more coordination between UN agencies and bodies and for a forum to express national consensus. He suggested a regional-level focus and noted the importance of collaboration on scientific and policy advice. He reminded delegates that NGOs — both business and environmental — play an important role.

COLOMBIA called for a carefully-defined scope for a coordinating mechanism and stated that sustainable management of the oceans should be as defined by Chapter 17 of Agenda 21. He also stated that self-sustaining financial mechanisms should not be the sole source of financing. NORWAY stated that implementation should be at the regional and national levels. The international role

is to assist regional cooperation. He also noted: the need for sustainable aquaculture practices; the risk presented by introduction of alien species; and the importance of advanced fishing gear technology. CHINA noted that it has formulated a national Agenda 21. He identified a number of related actions, including strengthening the integrated control of land-based pollution activities and the supervision of coastal and port construction projects.

AUSTRALIA supported: using a system-wide approach to meeting objectives; pooling UN resources; using Global Environment Facility (GEF) funds while encouraging private sector funding; and developing an agreed international framework. Australia criticized the report as biased toward Northern hemisphere countries and for promoting a top-down rather than a regional approach. The US suggested: preparing progress reports to the 1997 FAO meeting on fisheries; reducing the catch of discards and nontarget species; and addressing overfishing and excess capacity. He expressed reservations about using the CSD as a decision-making body on oceans, given that the Law of the Sea Convention is a pre-existing legal framework in this area.

MEXICO outlined his government's policy on oceans, and emphasized the importance of cooperation. He suggested attention to the agreed principles of the Rio Conference, including common but differentiated responsibility and the precautionary principle. MOROCCO described a national strategy on the marine environment that: reduces fishing activities in Morocco's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ); mandates safer and more efficient fishing technology; and establishes protected areas for the monk seal. He mentioned work to conserve straddling fish stocks, with help from Japan, through artificial reproduction of red tuna.

JAPAN noted points in the Secretary-General's report that he believed were inappropriately addressed: the issue of whale sanctuaries should not be dealt with by this group; the Kyoto Declaration should be endorsed by the CSD; and marine biodiversity should be addressed in a balanced way. PAKISTAN noted national efforts, including university programmes and school clubs, to increase awareness. Legislation will soon be introduced to keep industries from improper effluent disposal. The EUROPEAN COMMISSION (EC) stressed the priority of overfishing and overcapacity. He called for: proper implementation of the existing legal framework; intensified international cooperation through subregional and regional organizations; and increased consultation at the local level.

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL called for a moratorium on increasing net harvest in fisheries that are fully- or over-fished. He also: noted that aquaculture has often been unsustainable; urged caution in endorsing the Kyoto Declaration; and stated that the Secretary-General's recommendation regarding the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary was appropriate. JAPAN later responded that the Kyoto Declaration had been endorsed by 95 States. The NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL (NRDC), on behalf of World Wildlife Fund (US) and the National Audubon Society, stated that overcapacity in the fishing sector is at the heart of the crisis in world fisheries, and that bycatch of non-target species is also important.

The CHAIR then opened the floor for comments on specific recommendations in the Secretary-General's report. The EU, supported by the UK, called for short, clear, easily implemented CSD decisions. NORWAY suggested a discussion of UNEP's role in more specific terms. BRAZIL, supported by PAKISTAN, MOROCCO and others, stated that there was a lack of emphasis on technology transfer. PAPUA NEW GUINEA stressed capacity building, prior informed consent and funding. He stated that he was not convinced of the necessity for a global response to oil and gas

extraction, and noted that nuclear testing in the South Pacific has long-term impacts of international concern.

The US drew a distinction between redrafting the Secretary-General's report vs. providing clarifications to the text as input to the upcoming CSD meeting. The SECRETARIAT noted that two documents would be made available to the CSD, the Secretary-General's report plus the Addendum, as well as the report of the Intersessional Working Group.

III. MAIN POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Delegates offered a number of comments on the paragraph specifying CSD action to increase efforts for the conservation, rational use and development of ocean and coastal area resources. The EU suggested that text calling for the "demonstration of greater commitment to implement" international agreements on ocean issues be changed to call for the "prompt and full implementation" of the instruments.

COLOMBIA, supported by CHINA, proposed moving a reference to "international collaboration, particularly in the area of financing" to a separate paragraph. In the same reference, MEXICO, supported by GUYANA, suggested changing "international collaboration" to a call for enhanced cooperation. MEXICO also suggested deleting the reference to "system-wide frameworks for activities requiring cross-sectoral planning," and, in reference to text calling for "pursuing a system-wide approach to mobilizing funding," preferred broader terms of reference.

IV. ACTION REQUIRED

Programme area A. Integrated coastal area management:

The NETHERLANDS, supported by AUSTRALIA, COLOMBIA, BRAZIL and others, noted the importance of ecosystems besides coral reefs, including mangroves, estuaries and mud flats. BENIN mentioned the difficulties faced by developing countries in undertaking ICAM.

SWEDEN stressed action with regard to integrated management and sustainable development of coastal areas to protect marine and coastal biodiversity. ST. LUCIA endorsed the International Coral Reef Initiative and proposed a funding mechanism for regional coral reef initiatives. BRAZIL proposed a new sub-paragraph calling for the promotion of science, specifically regarding the treatment of sewage.

Programme area B. Marine pollution: The NETHERLANDS, supported by NORWAY, ICELAND, the US, AUSTRALIA and FRANCE, suggested that objectives for regulating normal operational discharge of offshore oil and gas installations should be global in scope, but that guidance for developing these regulations should be provided regionally. The NETHERLANDS offered to host an international workshop on this subject. NORWAY suggested that the IMO, which has already recommended against developing a global regulatory framework, should play a role in developing regional regulations.

