



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.187/3
7 June 2001
ENGLISH
Original French



MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

5th Meeting of the Steering Committee of the
Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

Monaco, 18-19 May 2001

**Report of the fifth meeting of the Steering Committee of the
Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development**

Table of contents

Body of the Report

Annexes:

Annex I: List of participants

Annex II: Agenda of the meeting

Annex III: Summary of conclusions of the 5th meeting of the Steering Committee

Annex IV: Provisional agenda of the 7th meeting of the MCSD

Introduction

1. Following the discussions and conclusions of the 6th meeting of the MCSD and considering the items on the agenda of the next meeting of the MCSD in Antalya, it was decided to convene the 5th meeting of the Steering Committee. The meeting was held on 18 and 19 May 2001 on the premises of the "Coopération internationale pour l'environnement et le Développement", Villa Girasole, Monaco.
2. The meeting was attended by the following members of the Steering Committee, accompanied in certain cases by advisers: Environnement et Développement au Maghreb (ENDA), Greece, Group of Chambers of Commerce for the Development of the Greek Islands (EOAEN), Malta, Monaco, Municipality of Naples and Tunisia. The Coordinating Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan was represented by the Coordinator and the Deputy Coordinator and acted as the secretariat for the meeting. A full list of participants can be found in Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting

3. H.E. Mr Bernard Fautrier, Minister Plenipotentiary for International Cooperation for the Environment and Development, President of the MCSD Steering Committee, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to Monaco. He said that the main agenda items before the Steering Committee were directly related to the preparation of the 7th meeting of the MCSD to be held in Antalya in October 2001, which would have to respond to certain important questions raised at the 6th meeting in Tunis, including the content of the MCSD's work following the completion of the three current themes, the implementation and follow-up by countries of its proposals for action and the more effective participation of the representatives of civil society. Finally, it would have to review the progress made in the dissemination of the Strategic Review, the preparation of a synthesis of the Strategic Review and the Strategic Orientations which were to serve as a basis for a Regional Sustainable Development Strategy for the Mediterranean.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

4. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG. 187/1, after agreeing that under agenda items 8 and 9 it would hold an exchange of views at its last meeting on Saturday morning, as an extension of the discussion at the 6th meeting of the MCSD in Tunis, of its future themes and the organization of its work.

Agenda item 3: Follow-up of the Strategic Review: finalization, publication, synthesis

5. The President recalled that the Strategic Review was an important stage in the life of the MCSD, which was set out in its terms of reference and had resulted in the text submitted to the meeting in Tunis, which had made several recommendations for its finalization and follow-up. The broadest possible attention should therefore be drawn to this work.
6. Mr Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator, presented and distributed to the members of the Steering Committee the Strategic Review in its new format. The Secretariat proposed to delete from its title the reference year 2000 so as not to confine it to a narrow time-frame and henceforth to call it "Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region". The new presentation was designed to be in line with the new brochure on the MCSD and would be used for future

publications with a view to giving them a similar image. There were still some gaps, particularly with regard to socio-economic indicators, which would be remedied insofar as possible.

7. He said that the synthesis of the Strategic Review, which had been requested by the Tunis meeting, had already given rise to two versions which had not been considered very satisfactory. It focussed on the key elements of the Strategic Review, both political and institutional. It would be published within one-and-a-half months in an easily useable format. Finally, also in accordance with the request made by the 6th meeting in Tunis, the Secretariat had started to make use of the large volume of information gathered during the preparation of the Strategic Review to carry out a supplementary and more in-depth analysis, including an analytical report on the action taken to promote sustainable development in the region. The difficulty in this case was of a political nature, since the work was based on national reports which were of very unequal quality in terms of both volume and the scope of the information provided. It was necessary to avoid this disparity being reflected to the detriment of certain countries in the resulting document.
8. Mr Lucien Chabason, Coordinator of MAP, emphasized the difficulties involved in producing the "synthesis". In the Strategic Review, every term of the analysis had been carefully weighed and the document was not neutral, but sometimes very critical. Synthesizing it therefore raised a problem of coherence with the basic document. The impression must not be given of altering the balance that had been achieved between the negative and positive aspects of the Strategic Review.
9. After the Steering Committee had agreed with the new presentation and title, a brief discussion was held on the proposal by one member not to be constrained by the time-limit of the end of June for its publication and dissemination, which would mean that it would not be possible to take into account the current work of the Blue Plan to improve certain aspects of the document, particularly on socio-economic and environmental indicators. However, other members believed that the rapid dissemination of the document was necessary in order to prepare in the best possible conditions for Rio +10 and the Johannesburg Summit. Some of the global and regional preparatory meetings had shown that the Mediterranean was experiencing problems in imposing its identity as a geographical entity and the dissemination in due time of the Strategic Review would make it possible to correct this impression and place emphasis on the integration dimension in the region. Another member proposed that the somewhat dispersed elements on certain themes, such as water, should be brought together. The two representatives of socio-economic actors and local authorities called, respectively, for the specific features of islands and natural risks to be brought out more clearly in the text.
10. The Secretariat confirmed that the latest work by Blue Plan would be used to update the tables and add the socio-economic and environmental indicators that were available. Two short boxes would cover islands and natural risks, respectively. However, apart from these minor additions and modifications, in accordance with the request made by the 6th meeting in Tunis, the substance and structure of the Strategic Review would not be touched.
11. The members of the Steering Committee approved this approach and agreed that the document should consist of around 20 pages, of which about 15 would be text and five would be made up of figures and tables.

