

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
1. Opening of the meeting	1
2. Adoption of the Agenda	2
3. Restructuring of the presentation of the 1998-99 Programme and Budget	2
4. Exchange of views for the different aspects of collaboration with METAP and EU	3
5. Implementation of the approved recommendations of the Extraordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in Montpellier, regarding institutional arrangements in relation to RACs	4
6. Preparations for the first meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)	6
7. Activities on CAMPs	7
8. Activities on MEDO	7
9. Communication (exhibition, etc.)	7
10. Any other activities	7
11. Conclusions	8
12. Closure of the meeting	8
Annex I : Conclusions	
Annex II : List of participants	
Annex III : Agenda	

Introduction

1. The XIIIth meeting of RAC Directors and MEDU was held in Barcelona from 17 to 19 September 1996 at the kind invitation of the CP/RAC. The meeting took place at the premises of the Waste Agency of the Generalitat de Catalunya, and all RAC Directors were invited to attend. The list of participants is attached as Annex II.
2. The meeting discussed several subjects, the main ones being: (i) the restructuring of the presentation of the 1998-99 Programme and Budget, the question being whether to adopt the structure by project approach, (ii) the implementation of the approved recommendations of the Extraordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in Montpellier, regarding institutional arrangements in relation with RACs, and (iii) the preparations for the first meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCS D). The adopted Agenda with all the subjects discussed is attached as Annex III.
3. The present report will recall the summary of the discussions. It was also agreed that the conclusions of the meeting which would be reached following the discussions, and attached to this report as Annex I, would be approved during the Meeting.

Agenda item 1 : Opening of the meeting

4. After the welcoming remarks by Mr V. Macià, Director of CP/RAC, Mr Lucien Chabason, MAP Coordinator, addressed the participants and explained the difficult situation prevailing in the MED Unit at present, due to the departure of the Deputy Coordinator and the Fund/Administrative Officer, underlining the length of time needed for new recruitments by following UN procedures. He then presented an overview of important meetings to be held during 1997, and stressed the need to continue during 1998-99 with new ideas in mind regarding the formulation of activities, and the programme and budget to be proposed to the Contracting Parties.
5. Several participants expressed their concern, especially with regard to the departure of the Fund/Administrative Officer, due to the fact that up until now continuous contact had been established with him in order to deal with the day-to-day problems regarding funds and administrative issues. He stated that in order to function satisfactorily, some measures would be taken immediately. For example, Mr Civili will temporarily assume the duties of coordination of the MED POL Programme until the recruitment of the new MED POL Coordinator, and somehow a provisional Fund/Administrative person will be appointed in order to guarantee the link regarding funds, project documents, etc. between the Coordinating Unit and the RACs. He also pointed out the interest that Ms Melvasalo, Director of the Water branch in Nairobi, has shown towards MAP.
6. The participants unanimously expressed their appreciation to the departing Mr Christian Marx for the excellent collaboration he has provided to all RACs and wished him every success in his new post.

Agenda item 2 : Adoption of the Agenda

7. Following the above discussion, the Agenda was adopted with the inclusion of the issue of better representation of MAP at meetings in agenda item 10.

Agenda item 3 : Restructuring of the presentation of the 1998-99 Programme and Budget

8. Several participants took the floor and expressed their views on this particular subject. Mr Glass mentioned in his intervention that MAP's success is the regional cooperation and consequently the bilateral cooperation, and Mr Trumbic added that there is a need to retain what has already been done at local level, namely, keeping all types of activities for the future.

9. Mr Hoballah continued on the same issue, but from a different angle, by saying that MAP is not in competition with other international bodies, e.g. the World Bank, so as to try to adopt similar approaches in the form of project approach. He also pointed out that the formulation of projects is not always possible, and MAP is essentially concentrated in regional cooperation where it can play the role of a bridge, by intermediating between countries.