BENIN differed on the need for global regulations, noting that operational discharges are a global problem. He suggested that oil and gas extraction activities in general are a relevant environmental issue for consideration by the CSD. The US suggested that the sub-paragraph that calls for priority to be given to the protection of the marine environment from LBA, should better reflect the priorities of the Washington Conference GPA.

The UK called delegates' attention to the EU-proposed text regarding the physical degradation of marine and coastal areas, including the impact of freshwater ecosystems on integrated coastal zone management, and suggested linking it with Chapters 17 and 18 (freshwater resources) of Agenda 21. The E&P FORUM (Oil Industry International Exploration and Production Forum) noted

there had been no mention of the IMO recommendations on regional regulation of offshore oil and gas activities.

SWEDEN emphasized the need for an international instrument for the regulation of POPs. He also suggested that the heading should read "Marine environmental protection." GERMANY supported the Netherlands proposal for a workshop on offshore activities.

BRAZIL proposed a new sub-paragraph regarding the impact on the marine environment from freshwater sources. PAKISTAN called for reference to toxic chemicals, and suggested that governments consider some regulation on the export of certain toxic chemicals, including certain agrochemicals.

Programme areas C and D. Living marine resources: The EC distinguished between subsidies that reduce fishing capacity and those that lead to overfishing. He presented a paper, supported by NORWAY and the US, that stresses the importance of developing regional fisheries management organizations to: establish sustainable harvest rates to rebuild commercial stocks; reduce bycatch; protect marine and coastal biodiversity; and keep under review the effectiveness of these management strategies. He offered EC assistance to develop such management organizations. NORWAY suggested adding aquaculture to the EC paper and reducing bycatch through policy decisions.

BRAZIL, supported by BENIN, objected to the paragraph calling for the reduction of subsidies to the fishing industry, since fishing is critical to the economies of several developing countries. BENIN stated that governments should not limit consultations on establishing regional fisheries management organizations with just FAO, as the text suggested. He stated that establishing conditions on financial assistance based on commitments to reduced overall fishing efforts, as implied by the text, was not acceptable. He further stated that effort-reduction should be measured by total fishing capacity, not number of fishing vessels.

INDIA, supported by PAPUA NEW GUINEA, noted that Articles 24, 25 and 26 of the Straddling Stocks Agreement acknowledge the dependency of developing countries on fishing, and stated that the Secretary-General's report should reflect this. MEXICO recommended that the paragraph on overfishing should be worded to follow the FAO Code of Conduct, including the precautionary approach. AUSTRALIA suggested adding wording to prohibit cyanide and dynamite fishing and to reduce the bycatch of seabirds. CANADA proposed changing the paragraph regarding subsidies to refer to subsidies that "aggravate" the problems of overfishing and overcapacity.

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES stated that FAO should be encouraged to develop regional organizations, and suggested increasing subsidies for harvesting unutilized and underutilized species to reduce overfishing of commercial species.

GREENPEACE proposed that governments and regional fishery management organizations develop plans to minimize bycatch and discards in fisheries to achieve a 60% global reduction by the year 2000. The NETHERLANDS COMMITTEE FOR IUCN called attention to the recommendations of the Second Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity with regard to marine biodiversity.

Programme area E. Critical uncertainties: BENIN stressed that technology transfer and financial assistance to developing countries would be essential to meet objectives regarding the development of information management systems and to monitor the effect of pollution on human health. MEXICO stated that text regarding monitoring should mention multilateral assistance.

Programme area F. International cooperation and coordination: THAILAND supported the recommendation that

CSD be the focal point for formulating priorities for the coastal and marine environment. The UK clarified a previously offered proposal regarding decision-making at the global level. He suggested that UNEP be the focal point for follow-up on the Washington Conference GPA, and that UNEP prepare the scientific background on marine issues, which would be sent to the CSD, the political body to address such issues.

BRAZIL added a reference to "technology transfer" in the paragraph calling for the use of the competent UN agencies in setting GEF funding priorities. MOROCCO also supported a reference to technology transfer. BENIN deleted the reference to providing assistance to "countries with economies in transition" in the paragraph calling on donor Governments to consider increasing financial support.

The BIODIVERSITY ACTION NETWORK suggested a sub-paragraph urging actors to cooperate in implementing the Jakarta Mandate on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity. The US opposed highlighting this initiative over others. JAPAN questioned the methodology used to estimate the cost of over-fishing (over US\$50 billion/year). He also suggested deleting the sub-paragraph calling for user charges, taxes, etc., to cover the costs of conservation and management.

AUSTRALIA supported the GEF as the primary financial mechanism and called for a role for the private sector. The UK, CANADA and others stated that paragraph 25(b), regarding actions donor governments should take, was not consistent with the approach adopted in the GPA on land-based activities. They preferred the GPA approach. The EU proposed changing the call for enhanced contributions to the GEF to a note that the "GEF has become a critical funding source." MALAYSIA, supported by Guyana and China, called the reference to 90% of funding from national sources dangerous, and proposed a reference to increased levels of overall ODA.

FOLLOW-UP TO THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES

During the afternoon of Monday, 26 February, delegates established an open-ended drafting group to deal with the question of the UNEP draft proposal for follow-up on the Washington Conference GPA. The group, which was chaired by Magnús Jóhannesson (Iceland), was asked to develop a draft resolution regarding implementation of the Global Programme of Action, and report back to the full working group on Thursday.

Delegates offered general comments to the Working Group on the UNEP draft proposal on Tuesday, 27 February. The US noted that the Washington Conference agreed to develop a draft resolution for the General Assembly (GA), outlining implementation. The draft resolution should: endorse the GPA; call on States to take action within relevant bodies; identify relevant organizations; bring the GPA to the attention of international funding organizations; contain specific provisions on the clearinghouse mechanism, including a pilot project and a steering group; and clarify UNEP's role.