Agenda item 4: Strategic Orientations: framework and preparatory process for a Regional Sustainable Development Strategy

12. The Deputy Coordinator recalled that at its meeting in Tunis the MCSD had proposed to assist the Contracting Parties by making proposals on the formulation and implementation of a regional strategy for sustainable development and to use the Strategic Review as a basis for that purpose, through the preparation of a framework document, or Strategic Orientations, using three thematic reports as a basis. The framework document would consist of around twenty pages and would be submitted to the next meetings of the MCSD and the Contracting Parties.
13. The members of the Steering Committee approved the major elements of the preparatory process, including the considerations set out in the Secretariat's progress report. They rephrased two of the three headings of the thematic reports which would henceforth be called "Environment and natural resources issues" (unchanged), "Economic development and social equity" and "Sustainable development policies, integration and participation". They considered that the new title of the second report would make it possible to shift the balance back towards the social aspects of development, which were essential, and that the work of preparing the document should not be based solely on three experts, but should involve a consultative and participative approach. One member preferred the term "sustainable development strategies" in the plural for the Strategic Orientations in view of the major differences in the levels of development of the various countries.
14. The President welcomed the support provided by Spain to the process through its offer to organize a meeting of experts representing the members of the MCSD and other partners who would contribute to the development of the "Strategic Orientations". He considered that over-hasty action should be avoided and that the aim should not be to go to the Johannesburg Summit with a finished document at any price. The Summit would undoubtedly provide a wealth of lessons which could be integrated into the Strategic Orientations for the purposes of the strategy. At the minimum, a preliminary draft should be taken to Johannesburg which showed that serious reflection was being undertaken within a context of serenity.
15. Most of the members expressed agreement, with one adding that the constant need to meet deadlines should be avoided. The MAP Coordinator also expressed the conviction that too much haste should be avoided, since the Mediterranean situation was undergoing radical change with the prospect of the accession to the European Union of new Mediterranean countries in the near future, and others in the longer term, with its implications for the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. It was still too early to envisage the consequences, although as they became discernible they would need to be taken into account in the Strategic Orientations.
16. In conclusion, the members of the Steering Committee agreed on the preparation of a three to five page draft framework document, as well as its terms of reference. They also agreed on the principle stages of the process of preparing the Regional Sustainable Development Strategy, as indicated in the summary of the Committee's conclusions contained in Annex III.

Agenda item 5: Implementation and follow up of MCSD proposals: questionnaire and pilot studies for a strategy

17. The Secretariat recalled that, since the adoption of the first proposals for thematic working groups, the issue of their follow-up had always given rise to significant debate at the meetings of the MCSD since, in the view of certain of its members, it

called into question the credibility and effectiveness of the MCSD. In accordance with a decision adopted at the last meeting of the Steering Committee, the Secretariat had launched a preparatory process for the preparation of guidelines for the implementation and follow-up of MCSD proposals once they had been adopted as recommendations by the Contracting Parties. The approach followed had involved sending out a specific questionnaire to the Contracting Parties, to the other members of the MCSD and the components of MAP, as well as the development of pilot studies analysing the manner in which several Mediterranean countries were implementing the proposals/recommendations. The Secretariat was constantly reminding the partners and hoped to obtain at least 50 per cent of the responses in due time.

18. All the members of the Steering Committee welcomed the pertinence of the approach adopted by the Secretariat and the work undertaken in accordance with the request made by the Corfu Meeting. A method of communication by electronic mail had been adopted which had proven effective. However, there should not perhaps be too much optimism concerning the response rate. One member referred to difficulties in filling in the questionnaire in view of the need to give yes/no replies, when reality was often more complex and involved several levels of interpretation. Certain aspects also required more in-depth treatment, such as the financing of activities, which in the final analysis determined the possibilities for their implementation. However, another member considered that a country which sincerely replied yes or no would be encouraged to act if it admitted to weaknesses in its policy. In overall terms, the Secretariat was requested to consult the task managers and former and new members of the MCSD in the preparation of the guidelines, as well as to involve, or at the very least to consult the representatives of the groups concerned for the preparation of the pilot studies.
19. One member suggested that an explicit recommendation should be made to States, which were the only ones responsible for follow-up, to work in collaboration with the representatives of civil society in preparing the pilot studies. The Deputy Coordinator indicated that experts were invited to work with the MAP Focal Points, but that responsibilities should not be mixed and MAP should simply identify cases in which the participative approach had been overlooked. With regard to the criticism that yes/no answers were too simplistic, it was pointed out that the Secretariat had included the possibility in the questionnaire of providing further comments to explain replies.