10. Mr Sainlos, Mr Saied and Mr Macià who also took the floor pointed out that within MAP, because of its coordinating role and the relatively low budget, it is not easy to formulate projects.

11. Mr Batisse and Mr Dharat considered also the realistic view by saying that international organizations have to seek for funds in order to assist countries and strengthen their national capabilities. The first one of the speakers was affirmative on the issue that it would be wrong to formulate large number of small projects that have no future and it is better to concentrate also on capacity building.

12. The exchange of views continued on the presentation of the budget to the Contracting Parties. Several participants were of the opinion that pluriennial projects are not realistic because at the meetings of the Contracting Parties, a budget for two years is presented. For improving the budget, there is a need to make changes and therefore we need a good quality of proposals.

13. Mr Glass referred to the above issue by saying that although the Contracting Parties, by reading the budget, usually are satisfied, it doesn't seem that the same counts for an outsider. There is a need to reduce the different fields proposed and to avoid general and of little value budget lines. In addition, there is a need to formulate the budget according to the eventual responses of the countries on the protocols.

14. Mr Civili had a different view on the presentation of the list of recommendations and he was of the opinion that, if the budget was to be structured following the project approach, then the recommendations would have to be included in the budget.

15. On this occasion Mr Chabason took the floor and stated that the recommendations should be divided into two different parts. The first one would include the recommendations for the Contracting Parties themselves and the second part the ones that the Secretariat has to follow and are of budgetary implication. In this respect, there is also a need to change the content of the Contracting Parties' meetings. For example, the countries could report or make a presentation on the application of the recommendations being adopted during the previous Contracting Parties' meetings.

16. Mr Batisse indicated that, in addition to what was said, there must be a budget ceiling defined before the Contracting Parties' meeting, while Mr Dharat pointed out that in order to accommodate the presentations of the countries and the discussions of general policy and strategic issues relevant to MAP as a whole, during the Contracting Parties' meetings, it is essential to deal with budgetary issues only for the 20% of the available time, while on the other hand the MAP Focal Points meetings should be upgraded and the most important decisions on the budget should be discussed during these meetings.

17. The discussion continued on the same agenda item 3 by exchanging views and finally a conclusion was reached and approved (see Annex I).

Agenda item 4 : Exchange of views for the different aspects of collaboration with METAP and EU

18. Mr Hoballah informed the participants about the official launching of METAP III on 18 October 1996, and the new structure of METAP. He also referred to the fields of collaboration between MAP and METAP in developing indicators for environmental performance. Mr Trumbic also referred to the strong involvement of PAP/RAC in METAP activities related to the evaluation of ICZM.

19. Mr Batisse expressed his concern regarding the new structure of METAP and mainly the new location that will be in Cairo, which is far away from the World Bank Headquarters.

20. For better coordination, Mr Chabason proposed, and it was accepted, that METAP activities will be followed by Mr Hoballah who will act as liaison officer between MAP and METAP with the responsibility to disseminate information, etc., until the appointment of the new MAP Deputy Coordinator. From the beginning there will also be a link for the LBS Protocol and METAP. A good approach for collaboration with METAP would be the involvement of MAP in regional activities and the involvement of METAP in national activities.

21. Mr Chabason gave an outline on the relationship with the EU and, in particular, with MEDA. MCSD, by preparing a list of activities and proposing it to MEDA, would provide MAP with the opportunity of being involved.

22. Some participants felt that there is a need to establish contact between MEDA or the EU and MCSD, and it was proposed that there will be two levels of cooperation, one for MAP and the other for each individual Centre without any competition. Mr Chabason clarified that MAP can provide assistance in its professional capacity and the impression that fundraising is the only motivation should be avoided.

23. In relation to MEDA, Mr Glass asked about possible collaboration with FAO, being the official contact within the MAP structure. Following a discussion, it was agreed that Mr Glass will be the contact with FAO seeking to find terms for cooperation.

