

Table of Contents

- Main body of the Report

ANNEXES

- ANNEX I List of participants
- ANNEX II Agenda of the meeting
- ANNEX III Draft Programme and budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (new structure)
- ANNEX IV Review of the Fourth Meeting of the MCSD - Results and follow-up

Introduction

1. The XVIIth meeting of the MED Unit and the Regional Activity Centres on the MAP programme was held in Athens, at the premises of MEDU, on 11 and 12 January 1999. All RAC Directors and MEDU professional staff were present. The list of participants is attached as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting

2. Mr L. Chabason, MAP Coordinator, opened the meeting and welcomed the new Directors, Mr Mohamed Adel Hentati, Director of SPA/RAC, and Mr Roberto Patrino, Director of REMPEC. He also paid tribute to the former Directors of SPA and REMPEC, Mr Mohamed Saied and Mr Jean-Claude Sainlos respectively, and thanked them for their fruitful cooperation. He pointed out that the purpose of the present meeting was to hold a first discussion and exchange of views on the programme and budget for the next biennium (2000-2001) in its new presentation. To facilitate this task, three papers had been prepared on: the structure of the programme; the structure of the budget; and a review of the results of the fourth session of the MCSD with proposals for follow-up.
3. He also pointed out that the meeting would discuss the "MAP Information Strategy", on which a draft proposal had been distributed to all participants.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the provisional agenda

4. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda proposed by the Secretariat in document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.151/1/Rev. 1 (see Annex II to this report).

Agenda item 3: Preparation of the programme and budget for the biennium 2000-2001

5. Mr F. Tissot, Fund and Administrative Officer, briefed the meeting on the current situation of the projects being implemented by MEDU and Regional Activity Centres. With regard to the 1997 extended projects, he indicated that they should be closed by 31 March 1999, irrespective of whether they had been extended into 1998 or terminated at the end of 1997. Terminal reports should be forwarded to MEDU as soon as possible. With regard to 1999, he informed the meeting that MEDU was still awaiting approval from Headquarters for the 1999 project so that the 1999 spending of the centres could be authorized on the following basis:
 - 50 per cent - salaries
 - 50 per cent - office costs
 - 30 per cent - activities
6. Mr Tissot pointed out that revisions of project documents would have to be prepared, with correct expenditures for 1999 and the carry over of 1998 unspent funds into 1999. The following table shows the status of unclosed completed old projects:

Project number	Responsible Officer/ Liaison Officer	Status
FP/ME/CA/5101-8902- MAP (1990-1994)	A. Aksel	Mr Aksel is working on the report Due date: 31/1/1999
FP/ME/5102-7606-ROCC (1976-1990) old REMPEC project	R. Patruno/F.S. Civili	IMO will have to be involved as the Centre is not equipped to prepare the report
FP/ME/5102-8305- PAP/RAC (1983-1989)	I. Trumbic/I. Dharat	All work is done. Waiting OK to close from HQs
CP/ME/5101-9401 CAMP Rhodes Project	I. Trumbic/I. Dharat	PAP/RAC will submit report soon. Due date: 31/1/1999
ME/5102-8402-SPA/RAC (1984-1991)	M. A. Hentati/I. Dharat	SPA/RAC will submit report soon Due date: 31/1/1999
FP/ME/CA/5101-8404 MEDPOL (1984-1991)	F.S. Civili	Report will be rewritten by F.S. Civili Due date: 31/1/1999
CP/ME/0401-94-22 100 Historic Sites (1994-1997)	D.Drocourt/F. Tissot	F. Tissot to travel to Marseille in order to close project in January

7. He also informed the meeting that all Centres and professionals at MEDU had to complete a Self-Evaluation Fact Sheet on an annual basis to reflect project performance against the activities and outputs outlined in the Annual Project Work Plan. The reports should have been sent to MEDU by mid-January 1999. He informed the meeting that computerization of accounts and management of data had been completed and a roster of consultants had been prepared. He urged all RACs to provide the MEDU Secretariat with names of consultants as it was the Secretariat's intention to update the list every six months.
8. After this brief introduction concerning the status of projects, the Coordinator suggested that participants give their preliminary views.
9. Mr G. Benoit, Director of BP/RAC, briefed the meeting on his Centre's activities in relation to the MCSD themes (indicators, tourism, free trade, water and urban/rural development), CAMP projects, and other activities including the preparation of

country profiles. With regard to indicators, he pointed out that BP had just closed a project with METAP aiming at defining environmental performance indicators in the field of water resources and demand, air-pollution and wastes in 12 Mediterranean countries. As regards tourism, a workshop was held in Antalya, which brought together about 60 people, including tour operators and other people from the tourism industry. Main activities for 1999 will include urban areas, statistics and indicators as well as free trade and sustainable development.