Agenda item 6: Participation in the preparatory process for the 2002 Johannesburg Summit

20. The Secretariat described the principal stages and features of the preparatory process for the 2002 Earth Summit, and particularly the major regional meetings (Africa, Western Asia, Europe) which concerned the Mediterranean in view of its situation as a crossroads, as well as the bodies to which the MAP and MCSD documents prepared for the Earth Summit would be sent. In these documents, emphasis was to be placed on the renewal of the Barcelona Convention and of MAP and on the major achievements of Mediterranean cooperation.
21. Two members requested the Secretariat to follow and participate as much as possible in the United Nations initiative on "financing for development" and the conference on that subject to be held at the beginning of 2002, since the Mediterranean could certainly learn lessons on that essential aspect by adapting it to the regional level, particularly through Euro-Mediterranean partnership. In that regard, the Coordinator noted that financing should not be "globalized" too much, or

there would be a risk of falling into generalities. It would be better to focus on the practical and specific aspects of the resulting themes, proposals and activities. In general, this was an element which had been overlooked in the recommendations proposed by the MCSD and adopted by the Contracting Parties. Another member emphasized the concept of anticipating financing, which made it possible to foresee constraints and blockages in the implementation process.

22. The President concluded that there was broad agreement on the stages of the preparatory process, the importance of the documents prepared by MAP and that the members of the MCSD and the Contracting Parties should be encouraged to play an active role in the process at the regional and national levels. The Secretariat should also play a continuous role in the provision of information by reporting on the progress made in the preparatory process as the months went by.

Agenda item 7: Progress of the Thematic Working Groups

23. The Deputy Coordinator then reviewed in detail the inter-sessional activities of the remaining three thematic groups. On the subject of the theme "free trade and environment", he recalled that METAP was working on a related theme of "trade and environment" and that it had been considered necessary to associate these two themes, with METAP and the Blue Plan having submitted a joint project for financing by METAP, the World Bank and the European Union, for which it was hoped that a positive response would be obtained in the next few months.
24. With regard to the theme of "industry", the working group was currently receiving substantial support from CP/RAC, which was carrying out a study on the situation and prospects for industry in the Mediterranean, which would serve as a basis for the workshop organized by the Centre in Barcelona from 27 to 29 June 2001.
25. On the subject of the theme of "urban management", the Deputy Coordinator said that it had certainly benefited from the highest level of interaction, since 90 cities had been contacted through an important questionnaire, to which around 50 replies had been received. A considerable volume of information had therefore been obtained. Two members emphasized the importance of the quality of life in urban areas and of marginal cities, which were two problems that were giving rise to increasing concern for local authorities.
26. In relation to "information/awareness", a theme for which the work had been completed and the recommendations adopted, the Steering Committee addressed the issue of the information brochure envisaged for several countries as follow up, and noted that it was often difficult to determine the target population, whose expectations, attitudes and concerns needed to be taken into account, but differed greatly from one country to another. The content and format should not therefore be imposed, and it would be preferable to adapt the work to each national context. The Secretariat had also been encouraged by the lessons learnt from the workshop on information and awareness in Arab countries, held in Cairo in October 2000, with a view to the preparation of a regional strategy in that field.

Agenda item 8: Participation and membership of major groups

27. The Deputy Coordinator recalled that the issue of the effective participation of socio-economic actors and local authorities had given rise to the expression of great concern at the 6th meeting of the MCSD in Tunis. In accordance with its terms of reference and in view of the holding of the next meeting in Antalya, the procedure for the renewal of members other than the Contracting Parties should be set in motion

as soon as possible, particularly since very few candidatures had yet been received for the above categories. The Steering Committee should therefore examine how this renewal procedure could be made more productive, effective and attractive, while still emphasizing the criteria of representativity