24. Mr Civili informed the meeting about ENEA, designated by the European Environment Agency, as the Topic Centre for Marine Pollution and Coastal Management. He will attend the first meeting of this Centre together with Mr Chabason. Some participants expressed an interest in being kept up to date about the activities of the European Thematic Centres.

25. The conclusions that have been agreed to following the discussion are attached as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 5 : Implementation of the approved recommendations of the Extra-ordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in Montpellier, regarding institutional arrangements in relation to RACs

26. Mr Dharat made a brief introduction on this item by recalling the status and functions of the Regional Activity Centres and by addressing the need to implement the recommendation of the Contracting Parties in Montpellier. This recommendation regarding institutional arrangements with RACs is in fact an invitation to the Coordinator to establish a small *ad hoc* group of limited duration to examine the best possible structures for the Coordinating Unit and MED POL, and to also review the role, functions and structure of the Regional Activity Centres and the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites and the relations they should maintain with one another. Also to make recommendations to be submitted to the Contracting Parties for their approval concerning the evaluation of the activities of the Regional Activity Centres and the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites.

27. Taking the floor, Mr Raimondi stated that he was of the opinion that the group should be composed by four to five technical experts who should be able to evaluate the effectiveness of each RAC. The effectiveness could be seen in terms of projects and outputs, as the RACs implement activities and activities can be obtained by projects.

28. Mr Batisse agreed on the limited number proposed before, although he found it difficult to involve external specialized persons able to understand the complex structure and organization of MAP and RACs. He felt sceptical about the task which the group should perform, because each Centre has its own characteristics and also depends on the national legislation of the country in which it is based.

29. Mr Sainlos, by expressing his view, felt that it would be too difficult for the *ad hoc* group to examine both function and structure of the Centres. It is a delicate matter and one has to take into consideration the different geographical conditions, the different countries and other less important but also influencing factors. In addition, there are Centres that have been established recently and others that have been functioning for many years. In conclusion, for performing this task we have to be flexible.

30. At this point Mr Chabason, for the purpose of facilitating the discussion, referred to the future needs and the existing situation. His point of view was that, due to the enlargement of the field of activities with the adoption of the new Protocols, it is necessary to adjust the role of each Centre for these new activities and therefore a description of the role of each Centre is needed. The Centres so far have a national profile and MAP has to be more involved, e.g. the Coordinating Unit should provide job descriptions for managerial posts. Also, there is a need for formal host country agreements because, although countries that propose Centres commit themselves for the financial assistance, it seems that after a period of time they tend to forget their obligations.

31. Several participants then took the floor and pointed out that formulating the host country agreements for RACs requires a lot of time for negotiation, while others shared the opinion that the evaluation exercise is a very difficult task and should be directed towards the validity of the activities and not in-depth evaluation. Also, this exercise will contribute to the clarification of the role and to the identification of activities of each Centre, while on the other hand it would be used as a kind of analysis as we have reached the end of MAP Phase I.

32. Following the exchange of views, Mr Chabason summarized the interventions. He stressed that it is difficult to follow an in-depth analysis, considering also the one that has been done for MED POL which cannot be defined as satisfactory. However, a functional analysis on what has been done is expected to be carried out, which will also include the evaluation of the tasks assigned.

33. Mr Batisse agreed with Mr Chabason's interpretation on the evaluation. He added that there are projects and also activities to be carried out and, in this context, there is a need for continuity of actions. His opinion was shared by Mr Sainlos who added to it by saying that for some Centres there are activities of a permanent nature and activities which can be identified through projects.

34. The meeting thought that the working group should have a clarification document to guide the efforts of the experts. This document should include an introductory report, analysis of the activities carried out by each Centre, host agreements, selection of personnel, etc., current tasks and future tasks taking into account the MCSD meeting. For the production of this document, each Centre will make its own contribution in early December. The conclusions reached for this agenda item appear in Annex I.