10. Mr I. Trumbic, Director of PAP/RAC informed the meeting that all activities would be implemented on time, with the exception the CAMP project for Fuka-Matrouh (Egypt), where there would be some delay due to the late receipt of inputs from the national authorities. He would request that the funds allocated to this activity be carried on to 1999.
11. On this issue, Mr I. Dharat, Senior Programme Officer, drew attention to the continued delays in finalizing the Fuka-Matrouh CAMP project, a matter which he believed, was harming the credibility of MAP vis-à-vis the Egyptian authorities. He emphasized the urgent need for PAP to complete the main report containing a synthesis of the activities undertaken by the Centres, in accordance with the project Agreement, as well as the proposals for a set of recommendations (short-term and long-term) and for follow-up activities. He also urged PAP to propose, in consultation with the relevant Egyptian authorities, an exact date for the final Presentation Conference to be held during the first half of 1999.
12. Mr A. Hentati, Director of SPA/RAC, summarized the implementation of SPA activities. He informed the meeting that various activities in the 1997/1998 programme budget had been fully implemented, he referred, in particular, to the successful meetings held in Arta, Greece, in October 1998, on endangered species. He pointed out that a second expert meeting for the Turtle Action Plan will be held in Tunis during February 1999. In 1999, his Centre would focus on habitat, a list of marine habitats expanded to include coastal habitats would be prepared and used as an important tool for the protection of species. Concerning protected areas in the Mediterranean region, he informed participants that a training course on the management of protected areas had been held in Morocco in November 1998. All those responsible for the management of protected areas in Morocco had participated in the training course. With regard to CAMP/ Sfax, he noted that the final presentation conference had been held in Sfax, on 15 and 16 December 1998, and represented a major contribution by the SPA Centre. The Conference had attracted a great deal of interest on the part of international and local authorities. He also informed the participants that a second meeting of experts on the Action Plan for Marine Turtles, would be held in Tunis, on 19 and 20 February 1999 and a meeting on Marine Vegetation would be held on 9 and 10 April 1999 immediately prior to the meeting of SPA National Focal Points, in order to reduce expenses. With regard to the vegetation meeting, the Coordinator pointed out that the issue of *caulerpa* should also be covered within the framework of the vegetation meeting, as it was considered a biodiversity issue rather than a pollution issue.