28. One member believed that the participation of the three groups, and particularly the two groups which lacked members, constituted an essential issue for the future of the Commission, since without their participation the MCSD had no reason for existing. As a MAP National Focal Point, he noted that this function was undoubtedly not the most appropriate for the designation of new members. In addition to the fact that the Focal Points were often involved in a multitude of tasks, they were not always aware of the most representative networks and groups. Another procedure should therefore be selected for the designation of new members.
29. The representative of the socio-economic actors indicated that there now existed a network of chambers of commerce for island regions in the European Union, and that it was imperative that ASCAME (Association of Mediterranean Chambers of Commerce) returned to the Commission. Furthermore, the envisaged forum for the civil society members of the MCSD would provide an opportunity to reflect on new procedures to extend the range of groups and improve their representativity. He cited the example of a municipality which was a member of the MCSD and which, through its revolutionary experience in the field of sustainable management, could serve as a model for other municipalities, but whose participation had unfortunately been too short to be effective. The commitments that they were undertaking in joining the MCSD should therefore be clearly explained to candidates.
30. All the other participants in turn made suggestions for: canvassing activities by the Secretariat; the relevance of the forthcoming forum for the members of the three groups of the MCSD; the regional and subregional networks approach; the use of the various MCSD meetings and workshops in which important partners participate (free trade, industry, urban management) as information channels and contact points; regional representativity; the personal role that should be played by each member of the MCSD in prospection and spreading the word; and the importance of the motivation and representative nature of future members of the MCSD. Finally, it was pointed out that it would be necessary to seek out and associate the major industrial sectors primarily concerned (cement, oil, plastics, etc) in view of the increasingly important role of the environment and sustainable development in their future strategies and the fact that they were setting up departments devoted to these subjects.
31. The Secretariat pointed out that the method for the designation of candidates from local authorities and socio-economic actors set out in the terms of reference of the MCSD laid the responsibility for proposing candidates on governments. In that respect, the President considered that, while giving due consideration to the role of the NFPs, the Secretariat as well as any other Partner could identify relevant candidates and forward their proposal to the NFPs. To that end it would be useful to prepare a profile for the nomination of new members. Moreover the Contracting Parties could be asked to consider more flexibility of the Mandate on this point; a proposal to this effect could be made to the next meeting of the MCSD. Two other members supported this point of view.
32. In response to a request by the Secretariat to set a final date for the submission of candidatures, the date of 15 October 2001 was decided upon.

Agenda item 9: Seventh Meeting of the MCSD: preparation and agenda, new themes to be envisaged

Discussion on the evolution of the MCSD

- 33 As decided when adopting the agenda, the Steering Committee took the opportunity to hold a general exchange of views on the future of the MCSD, its work, development and composition.
- 34 Mr Alexandros Lascaratos, the representative of Greece, recalled that at the 6th meeting of the MCSD in Tunis, his delegation had been one of those which had contested the selection of new themes before the work on the current themes had been completed, and had even challenged the selection of certain themes on a provisional basis. So far, eight themes had been addressed, with the work having been completed for five of them and recommendations adopted by the Contracting Parties. But what effect had they had and how had they been followed up? In the case of his own country, he could only point to a total absence of impact of these recommendations. There was a missing link, or trigger leading to the use of the recommendations to take action in practice, and he believed that the same applied to most other countries. The very credibility of the MCSD was at stake and the current debate offered a good opportunity for reflection on what could be done to remedy the situation.
- 35 Mr Magdi Ibrahim, representative of ENDA, shared these concerns. The problem lay in the power of the MCSD, as a consultative body. The same problem had arisen with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development. Perhaps the fact that only Ministers of the Environment were involved in the MCSD at the level of the Contracting Parties was a limiting factor, since they were not able on their own to make commitments on behalf of their respective governments and were often isolated in their own countries. It would be necessary to get away from the environmental image of the MCSD and go beyond it. The same issue was currently arising for environmental observatories, which were increasingly becoming sustainable development observatories.
- 36 Mr Bernard Fautrier, the representative of Monaco, believed it useful to recall the terms of reference of the MCSD, which tended to be overlooked, namely issuing advisory opinions and identifying, evaluating and examining the major ecological, economic and social problems in the region. In that respect, the question arose as to whether the MCSD had a role to play in following up its proposals. In his opinion, the three current themes should be completed by the end of the year, as they could not go on for ever, and the meeting in Antalya should agree on two or three new themes. Another aspect of the terms of reference which had also perhaps been overlooked was that the MCSD served as a type of filter or decanter for all the information provided by the Contracting Parties with a view to the development of new orientations.
- 37 Mr Paul Mifsud, the representative of Malta, called for a more effective follow-up by the National Focal Points, since this was an area in which States had sole responsibility. Mr George Giourgas, the representative of EOAEN, considered that everything perhaps came down to the title of the Commission. If it were to be called the "Mediterranean Study Commission for Sustainable Development", the ambiguities would undoubtedly be resolved. Or, if it were wished to convert the MCSD into a body with some power, it would be necessary to have the courage to raise the question frankly with the Contracting Parties. But while awaiting any such action, it was no good being under any illusion as to the effectiveness of the MCSD,

as that would only have the effect of discouraging the good will of the three groups, which were not seeing any practical results.