35. Regarding the recommendation of the Montpellier meeting for supporting the MCSD, Mr Trumbic will assume the task to submit to the second meeting of MCSD, guidelines for the preparation of the special national legislation ensuring the sustainable development of coastal areas.

Agenda item 6 : Preparations for the first meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)

36. Mr Dharat briefed the meeting on the list of candidates for the MCSD received from local authorities, socio-economic actors and NGOs, as well as on the provisional agenda. Following an exchange of views, some modifications were made to the list and to the provisional agenda, and it was also agreed that a report has to be prepared in order to provide assistance to the MCSD. The report should include the background of what has been done so far with regard to Sustainable Development, as well as the major problems in the Mediterranean. It should also reflect the priorities proposed by the Secretariat and the working methodology.

37. Mr Chabason continued the discussion by giving some examples of the priority issues for MCSD to deal with. Among them he emphasized the issues on water resources, coastal area management, biodiversity, prevention and elimination of marine pollution, including the implementation of LBS related activities (Mediterranean GPA, "hot spots", etc.).

38. In addition, Mr Batisse proposed some other issues including tourism, coastal management and water regarding agricultural and urban use. He also pointed out that the energy sector and the problem of industry represent a peculiar situation because we have no data for this particular field. He expressed some concern regarding urbanization and soil linked to agriculture, and considered fishing as a delicate matter. He also stressed that for proposing each factor we must give adequate background and reasons, and that for the first period it is better to deal with issues where we were successful in the past.

39. Mr Glass proposed that we need more information on agriculture and soil and therefore closer collaboration with FAO is needed. He also proposed, as a matter of priority, the issue of environmental health.

40. In the discussion which followed, some participants indicated that the approach should be oriented towards the capabilities of RACs and that there should be a regional dimension of the activities. Issues could be dealt with by using both entry of natural resources and activities.

41. Considering also the working methodology of the MCSD, it was proposed that specialized groups could be formed with eventual enlargement according to the issue, and that evaluation tools, e.g. indicators, should be used.

42. Following the exchange of views, the meeting agreed on the proposals which appear in Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 7 : Activities on CAMPs

43. Mr Dharat gave all the updated information on the CAMP projects, including the new ones under preparation.

44. During the discussion that followed, Mr Glass was of the opinion that the way of conducting the CAMPs could be much improved by introducing a feasibility study before the launching of each CAMP.

45. Following explanations given for the feasibility studies, Mr Trumbic asked that a meeting be held as soon as possible to discuss the financing of CAMPs.

46. The conclusions reached appear as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 8 : Activities on MEDO

47. Mr Hoballah briefly explained the issues regarding MEDO, and informed the meeting on the contents (including indicators) of a file prepared for submission to the EC.

Agenda item 9 : Communication (exhibition, etc)

48. Introducing this item, Mr Chabason was of the opinion that the communication policy has quite a few weak points. He also informed the meeting on the initiative to prepare a set of transparencies for better presentation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.

49. During the discussion that followed, it was agreed that each Centre should try to prepare a presentation of the activities for the meetings they will attend on behalf of MAP.

Agenda item 10 : Any other activities

50. As proposed at the start of the meeting, the representation of MAP in meetings was also discussed. Following an exchange of views, it was agreed that at meetings there should always be a sign indicating MAP, the report should be sent to MEDU and to all Centres and the costs should be borne by the Centres. The need to adopt a protocol for this reason was also discussed.

51. Mr Drocourt informed the participants that he was ready to host the next RAC Directors Meeting in Marseille during January 1997.

Agenda item 11 : Conclusions

52. Attached as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 12 : Closure of the meeting

53. In his closing remarks, Mr Chabason thanked CP/RAC for the very efficient organization of the meeting and for the hospitality, and pointed out that the very warm atmosphere of the meeting had contributed to the success of reaching the conclusions for future work with greater ease.

54. The Minister of Environment of Catalonia, Mr Pere Macias, also addressed the meeting prior to its closure, and stressed the importance of MAP in the Mediterranean region. He also emphasized the further strengthening of collaboration with MAP and the provision of adequate support to the Cleaner Production Centre in Catalonia.