13. Mr M. Raimondi, Director of ERS/RAC, explained that the ERS Centre focused mainly on activities relevant to CAMP projects and capacity building. A study on the "State of Remote Sensing Applications in Israel" had been prepared as his Centre's contribution to the CAMP/Israel. Another study entitled "Support of Remote Sensing Techniques to planning and decision-making processes of sustainable development in Egypt" had also been prepared by ERS/RAC within the framework of the Fuka/CAMP.
14. He expressed the view that, in general, more contacts, coordination and exchange of information were needed when dealing with the CAMP projects. Concerning the financial aspects, he noted that in 1998 funds had been solicited from the European Space Agency for the establishment of an information database relevant to remote-sensing activities in the Mediterranean region. With regard to capacity building, he noted that a national forum on "Support of Remote Sensing to Planning and Decision-making processes for sustainable development" had been held in Cairo, on 8 March 1998. He hoped that this type of initiative could be repeated in other countries. Finally, in his view, greater efforts should be made to coordinate MAP activities with relevant activities under other initiatives. The ERS/RAC Director also referred to the need to organize regular meetings of the ERS/RAC National Focal Points, which was not possible due to budget constraints. He proposed that an arrangement be made to convene such meetings in conjunction with other MAP meetings.
15. Mr V. Macià, Director of CP/RAC, stated out that during 1998 no MAP-related activities had been undertaken due to non-availability of funds from the host country (Spain). The Centre should have received funds from the Spanish authorities, but that had not been the case. Nevertheless, the Centre had been able to obtain the sum of US \$ 600,000 from the Spanish authorities to cover activities in 1999. Concerning the legal status of the Centre, he informed the meeting that since October 1998, the Centre had been an independent Catalanian public company, owned 100 per cent by the Catalanian Government. With regard to the draft Host Government Agreement, he said that his Centre would shortly send to MEDU its comments on the draft Agreement.
16. Mr R. Patruno, Director of REMPEC, briefly summarized his professional activities prior to his appointment as Director of REMPEC as of October 1998. He noted that the three-month gap between the departure of the former Director and the date on which he had taken up his post, had slowed down the activities of the Centre. For example, the regional training course had been postponed to 1999. Nevertheless, certain activities had been carried out such as the sub-regional cooperation on preparedness and the response system for Cyprus, Egypt and Israel, the Workshop in Syria on accidental marine pollution (April 1998), and the project in Turkey to develop a national preparedness and response system, which had been approved by LIFE third countries (US \$ 800,000 for three years). He also referred to the important meeting of legal and technical experts held in Malta, on 23 and 24 November 1998 with the aim of amending the Emergency Protocol in order to introduce the provisions required to implement the regional strategy to prevent pollution of the marine environment by ships, as approved by the latest meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention. The meeting

comprehensively reviewed proposals for amendment, made certain modifications and decided to forward the two documents by REMPEC to the MAP Coordinating Unit for further action.

Administrative Officer for REMPEC

17. Concerning the activities of REMPEC, the Coordinator indicated that the MEDU had tried to resolve the issue of the administrative post at the Malta Centre and had made some practical suggestions, but he felt that IMO should also assume its responsibilities as the collaborating organization with UNEP, within the 13 per cent programme support costs, and should now take the necessary action to resolve the problem.
18. Mr Patrino, Director of REMPEC, thanked MAP for its efforts to resolve the problem, but he felt that MAP should negotiate the issue directly with IMO and not through REMPEC. He added that the problem of the administrative structure of the Centre was very serious and called for an urgent solution. He pointed out that, if REMPEC was to be responsible for any additional tasks, such as preventing pollution from ships, an administrative officer would have to be appointed as soon as possible. He agreed with the MAP proposal to find a temporary solution for 1999 and recruit a consultant to deal with administrative matters, until the whole issue was resolved.

100 Historic Sites Programme

19. Concluding the brief exchange-of views on this item, the Coordinator expressed the view that the Bureau of the Contracting Parties should be made aware that IMO faced difficulties in arranging for funds to cover the cost of an administrative officer. He said that he was ready to help, but certain procedures should be followed. For example, REMPEC should first raise the issue with IMO, on the basis of the present discussion, and then MAP would raise it with the Bureau of the Contracting Parties. The possibility of a tripartite consultation could be explored.
20. Mr D. Drocourt, Director of the 100 Historic Sites Programme, informed the meeting that a number of activities relevant to the Algerian CAMP and the Tunisian CAMP, had been undertaken. A master plan had been prepared for some of the Tunisian historic sites, but it did not include many other sites in the plan and there was no real link between the cultural and environmental aspects.
21. On the future role of the 100 Historic Sites Secretariat within the framework of MAP, the Coordinator said that there was a need to protect and safeguard Mediterranean historic sites using the sustainable development approach. It was necessary to move from the cultural aspect to the sustainable development aspect of the sites, integrating the environmental component. Accordingly, he suggested that the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites programme prepare a specific clearly-substantiated report to be presented to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties, in order to give programme renewed impetus.