- 38 In the view of Mr Khalil Attia, the representative of Tunisia, the crucial point was that certain of the themes covered by the MCSD were outside the normal scope of MAP and of Ministers of the Environment. Another approach and organization of work therefore needed to be adopted, or there would be a risk of failure. A theme such as *sustainable agriculture*, for example, could evidently not be addressed effectively without the intervention of FAO, farmer's organizations and Ministers of Agriculture. It was therefore necessary to adopt a radically different point of view. At the next meeting of the Contracting Parties, it would therefore be necessary to obtain from them a new commitment concerning implementation: such a commitment would naturally be of a promotional and non-binding nature. His country had made full use of the MCSD's recommendations on water and care should therefore be taken in making generalizations when speaking of the failure to implement recommendations.
- 39 The representative of Greece found it *surprising* that the question should arise as to whether the MCSD should follow up its themes, since that directly affected the value of the work carried out. The MCSD was not the Contracting Parties, but it did constitute their opening towards civil society. Rather than confining itself to criticism, his country wished to play a positive role in the debate. For example, the work carried out on indicators and the workshop on that subject organized by the Blue Plan showed that there could be a very good follow-up. But that required a large measure of imagination. If the MCSD endeavoured to organize information meetings at the national level for several ministries, they would undoubtedly help to resolve its lack of visibility with national administrations, since he endorsed the opinion expressed by the representative of Tunisia that it was necessary to embrace other ministries and actors, create new links and promote inter-ministerial action, which was crucial for the implementation of horizontal and multisectoral themes, such as those which had been addressed up to now.
- 40 Mr Armando Mauro, representative of the Municipality of Naples, said that his city was a member of several networks, including Eurocities and EuroMed, and that he found among other cities around the Mediterranean coast the same desire to exchange experience and to open themselves up to the region and the world with a view to resolving the complex problems of urban communities. He himself took the opportunities offered by meetings to provide information on the MCSD and to report back to it on grassroots experience. There was undoubtedly a demand which needed to be met.
- 41 Three members turned back to the issue which they considered to be fundamental, namely financing. Any possibilities of implementation became attractive if it was known in advance that a financing mechanism was foreseen or possible. The role of the European Commission should be emphasized in that respect. It would perhaps be desirable for the Secretariat to establish a technical committee to examine the purely financial aspects of the implementation of the recommendations.
- 42 Mr Lucien Chabason, MAP Coordinator, said that clarification of the work of the MCSD was of major importance for MAP. Since the MCSD had been given terms of reference by the Contracting Parties, they were the ones who needed to take up the debate once again at their meeting in Monaco. We should not underestimate the medium and long term importance of the MCSD recommendations even though there is lack of immediate implementation. In most cases, they gave rise to a slow process of dissemination and assimilation. As countries progressed, they came to realize their needs. Moreover, we deal with new and very broad themes which exceed the

environmental competence of its members, the RACs and the other partners. The context therefore needed to be changed in several respects; (i) by developing the participative approach right from the initial conception of themes; (ii) by reviewing the content of recommendations, which remained very general, and which could include commitments for concrete action within a specified time-limit; and (iii) by proposing that the MCSD should return to old themes, such as tourism, so that they could be supported by a programme of work and endowed with the impact that had been missing up to now. Finally, although emphasis should be given to networks, this should not result in contacts being broken off with certain municipalities which had original experience to share.

- 43 The representative of Greece recalled his reservations concerning the choice of new themes, but nevertheless agreed to the selection in response to the spirit of the first orientations which had been outlined on the theme of "international cooperation, financing, partnership", as a means of putting the work of the MCSD into practice and returning to themes on which the work had been completed through the proposal of a programme of operational follow-up.
- 44 Endorsing the specific interest for this issue, the Steering Committee has suggested to the MCSD to retain "International Cooperation, Financing and Partnership".

Agenda of the 7th meeting in Antalya

- 45 The Steering Committee made a number of changes to the provisional agenda for the meeting in Antalya, in view of the modifications which decided upon above. The amended agenda is contained in Annex IV to this report.
- 46 At the request of the representative of EOAEN, the Secretariat indicated that it was planned to organize a two or three day meeting shortly before the Antalya meeting for the three groups of civil society in the MCSD with a view to examining ways of strengthening the cooperation and participation of their members in the Commission and discussing the message that would be sent to the Johannesburg Summit. The conclusions of this meeting would be reported to the Antalya meeting.