55. Mr Chabason closed the meeting at 14.00 hours on 19 September 1996.

ANNEX I

CONCLUSIONS

Following the discussions on the items of the proposed agenda, the participants agreed on the following:

Agenda item 3 : Restructuring of the presentation of the 1998-99 Programme and Budget

1. The meeting stressed that as was always the case MAP, due to its function as a catalyst, should be considered the most important tool for regional cooperation.
2. In view of the important role that MAP II will play in the near future, and the lessons learned so far, the programme for 1988-89 should be directed towards the implementation of activities on a regional basis, adequately coordinated, taking into consideration the need to provide policy tools to the Contracting Parties. The project approach, where applicable, may be adopted in order to facilitate inputs from international organizations, such as the World Bank, EU, etc. Activities should also reflect the spirit of regional collaboration and include capacity building. GEF should also be considered for application of activities in order to implement the Protocols and agreements.
3. The meetings of MAP Focal Points should be upgraded and should reflect the decisions on the upper ceiling of the proposed budget as well as on the detailed one. Consequently, the Contracting Parties' meetings should devote at most 20% of the time for discussion on budgetary issues, mainly regarding the upper ceiling, while the rest of the time would be used for substantive discussion on issues concerning the Environment and the Sustainable Development. In this context, high priority will be given to countries reporting on the recommendations that have been implemented nationally, and on the measures taken.
4. The structure of the document concerning the recommendations, to be presented to the Secretariat, will be divided into two parts. The first will include the recommendations addressed to the Contracting Parties themselves, while the second will include the invitation to the Secretariat to deal with issues including those of budgetary implication.

Agenda item 4 : Exchange of views for the different aspects of collaboration with METAP and EU

1. Until the recruitment of the new Deputy Coordinator, the link between MAP and METAP will be BP and Mr Hoballah personally will represent MAP in the METAP Cairo Meeting, taking into account that dissemination of all the information is within the duties of BP in respect to MAP.
2. Although BP, and Mr Glass personally, will make direct contact with FAO in the field of data collection regarding fisheries, soil, etc., Mr Chabason will undertake a new meeting in Rome with FAO in order to try to establish a channel of collaboration and relationship.

Agenda item 5 : Proposed recommendations

1. The purpose of the exercise is to undertake an analytical review of the activities of the Coordinating Unit, MEDPOL and the RACs, vis-B-vis the new MAP responsibilities and the need to remedy the discrepancies that exist between the Centres.
2. It was stressed that the whole review exercise should be flexible taking into due consideration the special status of each centre.
3. The Ad-hod group should be small in number, not exceeding five or six technical experts who are familiar with the work of MAP.
4. The exercise should also take into consideration the new development within MAP system including the adoption of new protocols (offshore, hazardous waste) and the integration of the sustainable development and biodiversity elements in MAP II.
5. It was also agreed that a special meeting of MEDU and RACs should be organized during January 1997, with a view to review a draft secretariat report to be submitted to the meeting of the small ad-hod group as the secretariat proposal for its work.

The report will be in two parts:

- I. The first part will deal with:
 - (a) An analysis of the MEDU and RAC=s current work;
 - (b) Their future tasks with regard to the new objectives inscribed in Agenda MED 21 and MAP II;

- (c) The status of each centre within MAP system.
- II. The second part of the report will deal with other important issues such as the host country agreements, financial component, personnel of the centres, etc.

Therefore, the meeting decided that each centre should provide MEDU, by 15 December 1996, its input concerning the above mentioned points.