AUSTRALIA expressed concern that the UNEP draft proposal did not adequately reflect the GPA, including: UNEP's role in implementation; new and additional financial resources; and government-appointed experts. CANADA agreed, and suggested examination of pre-existing guidelines before developing new global guidelines.

The EU suggested that the draft resolution require UNEP to set up a group of experts to define both the clearinghouse data directory and a suitable medium for access. The NETHERLANDS

praised the UNEP draft for supporting the regional seas programme. He proposed adding language on a global instrument addressing POPs. ICELAND, in his role as Chair of the Drafting Group, stated that he would use paragraphs 72 to 79 of the GPA, regarding the international institutional framework, as a point of departure.

CHINA stated that the issue of oceans is transboundary. He supported UNEP as coordinator of the GPA, and reaffirmed the need for new and additional financial resources. While concerned about POPs, he requested that the draft resolution address other water pollution problems relevant to developing countries.

BRAZIL agreed with the general assumptions of the UNEP proposal, especially the sub-paragraph on the marine coastal environment. He suggested more regional methodological studies before defining a global model, and suggested that financial commitments be a central theme of the Drafting Group.

PROTECTION OF THE ATMOSPHERE

The task managers, Peter Usher (UNEP) and Victor Boldirev (World Meteorological Organization (WMO)), introduced the Secretary-General's report, Protection of the atmosphere (E/CN.17/1996/22). The report reviews progress made in the implementation of four objectives in Chapter 9 of Agenda 21: addressing uncertainties; promoting sustainable development; preventing stratospheric ozone depletion; and transboundary atmospheric pollution.

WMO presented a report entitled "The Climate Agenda: An Integrated Framework for International Climate-Related Programmes." The report requests international organizations to: align their climate-related activities with the priorities of the Climate Agenda; provide a clear set of results and outputs for monitoring and review of projects; and establish the Inter-Agency Committee on the Climate Agenda as a formal inter-agency committee to identify priorities and resources. The report requests governments to: strengthen national climate programmes; build scientific and technical capacity in developing countries; and fund international coordination mechanisms.

The UN Committee on New and Renewable Sources of Energy and on Energy for Development (UNCNRSEED) presented the report of the 2nd session of UNCNRSEED (E/1996/E/C.13/1996) held 12-23 February 1996. The report distinguishes between the supply of energy for development, which affects about 2 billion people, and global environmental protection. Under the heading of Energy and Sustainable Development, the report describes four key areas: development of energy resources in developing countries; renewable sources of energy, with a special emphasis on biomass; efficient use of energy and materials; and energy and the protection of the atmosphere.

The CHAIR then opened the floor for general comments. The EU called for: increased energy efficiency in the industrial and transportation sectors; promoting use of renewable energy sources; and technology transfer and capacity building in developing countries. CANADA noted that POPs are an issue of urgent concern and called for more information on the Arctic and Antarctic environment. DENMARK noted that the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) suggests a discernable human influence on the global climate. He noted that the prerequisite for change is political will, and called for technology transfer.

ICELAND noted that: there is a growing illegal trade in chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs); some substitutes are greenhouse gases; and most countries have substantial untapped renewable

energy sources. SWITZERLAND supported the integrated approach of the report.

CHINA stated that developing countries will achieve the goals of climate agreements faster if they have financial assistance. He also noted scientific efforts regarding transboundary atmospheric pollution, and stressed cooperation on a regional and international basis. HUNGARY stressed: strengthening the cross-sectoral dialogue between relevant international organizations; political support from the CSD for policy makers at all international levels; and CSD coordination of scientific inputs to various emission reduction agreements, among others.

SWEDEN called for more emphasis on transboundary air pollutants and suggested that the sectoral issues, especially the transportation sector, could have been further elaborated upon. The US stated it would be important for the CSD to enhance activities on transboundary POPs. He also: called on the CSD to focus on local air pollution; noted the importance of lead pollution; and proposed that the CSD condemn the trade of illicit CFCs. BRAZIL, referring to the addendum, stated that the reference to the reduced use of alcohol as fuel does not reflect reality.

The NETHERLANDS stressed that the transport and energy sectors should be more sustainable. MEXICO noted national activities to mitigate air pollution and stressed the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, which he believed was treated in an unbalanced fashion in the Secretary-General's report.

AUSTRALIA stated that the Secretary-General's report was well balanced. She supported voluntary arrangements to promote linkages between atmospheric issues, and did not support a new intergovernmental body. JAPAN stressed regional cooperation and assistance to developing countries. COLOMBIA called for attention to institutional capacity building and scientific and technical knowledge. He noted that the report's emphasis on measures that should be taken by developing countries reflected a change in attitude, and stressed increased financial assistance.

NORWAY highlighted the issue of long-range transboundary air pollution and noted Norwegian cooperation with Asian countries on this issue. FINLAND noted that atmospheric pollution allows harmful radiation to penetrate deeper into lakes. He called for an integrated and coordinated approach to atmospheric issues and for the use of the precautionary principle.

CHINA stressed: new and renewable resources of energy; enhanced energy efficiency; and enhanced funding measures. MOROCCO stated that developing countries are committed to protecting the atmosphere but lack resources. He noted that the Secretary-General's report stressed new and additional resources and technology transfer, and suggested recommending specific operational measures in this regard.

BRAZIL commented that the report largely failed to address developed countries, including the concept of shared responsibility, contrary to the Climate Change Convention. He deplored the absence of financial assistance and technology transfer in the report, and described Brazil's use of lead-free gasoline and the promotion of alcohol fuel. PAKISTAN stated that the contribution of greenhouse gases by developing countries is very small. He suggested including solar energy in the report.

FRANCE described the Marrakech seminar held 13-17 November 1995, which focused on decentralized schemes for rural electrification. He urged the Working Group to consider the report's 19 recommendations. UNDP noted that the consumption of commercial energy is closely linked to such social parameters as life span and infant mortality, and described UNDP's energy strategy that emphasizes efficient use and renewable sources.