Agenda item 10: Any other business

- 47 Under this agenda item, the Secretariat requested the opinion of the Steering Committee concerning a request made by several former members of the MCSD who were not Contracting Parties to take part in the Commission's meetings as observers. According to the rules of procedure, such participation was not envisaged. Could a more flexible attitude be adopted.
- 48 In general, the members of the Steering Committee expressed a certain reticence in this respect, since it could increase the already high participation rate at meetings beyond reason.
- 49 The President of the Steering Committee informed the meeting that Morocco would be hosting the 7th meeting of the Framework Convention on Climate Change in November, which was a major event both for Morocco and the Mediterranean. He drew the attention of the members of the Steering Committee to the financial constraints of the above meeting. Any financial contribution by MAP and the Contracting Parties would therefore be welcome and would bear witness to Mediterranean solidarity. It should also be recalled in that connection that the 6th meeting of the MCSD had emphasized the importance of climate change for the region.

Agenda item 11: Adoption the summary of decisions and closure of the meeting

- 50 The Secretariat submitted to the meeting for adoption a summary of the decisions and of its work. The summary was adopted as amended and is attached as Annex III to this report.

- 51 After the customary exchange of courtesies, the President closed the meeting on Saturday 19 May at 1 p.m.

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS- LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

**CHAMBERS GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF GREEK ISLANDS (EOAEN)**

M. Georges Giourgas

Conseiller Affaires Européennes
Chambers Group for the Development of Greek
Islands (EOAEN)
17, Avenue de Phalènes
Bruxelles 1000
Belgique
Tel: 322 6485726
Fax: 322 6485725
Email: g.giourgas@freebel.net

**ENVIRONNEMENT ET DEVELOPPEMENT
AU MAGHREB (ENDA)**

Mr Magdi Ibrahim

Coordinator
ENDA
196, Quartier OLM
Rabat Souissi
Maroc
Tel: 212 37 756414/15
Fax: 212 37 756413
Email: endamaghreb@enda.org.ma
Email: Magdi@enda.org.ma

GREECE - GRECE

Mr Alexandros Lascaratos

MAP focal point
Assistant-Professor of Oceanography
Department of Applied Physics - Laboratory
of Meteorology and Oceanography
University of Athens- Building Phys-V
Panepistimioupolis
GR-157 84 Athens
Greece
Tel: 1 7276839
Fax: 1 7295282
Email: alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr

MALTA - MALTE

Mr Paul Mifsud

Permanent Secretary

Ministry for the Environment
Floriana CMR02
Malta
Tel: 356 241644
Fax: 356 250335
Email: paul.mifsud@magnet.mt

MONACO - MONACO

S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier
Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour
l'environnement et le développement
Tel: 377 93158333
Fax: 377 93158888/ 93509591
Email: bfautrier@gouv.mc

M. Patrick Van Klaveren
Conseiller Technique auprès du Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour
l'environnement et le développement
Villa Girasole
16, Bd. de Suisse
MC 98000
Principauté de Monaco
Tel: 377 93158148
Fax: 377 93509591
Email: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

NAPOLI MUNICIPALITY MUNICIPALITE DE NAPLE

Mr Armando Mauro
Representative of the Municipality of Naples
for the MCSD
Director International Institute Stop Disasters (IISD)
Via di Pozzuoli 110
80124 Napoli
Italy
Tel: 39 081 5704665
Fax: 39 081 5704665
Email: stopdis@tin.it
Email: armauro@tin.it

TUNISIA - TUNISIE

M. Khalil Attia

Président, Directeur Général
Agence Nationale de Protection
de l'Environnement (ANPE)
12 rue du Cameroun-Belvédère
Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 840221
Fax: 216 1 848069
Email: anpe.dg@anpe.nat.tn

M. Néjib Trabelsi

Directeur Général de l'Environnement
et de la Qualité de la Vie
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord
Tunis 1080, Tunisie

Tel : 216 1 702779
Fax: 216 1 702431 - 238411
Email: dgeqv@mineat.gov.tn

**COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN –
SECRETARIAT OF THE MCSD
UNITE DE COORDINATION DU PLAN D-ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE -
SECRETARIAT DE LA CMDD**

Mr Lucien Chabason

Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273101
Fax: 30 1 7253196-7
E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Mr Arab Hoballah

Deputy Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273126
Fax: 30 1 7253196-7
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

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

Tel: 301 7273100
Fax: 301 7253196-7
Email : unepmedu@unepmap.gr

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS- LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

**CHAMBERS GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF GREEK ISLANDS (EOAEN)**

M. Georges Giourgas

Conseiller Affaires Européennes
Chambers Group for the Development of Greek
Islands (EOAEN)
17, Avenue de Phalènes
Bruxelles 1000
Belgique
Tel: 322 6485726
Fax: 322 6485725
Email: g.giourgas@freebel.net

