

jeopardize or conflict with the provisions of the Convention. Many delegations, particularly from developing countries and some NGOs, such as the International Ocean Institute (IOI) and the Advisory Committee on the Protection of the Sea (ACOPS), stressed that the UNCLOS should be ratified as soon as possible; some added that, indeed, this should be done before the 1992 UNCED conference. The US and the UK expressed hope that there would be progress in resolving the outstanding issues in one section of the Convention; the US further noted that the Convention has resolved many issues on juridical obligations and balances of states and interests in oceans.

Canada, Chile, Gambia, and New Zealand stated that there is a need for new approaches to ocean management which build on UNCLOS and existing regional sea agreements. These delegations stated that they intended to table a draft proposal by experts from coastal states on principles and measures for an effective regime for conservation and management of living resources of the high seas, based on the UNCLOS. The Netherlands (EC) stated that management of high seas fisheries should continue to be undertaken on a regional basis with a view to strengthening such arrangements, a view shared by Japan. The UK added that such regional organizations should include coastal and distant fishing states.

Land-based Sources of Marine Pollution (LBSMP)

Numerous delegations praised the initiative by Canada to host the May, 1991 Halifax meeting on LBSMP. Responding to Canada's report of the meeting's results, delegations stated that the next meeting of experts, to be hosted by UNEP by the end of 1991, should build on the results of Halifax and recommendations by PrepCom III of UNCED (pursuant to discussions about options for Agenda 21). Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), such as Greenpeace, suggested that UNCED should initiate negotiations leading to a global convention on LBSMP. Although this proposal enjoyed tacit support by the Nordic states and such NGOs as ACOPS, they and most of the major industrialized countries (EC, US, Japan), stated that there is no need for such a legal instrument, but that the LBSMP experts' meetings could elaborate a comprehensive strategy or plan of action for dealing with LBSMP and integrated coastal zone management (including the protection and conservation of living marine resources), bearing in mind that coastal zones vary from region to region. Such a strategy could build on UNEP's 1985 Montreal Guidelines and strengthen existing regional seas' programmes.

The delegate from Sweden commented that the term, land-based sources of marine pollution, did not really take into account the degradation of coastal ecosystems (coral reefs, mangrove swamps, etc.) by human activities on shore. He suggested that the broader term, "degradation by land-based activities," takes into account degradation resulting from both effluent and socio-economic activity.