The Chair then opened the floor for specific comments on the Programme areas. The EU tabled a comprehensive review of the Secretary-General's report.

I. CURRENT STATE OF THE PROBLEM, PROGRESS AND TRENDS

Programme area A. Addressing the uncertainties: improving the scientific basis for decision-making: PAKISTAN noted the effects of POPs on human health, and called for language asking multinational corporations to voluntarily restrain the promotion of toxic chemicals. The EU review emphasized research and development of renewable energy.

BRAZIL stated that Programme area A should encourage scientific cooperation within existing regional economic integration processes. The US emphasized research on transboundary air pollution to augment the scientific basis for action. CANADA emphasized the importance of monitoring and estimating the impacts of climate change on Small Island Developing States (SIDS). MEXICO described a national registry of emissions and movement of air pollutants to coordinate regional monitoring efforts with the US.

Programme area B. Promoting sustainable development: BRAZIL inserted a reference to biomass, particularly alcohol fuels, in paragraph 12 on urban transportation. SWEDEN suggested that the paragraph calling for the application of market and non-market instruments to reduce air pollution focus on more than the end-use sector. CANADA called for consideration of costs and benefits in the use of these instruments. In the paragraph calling for a full internalization of environmental externalities and abolishing subsidies, SWEDEN, JAPAN and others noted that temporary subsidies can be appropriate to encourage use of environmentally friendly sources of energy. CANADA proposed a reference noting that voluntary agreements and other non-regulatory approaches have proven to be effective.

The EU review emphasized incorporating environmental cost-internalization into national energy policies. ICELAND called for promotion of research and technology to further the cost-effective use of renewable sources and suggested that multilateral financial institutions promote the use of clean technologies. The US noted that attention was not given to all forms of atmospheric pollution.

HUNGARY noted that the reference in paragraph 13, on the situation in developed, developing and countries with economies in transition, to efforts regarding end-use efficiency in industry and efforts to shift to cleaner production is country specific. He noted a number of common features of all countries with economies in transition, including higher per capita emissions compared to industrialized countries. BRAZIL noted the importance of biomass-derived ethanol as a substitute for lead in gasoline.

Programme area C. Stratospheric ozone depletion: GERMANY, the NETHERLANDS and CANADA supported the need for an integrated approach. GERMANY also noted that the appropriate technologies to reduce ozone depleting substances are available. In reference to a statement in paragraph 19 regarding the prospects for the involvement of developing countries in protection of stratospheric ozone, the US noted that the paragraph does not reflect States' obligations under international agreements or a forward looking attitude. The EU review called on the CSD to call for measures aimed at the illegal trade in ozone depleting substances.

Programme area D. Transboundary atmospheric pollution: SWEDEN related the major conclusions of a recent conference on acid deposition and noted that techniques are available to address

these issues, but efforts are necessary to stimulate the application of these techniques.

In reference to paragraph 35 on addressing transboundary atmospheric pollution in developing countries, JAPAN suggested that frameworks for action on this issue should not be cast in the context of actions by developing vs. developed countries. They should be joint activities of all countries in specific regions.

The US noted that with regard to the reference to "common but differentiated responsibility" in paragraph 27 on policies to increase developing country actions, the type of pollution determines where the responsibility lies, especially in the case of transboundary pollution. The EU review welcomed the on-going negotiations on a Protocol on Heavy Metals and POPs and on a Second NO_x Protocol within the ECE Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution.

BRAZIL added a reference to technology transfer in a paragraph stating that developing countries need further assistance to encourage atmospheric protection.

In paragraph 34 on national level actions, CANADA proposed adding indigenous groups to the list of stakeholders that need to be consulted. The US noted that transportation should be mentioned in relation to urban air pollution. AUSTRALIA suggested naming the "relevant conventions" in the paragraph calling on States to ratify agreements related to protection of the atmosphere.

In paragraph 36 on international level actions, CANADA supported better integration and coordination, but stated that there should be no new bureaucracy to manage these activities. With regard to a call for increased expenditures for atmospheric science, CANADA indicated that it would not oppose recommendations for voluntary contributions. She also stated that technology transfer would have to be consistent with national laws and capacity.

MEXICO suggested more discussion on the Climate Agenda before the initiative is supported, as proposed in paragraph 36. The Task Manager noted that the Climate Agenda is an attempt to coordinate the existing climate programmes of international agencies. It builds on available, on-going international climate related programmes and was prepared in response to a request by governments.

In the paragraph linking protection of the atmosphere to the sustainable management of ecosystems and natural resources, BRAZIL added a reference to compensatory measures for protecting ecosystems from atmosphere-related adverse effects. In the paragraph encouraging policies on air pollution to address resource management issues, BRAZIL added a reference noting that technology transfer and financial support are vital to developing countries for accomplishing this.

CHAIR'S DRAFT REPORT OF THE AD HOC INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP

Delegates discussed the Chair's Draft Report during three sessions on Thursday and Friday. The group addressed portions of the three parts of the text (oceans, atmosphere, follow-up on the GPA on LBA), but did not have time to reach agreement on the entire text. Nevertheless, the Chair noted that the Working Group had provided a basis for CSD discussions. The text that the Working Group discussed will be so noted, and text that was not addressed will be identified as the Chair's summary. The following is a brief summary of the text and delegates' comments.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction to the Chair's Draft Report notes that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Intersessional Working Group is not a negotiated text, although it was discussed during the meeting. The report

focuses on the key issues and conclusions of the Working Group, and suggests possible recommendations for CSD consideration.

I. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS AND INTERLINKAGES

A. Major recommendations: This section highlights a number of recommendations in the oceans and atmosphere portions of the text. Delegates agreed to use language from the Washington Conference on LBA regarding: development of a legally-binding instrument for the reduction and/or elimination of emissions and discharges of POPs; and addressing serious public health problems and the degradation of coastal ecosystems that result from the disposal in coastal areas of inadequately treated waste water. The Chair's summary also includes references to: technology transfer; international community support for national efforts to mobilize financial resources; efficiency improvement in energy production, conversion and distribution; and action against the illegal trade of ozone depleting substances.