**ENVIRONNEMENT ET DEVELOPPEMENT
AU MAGHREB (ENDA)**

Mr Magdi Ibrahim

Coordinator
ENDA
196, Quartier OLM
Rabat Souissi
Maroc
Tel: 212 37 756414/15
Fax: 212 37 756413
Email: endamaghreb@enda.org.ma
Email: Magdi@enda.org.ma

GREECE - GRECE

Mr Alexandros Lascaratos

MAP focal point
Assistant-Professor of Oceanography
Department of Applied Physics - Laboratory
of Meteorology and Oceanography
University of Athens- Building Phys-V
Panepistimioupolis
GR-157 84 Athens
Greece
Tel: 1 7276839
Fax: 1 7295282
Email: alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr

MALTA - MALTE

Mr Paul Mifsud

Permanent Secretary
Ministry for the Environment
Floriana CMR02
Malta
Tel: 356 241644
Fax: 356 250335
Email: paul.mifsud@magnet.mt

MONACO - MONACO

S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier
Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour
l'environnement et le développement
Tel: 377 93158333
Fax: 377 93158888/ 93509591
Email: bfautrier@gouv.mc

M. Patrick Van Klaveren
Conseiller Technique auprès du Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour
l'environnement et le développement
Villa Girasole
16, Bd. de Suisse
MC 98000
Principauté de Monaco
Tel: 377 93158148
Fax: 377 93509591
Email: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

NAPOLI MUNICIPALITY MUNICIPALITE DE NAPLE

Mr Armando Mauro
Representative of the Municipality of Naples
for the MCSD
Director International Institute Stop Disasters (IISD)
Via di Pozzuoli 110
80124 Napoli
Italy
Tel: 39 081 5704665
Fax: 39 081 5704665
Email: stopdis@tin.it
Email: armauro@tin.it

TUNISIA - TUNISIE

M. Khalil Attia

Président, Directeur Général
Agence Nationale de Protection
de l'Environnement (ANPE)
12 rue du Cameroun-Belvédère
Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 840221
Fax: 216 1 848069
Email: anpe.dg@anpe.nat.tn

M. Néjib Trabelsi

Directeur Général de l'Environnement
et de la Qualité de la Vie
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord
Tunis 1080, Tunisie

Tel : 216 1 702779
Fax: 216 1 702431 - 238411
Email: dgeqv@mineat.gov.tn

**COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN –
SECRETARIAT OF THE MCSD
UNITE DE COORDINATION DU PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE -
SECRETARIAT DE LA CMDD**

Mr Lucien Chabason

Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273101
Fax: 30 1 7253196-7
E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Mr Arab Hoballah

Deputy Coordinator
Tel: 30 1 7273126
Fax: 30 1 7253196-7
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

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

Tel: 301 7273100
Fax: 301 7253196-7
Email : unepmedu@unepmap.gr

ANNEX III

Conclusions of the Fifth Meeting of the Steering Committee of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, Monaco, 18-19 May 2001

1. Follow-up of the “Strategic Review”

- a) The Steering Committee approved the new presentation and the change of the document’s title to “Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region”.
- b) In order to ensure its timely distribution to all the actors and organisations concerned, the Committee decided to keep the final deadline of end June 2001 for the new version and asked the Secretariat to use this time interval for an updating of the document with the new information which would be available until then, at the Blue Plan in particular, with special emphasis on socio-economic indicators and, if possible, on environmental indicators; the insularity theme will be highlighted by means of a box and the aspect of natural risks added, also in the form of a box;
- c) Subject to the above additions, the report’s substance and structure will not be modified, in accordance with the decision of the 6th MCSD Meeting.
- d) The preparation and distribution of the Review’s summary will be an opportunity to underscore the importance of both the thematic and sub-regional integration within the context of sustainable development.

2. “Strategic Orientations”

- a) The Steering Committee approved the preparatory process of the “Strategic Orientations” which should continue, through further consideration and a participative approach, without focusing on the need to go to the Johannesburg Summit with a finalized document.
- b) Therefore, only a short framework document, together with draft terms of reference, will therefore be presented to the next meetings of the MCSD and the Contracting Parties.

- c) Thanks to the support given by Spain to this activity, a meeting of experts representing the MCSD members and the other partners involved will be held in this country during the first half of 2002, in order to contribute to the formulation of the "orientations".
- d) The results of the Johannesburg Summit, as well as the rapid evolution of the Mediterranean regional context, will be taken into account for the preparation of the draft "orientations" which will be presented at the 8th MCSD Meeting in 2002, while a final draft will be submitted for adoption at the 13th Meeting of the Contracting Parties in 2003.
- e) The "Strategic Orientations" will be prepared on the basis of the following three thematic documents which will provide their essential contents: "Environment and natural resources", "Economic development and social equity", "Sustainable development policies, integration and participation".

