

### Integrated Coastal Zone Management

Delegations from developed and developing countries noted that, in addition to strengthening regional seas programmes, consideration must be given to elaborating principles, guidelines, and activities to promote integrated coastal zone management. This encompasses effective measures to deal with land- and sea-based pollution (Kenya and Malaysia made pointed references to dealing with the problem of sewage in coastal zones), as well as promoting environmentally sound fisheries management, and protecting and enhancing local marine eco-systems. Caribbean, South Pacific (including the South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme), African countries (Senegal, Kenya), and Malaysia all noted that the concept of integrated coastal zone management was sensible, but could only work in developing countries provided they received the assistance necessary to develop and implement coastal management programmes. Four Directions asserted that coastal zone management was essential to ensure indigenous communities could attain food security and continue traditional marine activities.

Venezuela and Malaysia cautioned that it had to be understood that coastal zone management did not imply external interference in countries' sovereign rights to their exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and the resources contained in them, but rather that such management programmes would be the means by which countries could identify environmental and developmental problems and, through international cooperation, resolve them. Malaysia further explained that it had reached an understanding with its neighbour, Thailand, to cooperate in protecting and enhancing the marine resources and environment shared by the two states.

### Capacity-Building in Developing Countries

Several developing countries stated that PC/42/Add.6 needed clearer references to ways in which countries could cooperate to build capacity in developing countries. Chile stressed the need for better information and data exchange, education and training. Kenya and Tanzania stated that developing countries needed funding and technology; China and Barbados suggested that the revised PC/42/Add.6 include the cost of implementing its proposals and ways in which funding can be made available to assist developing countries. Brazil commented that the target dates for implementing the various activities called for in PC/42/Add.6 should take into account the difficulties developing countries have in meeting such objectives unless they receive assistance.

Algeria asserted that PC/42/Add.6 did not seem to adhere to the spirit of UN General Assembly resolution 44/228. The document seemed to imply that all countries are equal as far as meeting environmental obligations; it did not specify the particular needs of developing countries and the greater obligations of developed countries to