In reference to the recommendation on POPs, COLOMBIA, on behalf of several developing countries, suggested noting that "international action is needed" on the issue of POPs, rather than calling for Governments to "develop a global legally-binding instrument." He also suggested that reduction and/or elimination of use, emissions and recharges of POPs be taken, if necessary, on a step-by-step basis, and noted that sewage treatment, a critical issue to developing countries, was not included in the Chair's draft report. The US questioned the proposal for action on a "step-by-step" basis. AUSTRALIA wanted to ensure that POPs are dealt with through UNEP. The Chair suggested using language from the Washington Conference on LBA regarding POPs and drawing on text from that Conference to add a recommendation regarding sewage treatment.

B. Interlinkages: This section of the Chair's Draft Report notes that delegates identified a number of issues common to both Chapters 9 (atmosphere) and 17 (oceans), as well as to other Chapters of Agenda 21. An integrated approach to protective measures is called for to address the adverse impacts of human activity on oceans and the atmosphere.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 17 ON PROTECTION OF THE OCEANS, ALL KINDS OF SEAS, INCLUDING ENCLOSED AND SEMI-ENCLOSED SEAS, AND COASTAL AREAS AND THE PROTECTION, RATIONAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR LIVING RESOURCES

A. General considerations: In this section, the Working Group re-affirmed the common aim of promoting the sustainable development and conservation of the marine environment. The text notes the considerable progress in recent intergovernmental negotiations, and agreed that activities relating to oceans, seas and coastal areas require greater priority in national, regional and international decision-making, noting the special characteristics and needs of developing countries in particular.

In the paragraph regarding the common aim of promoting the sustainable development and conservation of the marine environment, COLOMBIA proposed that an integrated approach take into account "the special requirements of the developing countries." He also suggested that "consideration" be given to the precautionary approach and that international arrangements for decision-making recognize the importance of "financial resources," "transfer of adequate technology," and "resource ownership and management." CANADA, supported by the US, stressed that an integrated approach should reflect the precautionary approach and related risks to people and resources. The NETHERLANDS and the EU proposed deleting the reference to "related risks to people

and resources.” JAPAN, PAPUA NEW GUINEA and the REPUBLIC of KOREA preferred retaining the reference to risks, and delegates agreed.

Delegates engaged in considerable discussion on the wording of a paragraph referring to the “need for Governments to sign, ratify and implement” a list of legally-binding and non-binding agreements relating to oceans. AUSTRALIA pointed out that the use of “sign and ratify” singles out those agreements that are legally binding, but since the list includes non-legally-binding agreements, it was best to focus on “implementation.” NORWAY, supported by the EU and JAPAN, strongly emphasized signing and ratification, which emphasizes both participation and implementation. Delegates adopted text noting “the need now for Governments concerned to participate in and implement these agreements” followed by “Implementation is important at all levels.”

The US proposed language referring to Part XI of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which addresses deep seabed mining. A proposal by the EU noting that UNCLOS “provides the framework for the protection of the marine environment” was accepted. Language referring to the need for greater priority for actions relating to “oceans and seas” was amended to “oceans, seas and coastal areas” by COLOMBIA.

Programme Area A. Integrated management of coastal areas (ICAM): This section notes examples of successful regional programmes, stresses the need for increased support for training, and notes the need to address all critical habitats in the coastal zone. The Working Group recommends that the CSD call on States to adopt measures consistent with ICAM plans and landlocked States to consider impacts of freshwater management systems on coastal seas. The section also recognizes the importance of coral reefs and related ecosystems.

COLOMBIA added the Northwest Pacific Action Plan (NOPAP) and the Conference of African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean to the list of regional programmes, as well as a reference to capacity building. The EU added the Mediterranean Action Plan.

COLOMBIA deleted a call for promotion of “scientific” programmes and added a reference to control of pollution in river systems caused by mining industries. The EU added text requesting the World Bank and regional development banks to continue their work to develop implementation means that fit together with UNEP programmes. NORWAY added a paragraph calling for States to consult with representatives of relevant sectors and communities involved with issues of coastal management.

COLOMBIA added text welcoming the 1997 International Year of the Reefs and requested that UN agencies contribute to public education through this and other mechanisms. The EU proposed redrafting the paragraph on coral reefs to focus on marine and coastal areas, and included a reference to the decision by the Second Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity regarding marine and coastal biodiversity. Delegates did not agree to focus the paragraph on marine and coastal issues, but did add a reference to the biological diversity of coastal and marine areas.

Programme Area B. Marine environmental protection: This section welcomes the outcome of the Washington Conference on LBA and recommends that governments develop a legally-binding instrument regarding POPs. The Working Group recommends that UNEP revise its proposed work plan on the GPA, and takes note of the International Maritime Organization’s conclusion that harmonized environmental regulations on off-shore oil and gas activities under discussion are proving productive.

MEXICO stated for the record that his country abides by the agreements of the GPA, but noted that Appendix I of the Chair’s Draft Report contains elements regarding the GPA and added that he needed time to review the Washington agreements.

The EU proposed language calling on the CSD to invite other regions to follow the example of the ECE, which is starting negotiations to control POPs under the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. AUSTRALIA objected.

CANADA, supported by the US, added a recommendation that UNEP revise its proposed work plan on implementation of the GPA. COLOMBIA added that the revised work plan should be based on comments provided by the Working Group and take into account the proposed elements of the draft GA resolution.

Delegates discussed deleting a paragraph referring to the adverse impact of POPs, ozone depletion and, potentially, climate change on Arctic and Antarctic environments. CANADA, supported by several Nordic countries, suggested text in the section on atmosphere noting the meeting of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy, scheduled for March 1996.