Agenda item 6 : Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)

1. The meeting made few modifications and took note of the list of candidates to the MCSD, received from local authorities, socio-economic actors and NGOs.
2. The meeting reviewed and made some modifications to the Provisional Agenda (attached) of the first meeting of the MCSD which will be held in FEZ, Morocco, on 5-7 December 1996 (dates still to be confirmed by the host country).
3. After exchanging views on the methods of work of the Commission, priority issues to be proposed and the type of report to be submitted by the Secretariat to the first meeting, the participants agreed on the following:

The report will be divided into four sections:

- (i) a brief history of what has been done in the field of sustainable development within the Mediterranean region, with special reference to Agenda MED 21 and MAP II (to be prepared by Mr. I. Dharat);
- (ii) major problems of sustainable development in the Mediterranean (to be prepared by BP in cooperation with all centres);
- (iii) priorities with regional dimension proposed by the Secretariat (to be prepared by BP in cooperation with all centres);
- (iv) methods of work of the Commission. This part would also include indicators for evaluation, approaches of formulating *ad hoc* technical groups, etc.

The report should not exceed 30 pages.

4. The meeting took note of the Commission's status within the MAP system as decided by the Extraordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties, i.e., it will be

an advisory body within the MAP system to make proposals directly to the Ordinary Meetings of the Contracting Parties.

It will use the rules of procedure of the meetings of the Contracting Parties, until new rules of procedure for the Commission are proposed and adopted by the meeting of the Contracting Parties.

5. The RACs meeting decided that the Secretariat should prepare a draft rules of procedure of the Commission to be submitted to the second meeting of the MCSD to be held in 1997.
6. The meeting agreed to the Coordinator's proposal that MEDU and all centres and cooperating agencies should prepare a reference file which contains pertinent documents relevant to the work of the Commission, in order to distribute it to all participants.

Agenda item 7 : Regarding CAMPs

A feasibility study for the Algerian CAMP is part of the coordination and the Centre will be responsible for launching the project with funds allocated through and from the EU. Before starting a new CAMP, a feasibility study has to be worked out.

MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

MCS D

Provisional Agenda for the First Organisational Meeting (Fez, Morocco, 5-7 December 1996 tentative)

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Agenda item 1: | Opening of the Meeting |
| Agenda item 2: | Rules of Procedure |
| Agenda item 3: | Election of Bureau of the Commission |
| Agenda item 4: | Adoption of the agenda and methods of work of the Commission |
| Agenda item 5: | Introductory report and proposal by the Secretariat |
| Agenda item 6: | Presentation by the participants and general discussion on the Secretariat proposals on the methods of work of the Commission |
| Agenda item 7: | Priority field of activities for environment and development in the Mediterranean, on the basis of Agenda MED 21 and MAP II as a background for a biennial programme of work |
| Agenda item 8: | Date, Place and Provisional Agenda of the second session of the Commission |
| Agenda item 9: | Other matters |
| Agenda item 10: | Adoption of the report of the meeting |
| Agenda item 11: | Closure of the meeting |

ANNEX II

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN
CENTRES D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES DU PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA
MEDITERRANEE**

UNEP/IMO REGIONAL MARINE
POLLUTION EMERGENCY
RESPONSE CENTRE FOR THE
MEDITERRANEAN SEA (REMPEC)
CENTRE REGIONAL
MEDITERRANEEEN POUR
L'INTERVENTION D'URGENCE
CONTRE LA POLLUTION MARINE
ACCIDENTELLE

Mr Jean-Claude Sainlos
Director

Regional Marine Pollution Emergency
Response Centre for the
Mediterranean (REMPEC)
Manoel Island, GZR 03
Malta

Tel: 35 6 337296-8
Fax: 35 6 339951
Tlx: 406-1464 UNROCC MW
CBL: UNROCC MALTA

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
THE BLUE PLAN (RAC/BP)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
DU PLAN BLEU (CAR/PB)

Mr Michel Batisse
Président

Mr Bernard Glass
Director

Mr Arab Hoballah
Deputy Director

Regional Activity Centre for the Blue
Plan
Place Sophie Laffitte
Sophia Antipolis
06560 Valbonne
France

