



**Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme**



Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/GC.21/CW/L.1/Add.1
5 February 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twenty-first session
Nairobi, 5-9 February 2001
Agenda item 12

GLOBAL MINISTERIAL ENVIRONMENT FORUM

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

Draft Report of the Committee of the Whole

Addendum

Rapporteur: Mr. Michael K. Koech (Kenya)

Action by the Committee (continued)

1. At its 4th meeting, on 7 February 2001, the Committee continued its work on the draft decisions, as contained in the document on draft decisions submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives pursuant to the mandate given to it by the Governing Council in paragraph (g) (iv) of its decision 19/32 (document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The Committee agreed to forward the following draft decisions to the drafting group, taking into account the comments made during the discussion:

(a) Further improvement of the strategic framework on environmental emergency prevention, preparedness, assessment, response and mitigation (draft decision number 13 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Norway, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union), Switzerland, and the United States of America;

K0100158 080201

(b) Policy and advisory services in key areas of institution-building (draft decision 15 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Canada, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America;

(c) Preparation of the draft guidelines on compliance with international environmental agreements and on effective national environmental enforcement and international cooperation and coordination in combating environmental crime (draft decision number 16 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision at the 4th meeting of the Committee: Antigua and Barbuda, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Japan, Norway, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America. At the 5th meeting of the Committee, further comments on the draft decision were made by China and Colombia;

(d) The role of civil society (draft decision number 26 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision at the 4th meeting of the Committee: Antigua and Barbuda, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, Namibia, Norway, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union). At the 5th meeting of the Committee, comments were made by the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, India, Japan, Norway, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America;

2. At its 4th meeting, the Committee also considered the draft decision on the programme for the development and periodic review of environmental law for the first decade of the twenty-first century (draft decision number 14 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Australia, Canada, Egypt and the United States of America. The Committee approved the decision with acclamation for transmission to the Governing Council;

3. At its 5th meeting, on 7 February, the Committee continued its work on the draft decisions, as contained in the document on draft decisions submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives pursuant to the mandate given to it by the Governing Council in paragraph (g) (iv) of its decision 19/32 (document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The Committee agreed to forward the following draft decisions to the drafting group, taking into account the comments made during the discussion:

(a) Support to Africa (draft decision 7 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, China, Egypt, Morocco, Rwanda, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America;

(b) Coral reefs (draft decision 5 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, France, Japan, Philippines, Sweden (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America;

(c) Biosafety (draft decision 6 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Australia, Turkey and the United States of America;

(d) Atmosphere (draft decision 9 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Australia, Brazil, Colombia and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union);

(e) Further development and strengthening of regional seas programmes: promoting the conservation and sustainable use of the marine and coastal environment, building partnerships and establishing linkages with multilateral environmental agreements (draft decision 24 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1). The following countries made comments on the draft decision: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia and Cuba;

4. Also at its 5th meeting, the Committee approved the following draft decisions for consideration by the Governing Council:

(a) Status of international conventions and protocols in the field of the environment (draft decision 17 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1);

(b) Establishment of a regional seas programme for the Central-East Pacific region (draft decision 18 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1), as amended by the United States of America;

(c) Participation of the United Nations Environment Programme in the work of the Global Environment Facility (draft decision 19 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1), as amended by Antigua and Barbuda, and Sweden (on behalf of the European Union).

5. At the same meeting, the Committee considered a proposal by Cuba for a draft decision establishing a deadline by which UNEP would be required to submit details regarding allocation of resources under subprogramme 5, regional cooperation and representation, to the Committee of Permanent Representatives. The Committee agreed to forward Cuba's proposal to the drafting group.

6. At the same meeting, on 7 February 2001, the Committee took up consideration of a draft resolution submitted by Iceland on global assessment of the marine environment. Following the introduction of the draft decision, by the representative of Iceland, the Committee agreed to defer further consideration of the proposal until its 6th meeting.

7. At the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran drew the attention of the Committee to a proposed draft decision on forests that he wished to submit. The Committee agreed to consider the proposal at its 6th meeting.

8. Also at the 5th meeting, the Committee agreed to defer its consideration of the draft decision on the implementation of the Northwest Pacific Action Plan (draft decision 25 in document UNEP/GC.21/L.1) until its 6th meeting.

Annex

CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY OF THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Discussion of individual subprogrammes (continued)

Subprogramme 5: Regional Cooperation and Representation

1. Several representatives acknowledged with appreciation the high priority given to Africa under the subprogramme, and one stated that it would welcome a discussion on strengthening funding for this element of the programme. Others lauded UNEP's success in strengthening regionalization and decentralization. Another commented that the programme showed the benefits of working with partners in the regions. One representative wished to see increased strengthening of awareness-raising activities in the regions, suggesting that this would contribute to the success of the Second Earth Summit. Other representatives stressed the importance of collaboration with regional bodies such the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, as well as other United Nations organizations and global conventions. One representative suggested that UNEP should be careful, however, not to duplicate the efforts of others, and should focus on its normative mandate by supporting policy development and regional coordination, while leaving implementation to others. Several participants emphasized the need to consider and address the link between poverty and to bear in mind the gender aspects of environment and sustainable development.

2. Another representative expressed the desire to see UNEP, as part of its work under this subprogramme, give full technical and financial support to all regions to allow countries to attend the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Second Earth Summit. The representative for the secretariat stated that UNEP had begun consultations to provide such support, but cautioned that UNEP's ability to provide financial support would be strictly dependent on available funds.

Subprogramme 6: Environmental Conventions

3. In introducing the subprogramme, the Deputy Executive Director, pointing to its activity to promote interlinkages among multilateral environmental agreements and related international activities and programmes, emphasized that such work on collaboration and interlinkages took full cognisance of the decisions and authorities of secretariats and the respective conferences or meetings of the parties.

4. A number of representatives expressed support for the activities under the subprogramme. One representative, speaking on behalf of a regional economic integration organization and its member States, considered that capacity-building in developing countries and countries with economies in transition was of the utmost importance for the effective implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. However, there was a need to differentiate clearly between capacity-building activities to implement the Protocol and the creation of frameworks for the use of biotechnology. In the period up to the first meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, it was necessary to draw up an indicative list of key priorities for capacity-building. Moreover, the promotion and facilitation of public awareness should be integrated into capacity-building activities.

5. One representative considered that UNEP was the best suited organization to address coral reef concerns. However, another representative, speaking on behalf of a regional economic integration organization and its member States, considered that the work programme was limited in terms of both overall and specific actions. UNEP and the regional seas programmes should review their activities closely to help promote a coordinated approach with United Nations and other bodies. UNEP had a particular role to play in planning for the inclusion of coral reef protection activities in the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The role of UNEP should also include support to regional and national initiatives to hinder coral reef degradation. UNEP should encourage the regional seas programmes to consider the scope for integrating coral reef protection within their action plans. One representative expressed concern about the decline in support to the regional seas programmes.