Delegates adopted text that resulted from consultations coordinated by the Netherlands regarding off-shore oil and gas activities. It states that the Working Group takes note of developing harmonized environmental regulations within regional programmes, recognizes the expertise of the International Maritime Organization, UNEP and the UN Office of the Law of the Sea in promoting regional regulation, and takes note of a workshop to be hosted by the Netherlands on this subject, as well as an upcoming meeting of the Western Hemisphere Oil and Gas Environmental Forum in Rio de Janeiro.

A paragraph calling on Governments to implement a precautionary approach regarding operational pollution from off-shore oil and gas and POPs was deleted. AUSTRALIA, supported by BRAZIL, deleted the paragraph calling for a reduction in harmful pesticides, stating that the issue will be considered under a legally-binding instrument on Prior Informed Consent, currently under negotiation.

Programme areas C and D. Living marine resources: An informal group discussed this section, but it was not taken up by the Working Group. The text refers to the social and economic contribution of sustainable fisheries, and recommends that States: strengthen research; establish/strengthen subregional and regional fishery management organizations and increase consultation at the local level; apply the precautionary approach; and minimize wastes and discards. It also recommends: addressing the overcapacity of fishing fleets; monitoring and enforcing conservation and management measures; conducting international trade in fish and fishery products in accordance with the World Trade Organization Agreement; increasing efforts to ban destructive fishing techniques and to reduce bycatch; and abolishing measures leading to overfishing. Governments should, where appropriate, promote sustainable aquaculture while minimizing potential adverse environmental impacts, and the FAO should be invited to prepare a report to the CSD on the foregoing actions.

Programme area E. Critical Uncertainties: Delegates adopted the single paragraph in this section, stressing the development of research capacity and information systems in developing countries and SIDS, and supporting the Global Ocean Observing System.

Programme area F. International cooperation and coordination: An informal group discussed this section, but it was not taken up by the Working Group. The Chair’s Draft Report states that the Working Group recommends improving coordination between intergovernmental agencies, and asks the June 1997 special session of the GA to provide recommendations on the

future role of the CSD as the focal point for strategies and priorities for action on global marine environmental issues. It recommends that the CSD invite the Secretary-General to review the working of the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas, as well as the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environment Protection, and to link the latter group to UNEP's Regional Seas Programme. The text also notes that some countries have not agreed to apply the user-pay principle (i.e. generating local resources through user fees and taxes); recognizes the GEF as a key funding mechanism but notes its limitations; and recommends that the CSD encourage private sector efforts.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO CHAPTER 9 ON PROTECTION OF THE ATMOSPHERE

A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS: The Chair's Draft Report stresses measures at all levels to reduce air pollution, combat climate change and prevent ozone layer depletion. It notes the importance of integrated solutions and applying a precautionary approach, mentions the adverse impacts on human health of local air pollution, and discusses the responsibility of developed versus developing countries in addressing these problems.

The EU, supported by JAPAN, amended a paragraph regarding integrated solutions to atmospheric pollution to apply the precautionary approach and to apply environmental cost internalization as a working principle. The former amendment was adopted, but COLOMBIA objected to the latter.

COLOMBIA expressed concern with a paragraph emphasizing urban air pollution, but there was insufficient time to fully discuss the text. Delegates agreed to merge three paragraphs on common but differentiated responsibility for global emissions, resources, technology transfer and capacity building into a single paragraph. The full Working Group did not have sufficient time to consider text drafted by an informal group, which produced two versions of the paragraph, the first stressing broad international action emphasizing common but differentiated responsibility of all countries as outlined in the Rio Declaration. The second version emphasized the leading role of developed countries in reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and ozone depleting substances, and acknowledged technology transfer and institution and capacity building as a priority issue for the CSD.

AUSTRALIA proposed deleting text encouraging governments and organizations to cooperate in the implementation of relevant policy instruments aimed at minimizing adverse effects of international competitiveness. FINLAND, SWITZERLAND and NORWAY objected and a compromise was reached, with the addition of "as appropriate."

Text encouraging ECE member countries that have not done so to ratify the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and its Protocols was deleted. In a paragraph calling on States to draw on the broad spectrum of policy instruments, COLOMBIA suggested deleting references to specific policy instruments, including tradeable permits. The EU preferred retaining the specific references, and proposed adding "environmentally damaging subsidies," but delegates agreed to delete the specific policy references.

COLOMBIA proposed deleting a reference calling for the successful conclusion of the Berlin Mandate negotiations. The EU objected, and delegates agreed to keep the text, but deleted "successful" at BENIN's request.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROGRAMME AREAS:
Programme area A. Addressing the uncertainties: improving the scientific basis for decision making: This section notes the importance of a sound scientific base upon which responses to atmospheric degradation can be formulated. It recognizes the

second assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) as the most important and reliable assessment of climate change, and supports an integrated approach to the protection of the atmosphere through consultative arrangements among relevant conventions. CSD support for enhanced research is recommended.

COLOMBIA added text recognizing that special conditions and needs of different groups and countries must be taken into account and noting that the level of scientific and technical expertise required by the developing countries needs the support of the international community.

BENIN proposed deleting the conclusion that "the establishment of new intergovernmental bodies could not be justified" for atmosphere protection issues. The US preferred retaining the text. Delegates did not have time to complete their consultations on this issue.

The EU proposed deleting a paragraph noting the importance of research on strategies to adapt to the impacts of changes in the atmospheric composition and climate. BENIN objected. Delegates did not have time to complete their consultations on this paragraph.