Tel: 33 93653959 - 93654402
Fax: 33 93653528
Tlx: 42-970005
Eml: planbleu@iway.fr

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
THE PRIORITY ACTIONS
PROGRAMME (RAC/PAP)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
DU PROGRAMME D' ACTIONS
PRIORITAIRES (CAR/PAP)

Mr Ivica Trumbic
Deputy Director
PAP/Regional Activity Centre
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana
P.O. Box 74
21000 Split
Croatia

Tel: 385 21 591171
Fax: 385 21 361677
Eml: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS
(RAC/SPA)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
POUR LES AIRES SPECIALEMENT
PROTEGEES (CAR/ASP)

Mr Mohamed Saied
Director

Centre des activités régionales pour
les Aires spécialement protégées
(CAR/ASP)
Boulevard de l'environnement
BP.337
1080 Tunis CEDEX
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 795760
Fax: 216 1 797349
Tlx: 409-15190 ANPE TN
Eml: racspa@tunisia.eu.net

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
ENVIRONMENT REMOTE SENSING
(RAC/ERS)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
POUR LA TELEDETECTION EN
MATIERE D'ENVIRONNEMENT
(CAR/TDE)

Mr Michele Raimondi
Managing Director

Regional Activity Centre for
Environment Remote Sensing
2 Via G. Giusti
90144 Palermo
Italy

Tel: 39 91 342368
Fax: 39 91 308512

100 MEDITERRANEAN HISTORIC
SITES
100 SITES HISTORIQUES
MEDITERRANEENS

M. Daniel Drocourt

Coordonnateur

Mme Myriame Morel-Deledalle

Coordonnateur Adjoint

"100 Sites historiques
méditerranéens" du Plan d'action pour
la Méditerranée

Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville de
Marseille

10 Square Belsunce

13001 Marseille

France

Tel: 33 91907874

Fax: 33 91561461

à partir du 18 octobre:

Tel: 33 04 91907874

Fax: 33 04 91561461

CENTRE FOR CLEANER
PRODUCTION INITIATIVES

Mr Víctor Macià

Director

Ms Amparo Rambla

Ms Esther Monfà

Ms Maria Montaña

Centre for Cleaner Production
Initiatives

Travessera de Gràcia, 56, 4a planta

08006 Barcelona

Spain

Tel: 34 3 4147090

Fax: 34 3 4144582

Eml: prodnet@cipn.es

**UNEP/COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN (MAP)
PNUE/UNITE DE COORDINATION DU PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA
MEDITERRANEE (PAM)**

**COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN
UNITE DE COORDINATION DU
PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA
MEDITERRANEE**

Mr Lucien Chabason
Coordinator

Mr Ibrahim Dharat
Senior Programme Officer

Mr Francesco-Saverio Civili
First Officer

Mr George Kamizoulis
WHO Senior Scientist

Coordinating Unit for the
Mediterranean Action Plan
P.O. Box 18019
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
116 10 Athens
Greece

Tel: 30 1 7253190-5
Fax: 30 1 7253196-7
Tlx: 222564 - 222611 MEDU GR
Eml: unepmedu@compulink.gr

ANNEX III

AGENDA

- Agenda item 1. Opening of the meeting
- Agenda item 2. Adoption of the Agenda
- Agenda item 3. Restructuring of the presentation of the 1998-99 Programme and Budget; "towards the adoption of a structure by project approach"?
- Agenda item 4. Exchange of views for the different aspects of collaboration with METAP and EU.
- Agenda item 5. Implementation of the approved recommendations of the Extraordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in Montpellier, regarding institutional arrangements in relation to RACs.
- Agenda item 6. Preparations for the first meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD).
- Agenda item 7. Activities on CAMPs
- Agenda item 8. Activities on MEDO
- Agenda item 9. Communication (exhibition, etc.)
- Agenda item 10. Any other activities
- Agenda item 11. Conclusions
- Agenda item 12. Closure of the meeting