22. During the brief debate on this issue, speakers agreed with the new approach in dealing with the issue of historic sites proposed by the Coordinator and stressed that, in view of the trend towards the ecological type of tourism (national parks, historic sites, protected areas) ways should be found to integrate historic and ecological sites into the sustainable development approach.
23. In concluding the discussion on this issue, the Coordinator requested the Director of 100 Historic Sites Programme to prepare a report for submission to the meeting of the Contracting Parties and noted that the issue of who would be responsible for the programme in the future was still open for further discussion and a decision.
24. Mr F.S. Civili, MEDPOL Coordinator, explained that the approval of MEDPOL Phase III represented a major challenge and an integrated approach rather than a sectoral approach had to be followed. In order to give a better understanding of this new approach to MEDPOL Phase III, visits to several countries had been undertaken in order to explain the new philosophy of the programme. The capacity-building programme had also been implemented. Another important event, had been the preparation and approval of the UNEP/GEF project for the implementation of the SAP, which expanded and broadened the framework of the MEDPOL programme. As a result of the project, he hoped that by the year 2000, the various national action plans to address land-based pollution would be in concrete form.
25. Concerning the monitoring component, he stressed that it still remained a very important component of MEDPOL. Regarding future meetings within the MEDPOL programme, he informed the participants that the regular meeting of MEDPOL Coordinators would be held in Italy, from 3-7 May 1999, and a meeting of experts on compliance and control would be held in Athens, from 16-18 March 1999.
26. With regard to the MCSD theme on industry, he noted that the work was continuing in collaboration with the Task Manager (Italy), the UNEP, Paris Industry Office, and UNIDO. Work would also continue on CAMP projects. Finally, he noted that procedures for the recruitment of a P-3 level expert, within the MEDPOL component were being finalized.
27. The Coordinator concluded the preliminary discussion by giving a brief account of the present situation concerning environment in the Mediterranean region and referring to particular issues related to MAP. He noted that, within the international context, the situation was not very encouraging. The results of Rio+5 were not very positive, and climate negotiations were not moving forward. In addition, the growing number of texts and meetings had discouraged countries. Within UNEP the Regional Seas division had disappeared, and that was not an encouraging sign. Henceforward, MAP would belong to the Division for Environmental Conventions.
28. At the MED level, cooperation with METAP continued, despite the fact that METAP had not received the funds expected. Furthermore, METAP staff had faced continuous changes which hampered the smooth continuity of the programme. A lot of criticism had been openly directed towards the programme.

29. At the national level, the Coordinator noted the reluctance and the lack of enthusiasm on the part of countries to commit themselves to protect the environment and to implement the political undertakings they had already made. Despite these shortcomings, he stressed that MAP should maintain a high level of involvement and contacts with countries. If MAP was to proceed in 1999 without the necessary ratification of the MAP legal instruments, it would find itself in an embarrassing situation that might lead to the suspension of some activities.
30. Finally, the Coordinator referred to other important developments within MAP, such as:
- the financial situation was satisfactory due to the payment of contributions by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the main contributors;
 - an assessment of CAMPs had been undertaken with PAP and METAP;
 - an evaluation of PAP/RAC would convene shortly;
 - the status of NGOs within MAP was being clarified and improved;
 - the main weakness was in the information component. For example, good work was done at the Crete and Arta meetings, but there had been no real dissemination of information about these meetings. There was a gap between what was being done and what was actually disseminated. Steps had been taken to bridge this gap, however, by preparing the MAP Information Strategy.

Presentation of the new programme and budget structure for the next biennium

31. The Coordinator briefly introduced his ideas concerning a new presentation of the future programme and budget (2000/2001 biennium). He referred to the paper prepared by Mr Dharat (see Annex III to this report), and pointed out that the main objective of this new structure was to improve the presentation of MAP's proposals concerning the programme and budget, with a view to streamlining its work, improving its managerial process and ensuring synergy and transparency. The intention of the exercise was to submit to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties, through the meeting of the National Focal Points (Athens, September 1999), an improved, clearer, more comprehensive and better integrated presentation that would help countries to immediately identify the major issues, related problems, response by MAP and gaps that remained to be overcome, with specific recommendations relevant to the issue in question, together with the budgetary allocation.
32. He informed participants that a liaison officer within MEDU would be appointed for each component. The whole exercise (the document on programme and budget) should be finalized by the end of June 1999, but would be sent to countries immediately after the meeting of the MCSD (Rome, 1-3 July 1999). There was thus a period of around five months in which to prepare and finalize the document.
33. The Coordinator noted that there were not sufficient funds to cover basic activities related to MCSD, the REMPEC administrative post, the follow-up to CAMP projects, some MEDPOL activities were not covered and some countries in the