Programme area B. Promoting Sustainable Development:
 This section addresses the issues of: energy development, efficiency and consumption; transportation; industrial development; and terrestrial and marine resource development and land use. Delegates only discussed the text regarding energy development, efficiency and consumption. It is recommended that the CSD: urge governments to give priority to renewable energy sources and enhance research; encourage policies that incorporate measures for better air quality; encourage industry to use environmentally sound technologies in their investment strategies; and encourage Parties to the Convention to Combat Desertification to coordinate activities with those undertaken under other international agreements.

COLOMBIA proposed deleting a reference noting that the production and use of energy is the main source of greenhouse gas emissions. AUSTRALIA, DENMARK and others objected.

COLOMBIA proposed adding a paragraph noting the importance of strengthening the commitments of the Parties listed in Annex I to the Convention on Climate Change through the adoption of a Protocol or another legal instrument, and emphasizing the need for a clear commitment for changing consumption and production patterns by the developed countries. The CHAIR, AUSTRALIA, the US and others suggested deleting the text. The second half of the text, regarding consumption and production patterns, was agreed to once it specified "energy" patterns, particularly in developed countries. COLOMBIA added text calling for action as recommended by the Convention on Desertification.

BENIN proposed noting that energy is one of the requirements for "sustained" economic growth. The NETHERLANDS proposed "economic development," but delegates agreed to keep the original text, "economic growth." CANADA proposed text calling for atmospheric monitoring systems to support understanding and predictions of human impacts on climate change.

PAKISTAN added a reference to passive solar architectural design. Delegates retained text regarding environmental cost internalization, but deleted a call for it to be "an integral part of policy."

Programme area C. Stratospheric ozone depletion: This section of the Chair's Draft Report states that delegates noted the success in addressing the problem of ozone layer depletion under the auspices of the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol. The CSD was requested to urge governments to: take action against

the illegal trade in ozone depleting substances (ODS); provide support to developing countries to enable them to phase out ODS; make efforts to limit production and consumption of alternatives to ODS with high global warming potential; and take account of the potential cost saving related to human health as a consequence of action.

Programme area D. Transboundary air pollution: This section of the Chair's Draft Report notes the growing threat of transboundary air pollution and the need for cooperation to overcome this problem. Recommended actions for the CSD include: reaffirming the need for effective transboundary air pollution agreements; urging governments and organizations to take measures to reduce emissions of acidifying substances; encouraging developed countries to enhance programmes that share expertise with developing countries; and taking note of the pollution affecting the Arctic and Antarctic environments.

GUIDELINES FOR A DRAFT RESOLUTION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GPA (ANNEX I): The suggested elements for a resolution on "Institutional arrangements for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities" include endorsement of the Washington Declaration and GPA and a call for States to take measures to implement the GPA. NGOs and financial donors and institutions are called on to give priority to GPA-related projects. UNEP is called on to establish the clearinghouse mechanism referred to in the GPA, and States are called to take action in the governing bodies of relevant international organizations related to the establishment of the clearinghouse mechanism.

ICELAND noted that the drafting group did not have sufficient time to complete consideration of the final paragraph, regarding determination of the specific arrangements for integrating the outcomes of periodic intergovernmental reviews at the 1997 Special Session of the General Assembly to review the implementation of Agenda 21.

COLOMBIA, on behalf of a number of developing countries, proposed several amendments. He suggested that the paragraph "endorsing" the Washington Declaration and the GPA "take note of" the texts. He deleted the call for States to take action to secure formal endorsement by international organizations, replacing it with a call for the organizations to support the GPA. He also deleted a specification that aid be directed especially to the least developed countries, countries with economies in transition and small island developing States.

The US, supported by CANADA and the EU, noted that the call to "endorse" the GPA had been agreed to by 112 delegations at the Washington Conference, and preferred the original text. MOROCCO, supported by BRAZIL and the REPUBLIC of KOREA, proposed replacing "endorse" with "welcomes," but the US objected.

An immediate informal consultation took place, but was unable to reach consensus. The small group agreed to replace the introductory note that the text was transmitted for CSD "consideration" with a note that the text was transmitted "for further negotiations." The amendments suggested by Colombia were listed at the end of the Annex.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE SESSION

During his opening address, Nitin Desai, Under-Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development, noted that the Working Group would address two of the most difficult issues discussed in Rio — oceans and atmosphere. These two issues have received a great deal of attention during the post-UNCED process. The Working Group concentrated on how to coordinate follow-up to the variety of existing international agreements (especially with regard to oceans) and what the CSD response should be to issues not yet addressed by the international community (especially with regard to atmosphere).

One of the major debates during the session was what the role of the CSD should be on oceans issues. This is one of the areas where a great deal of progress has been achieved since UNCED, and many questioned which forum would best coordinate all of these activities. Some delegates proposed designating the CSD as the coordinating forum, a meeting where the results from other fora would be amalgamated. This proposal was opposed by others who felt that the CSD was not the best forum because it is too political, it is not substantive enough, and it has a limited mandate of five years. Some felt that the issues would get more attention if they were addressed by the General Assembly. Last year, the Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks was removed from the Second Committee and included with Law of the Sea issues in the General Assembly Plenary. Some believed that fisheries issues thus received more attention and better coverage, and thought that other oceans issues should be brought within the framework of the General Assembly.

Delegates to the CSD Intersessional Working Group privately debated questions regarding this decision, such as whether the General Assembly is prepared to give prominence to oceans issues and whether it is realistic to put aside an entire week for those issues. A week is considered by some to be the minimum time necessary to review all oceans issues, including fisheries, drift nets, Law of the Sea, Land-Based Activities, and marine and coastal biodiversity. The Chair's Draft Report suggests that the CSD "play the focal point for formulating the consensus of States on strategies and on priorities for action" on global marine issues, but the Working Group did not have time to discuss the text and it will be taken up again at the CSD.