3. Implementation and follow-up of the MCSD's proposals

- a) The Steering Committee took note with satisfaction of the Secretariat's work with the sending of the questionnaires and approved its suggestion to develop "guidelines" rather than a strategy for the follow-up.
- b) To ensure wider participation, it recommended that task managers, former and new MCSD members, should be consulted during the formulation for both thematic and general "guidelines".
- c) In a similar spirit, it invited the Secretariat to call upon the representatives of concerned groups to contribute to the preparation of pilot studies.
- d) The Secretariat will submit to the meeting in Antalya preliminary draft terms of reference for programmes on the follow-up and implementation of thematic recommendations, including the old recommendations adopted by the Parties.

4. Preparatory process for the Johannesburg Summit, funding problems.

- a) The Steering Committee took note of the main activities and meetings of the preparatory process and relevant timetables; it encouraged the Secretariat and MCSD members to be part of this process in order to promote the achievements of the Mediterranean region through it, as well as through national reports.
- b) The importance of funding for development was emphasized; in this respect, it was agreed that the Secretariat should be invited to follow the preparation process of the UN Conference on Financing for Development and adapt it, as appropriate, to the regional level.

5. Ongoing work of thematic groups

- a) The Steering Committee took note of the progress of the three groups "Industry", "Free-trade" and "Urban Management".
- b) Efforts to disseminate information and increase public awareness will continue, in particular by promoting publications in the countries which reflect their individual situation.
- c) The Steering Committee expressed the wish that, in a general way, the aspect of "funding" should be included in the thematic proposals.

6. Participation and involvement of the major groups of Society.

- a) To initiate the process of renewing the members of the three MCSD categories, the Secretariat was invited to write to the MAP national focal points asking them to name candidates for the representatives of socio-economic actors and local authorities. A candidates "profile" will be proposed to them, emphasizing the importance of networks, the candidates' motivation, the need for a broad vision and a Mediterranean focus.
- b) In order to diversify the Commission's composition, the Steering Committee invites the Secretariat to ask MCSD members to propose potential candidates and also contact, for that purpose, other partners and networks.

- c) The workshops planned for the “Industry” and “Urban Management” groups could be used to identify potential partners.
- d) The candidature proposals should be submitted by 15 October 2001 at the latest.

7. Seventh Meeting of the MCSD.

In reviewing the provisional agenda for the meeting of Antalya, the Steering Committee has discussed the point concerning the new issues and has proposed:

- a) To retain “International cooperation, financing and partnership”, among the new issues that are under preparation.
- b) To reflect on the eventual follow up of the themes already dealt with, in order to make recommendations more operational and complete them, if necessary, to best meet the region’s requirements (in particular, financial requirements, deadlines, partners).

8. Evolution prospects of the MCSD.

- a) The Steering Committee invited the Secretariat to prepare for the Antalya meeting an informal document summarizing the main points of its discussions in Monaco on the MCSD’s evolution prospect and ways of improving its effectiveness; this document will serve as an introduction to the further discussion of this question at the Commission’s plenary session.
- b) Since the examined themes extend well beyond the environmental basis on which MAP was established, the MCSD’s Steering Committee proposed that for future work it would be advisable to promote a participatory approach by any means, develop partnership and cooperation, diversify skills, work with all ministries and organizations concerned, depending on the themes and examine, in a systematic way, possibilities of financing concrete actions for the follow-up of recommendations.

- d) The MCSD could present to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties a proposal for revising the Commission's terms of reference as regards the follow-up and implementation of recommendations and any other matter which could make future work more effective.

- e) The Secretariat is invited to convene, just before the Antalya meeting, a meeting of the members of the Commission's three categories on which a report will be submitted to the Commission; the object of this meeting will be to improve cooperation between the three groups, as well as their participation in the work of the Commission and to examine ways of obtaining representative and motivated candidatures for renewing the members of these groups.

ANNEX IV

Provisional Agenda for the 7th MCSD meeting:

1. Opening of the meeting;
2. Adoption of the Agenda;
3. Election of the Steering Committee;
4. Guidelines for implementation and follow up of the MCSD proposals;
5. Review of activities and adoption of proposals:
 - Industry and Sustainable Development
 - Free Trade and Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context;
 - Urban Management and Sustainable Development;
6. New issues;
7. Follow up of themes already studied;
8. Follow up of "Strategic Review";
9. "Strategic Orientations" for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development;
10. Major Groups: participation and contribution to MCSD activities;
11. MAP/MCSD participation and contribution to the preparatory process of the 2002 Earth Summit;
12. Round table discussion on MCSD assessment and prospects;
13. Adoption of proposals and conclusions.