A significant North-South difference emerged during discussion of the Secretary-General's text on atmosphere. Throughout the meeting there was no unified Group of 77 position, although Colombia organized and spoke on behalf of several developing countries. Several developing country delegates commented on the commitments and goals of industrialized countries in reducing atmospheric pollution, which they believed were insufficiently emphasized in the text. Privately, developing country delegates expressed a desire to see the Chair's text reflect a more explicit linkage between Agenda 21 Chapter 9, especially the sections on greenhouse gases and transboundary pollution, Chapter 17, and Chapter 4 (Changing Consumption Patterns). Language linking Chapters 9 and 4 (specifically "energy" production and consumption patterns, particularly in developed countries) was added to Programme area B of the atmosphere text.

NGOs were not present in great numbers and focused almost exclusively on marine issues (those following atmosphere issues were presumably in Geneva), but several of those attending felt that their ability to have an impact on the process at the intersessional meeting was greater than it will be at the CSD. Perennial problems of document access and exclusion from small group consultations frustrated some, but NGOs were able to take the floor during the

session and some of their suggestions were included in the Chair's summary.

When asked about the "expert" nature of the intersessionals, some suggested that, once again, the goal of convening a meeting of experts was not realized. Many delegations did include experts on the sectoral issues, although there were fewer on atmospheric issues because of the concurrent climate change meeting in Geneva. While some of the negotiators from the Washington Conference on marine pollution from land-based activities attended, some States relied solely on their Second Committee members. Many interventions focused on political aspects of oceans and atmosphere issues, although seasoned observers noted that the Working Group discussions were still more substantive than the CSD is expected to be.

Some expect the recommendations of the Working Group will be re-written at the CSD with a focus on political issues, and questioned the benefit of this intersessional meeting. The redundancy and repetition of decisions taken here and at other UN activities, such as a previous week's meeting on renewable energy and the concurrent discussions on climate change, also caused some to question the usefulness of the intersessional meeting, especially given the current scarcity of resources within the UN system.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR BEFORE THE CSD

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS: The second session of the IPF will meet from 11-22 March 1996 in Geneva. Substantive focus will be on Cluster I (items I.2 — causes of deforestation, I.4 — afforestation, reforestation and restoration, and I.5 — needs and requirements of countries with low forest cover); Cluster II — international cooperation in financial assistance and technology transfer; and Cluster III (item III.1 — assessment, scientific knowledge and valuation). There will also be an initial discussion on the rest of the work programme elements. For more information, contact Elizabeth Barsk-Rundquist, tel: +1-212-963-3263; fax: +1-212-963-1795; e-mail: barsk-rundquist@un.org.

ARCTIC COUNCIL MEETING: A meeting of the ministers of the Arctic Council to discuss the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy will take place in Canada in March 1996. The meeting will be attended by Norway, Finland, Sweden, Iceland, Canada, the US and Russia. For more information, call the Canadian Mission to the UN at +1-212-751-5600.

INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF INITIATIVE: An Asian-regional meeting on the International Coral Reef Initiative will be co-hosted by the Japanese Environmental Agency and UNEP. It is tentatively scheduled to take place in Jakarta, Indonesia, the week of 18-22 March 1996.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SYSTEMS: Canada will host, under the auspices of OECD, a meeting regarding environmentally sustainable transport systems from 24-27 March 1996, in Vancouver, Canada. For more information, contact Julie Charboneau, +1-819-994-2493.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE OIL AND GAS ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM: The Western Hemisphere Oil

and Gas Environmental Forum will meet from 17-19 April 1996 in Rio de Janeiro. The meeting will be hosted by the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations, and will feature presentations by several EU countries on environmental practices. For more information, contact the Brazilian Mission to the UN at +1-212-889-2277.

CONFERENCE ON INTEGRATING ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING IN ISLANDS AND SMALL STATES: This Conference, which is organized by the Foundation for International Studies at the University of Malta, will be held in Malta from 14-16 March 1996. For further information, contact Prof. Lino Briguglio, Foundation for International Studies, University of Malta, tel: +356-248218, fax: +356-230551, e-mail: lbrig@unimt.mt.

FAO TECHNICAL WORKSHOPS FOR SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES: The FAO will conduct two workshops with relevance to SIDS follow-up. The first is a Workshop for the South Pacific Islands, on 26-29 March 1996, in Apia, Western Samoa. The second is a Workshop for the Caribbean, in April 1996, in Barbados. One of the agenda items of both workshops is linkages of tourism with agriculture, forestry and fisheries. For further information on these workshops, contact Mr. L. S. Botero, FAO, tel: +39-6-5225-2251, fax: +39-6-5225-3369.

FOURTH SESSION OF THE CSD: The fourth session of the CSD is scheduled to meet from 18 April - 3 May 1996 at UN Headquarters in New York. The proposed schedule is to open the session with a presentation of the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests, to be followed by a discussion on cross-sectoral issues not dealt with by the *ad hoc* working groups (technology transfer, education, capacity building, trade, poverty, population, decision-making, major groups and national reporting). During the week of 22-26 April, the CSD will begin with a presentation of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Finance and Consumption and Production Patterns, followed by a panel and discussion. On Tuesday, there will be a presentation on the work of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Sectoral Issues, followed by a panel and discussion. During the rest of the week, the CSD will examine implementation of the SIDS Programme of Action and exchanges of national experiences on coastal zone management and sustainable development strategies. The drafting groups will begin their work on Thursday and conclude the following Tuesday. The High-Level Segment will take place from Wednesday through Friday, 1-3 May. For more information, contact Andrey Vasilyev, Division for Sustainable Development, tel: +1-212-963-5949, fax: +1-212-963-4260, e-mail: vasilyev@un.org.

CSD ON THE INTERNET

The DPCSD has completed work on its World Wide Web site with official documentation on the work of the CSD located at <<http://www.un.org/DPCSD/>>. In addition, the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) has added a special section to its *Linkages* World Wide Web site <<http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/>> with special multi-media coverage of the CSD and the preparations for the 1997 special session of the General Assembly.