South needed more support. He stressed that MAP was not a Convention Secretariat such as the Helsinki Secretariat, but an action-oriented Secretariat. Therefore, to cover the budgetary gap, he proposed to draw up an appropriate budget to be accepted by all Contracting Parties with a reasonable increase not exceeding more than 2 to 3 per cent. Concerning the MCSD, he recommended following the previous approach under which countries agreed to host the various meetings of the Commission and identifying financial requirements related to the MCSD in a separate section of the budget to be presented to the meeting of the Contracting Parties with a view to obtaining voluntary contributions. Another possibility for financing the activities of the MCSD was to ask the EU which supported the Commission's work, to take over the costs of the Commission through its voluntary contribution to MAP, without prejudice to the activities of RACs which are financed through the voluntary contribution of the EU.

34. The Coordinator informed the participants that within three weeks, a note would be sent on the new structure of the programme and budget document. All Centres and MEDU professionals should prepare their inputs and send them to MEDU by the end of February 1999. There would be an opportunity for further individual consultations on the first inputs.
35. Mr Tissot, Fund & Administrative Officer, presented the budgetary part of the paper on the new structure (Annex III to this report). He indicated that the financial section would not change substantially compared to the previous structure. However, titles of components had to be the same as those in the programme section. The introductory part of each section concerning "objectives" would be deleted.
36. A general discussion on the new proposal took place. One speaker warned of the possibility of overlapping and duplication of work between components and activities of Regional Centres. Another speaker proposed adding a new fifth component related to the budget for each issue. A third speaker thought that the proposal might raise problems because the issues were not only MAP's responsibility. Moreover, linking recommendations with the budget would be difficult when dealing with budget reductions and he wondered what could be done if other partners failed to respond. Another participant stressed the importance of having a budget at the end of the section for each component, with a separate section for the entire budget. The need to specify the activities clearly and determine who would be responsible for implementation was underlined.
37. All speakers agreed to the new proposal, which would streamline MAP's work. Some speakers made suggestions concerning the various points of the proposal. One related to the establishment of a medium-term programme (five-year horizon), in addition to the existing two-year programme (biennium). In common with other speakers, he was not in favour of asking the EU to finance the activities of the MCSD through its voluntary contribution. In this connection, the idea of making countries in the region responsible for hosting the MCSD meetings and financing specific activities should be left open. Other non-Mediterranean countries could also be contacted for financial support for the activities of the Commission.

38. Another point concerned whether the Blue Plan and PAP Centres would present their proposed budgets to the Focal Points meeting (Athens, September 1999). The Coordinator replied in the affirmative and added that, in future, it would be preferable to organize separate NFP meetings for each of the BP and PAP Centres, instead of having their national focal points meetings within the scope of the MAP National Focal Points meeting. He would seek the advice of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties on this issue, after receiving the final comments from the Directors of these two Centres. He also would ask Contracting Parties, that have not done so, to nominate their national focal points for the BP and the PAP Centres, to urge them to nominate, if possible, the same focal point for the two Centres and to organize a joint focal point meeting for the two Centres (sharing the cost of such meetings).

Agenda item 4: Review of the results of the Fourth Session of the MCSD and preparation of the Fifth Session and the various Thematic Working Groups

39. Mr A.Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator, introduced a paper entitled "Review of the Fourth Meeting of the MCSD - Results and Follow-up", attached as Annex IV to this report. He referred to the first four pages of the paper relating to the major issues, decisions and tasks resulting from the Fourth Session of the Commission (Monaco, 20-22 October 1998), in particular, the composition of the new Steering Committee (Tunisia, EOAEN, Cyprus, MIO-ECSDE, Municipality of Silifke, Monaco and Spain). He also referred to the MCSD decision requesting the Secretariat to prepare a report on the method of work, including options for following-up recommendations. The report would be discussed at the next meeting of the Steering Committee before review and submission to the Fifth MCSD Session (Rome, 1-3 July 1999). The Secretariat also had to prepare a note on criteria for selecting new themes, for review of the Steering Committee and draft Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee. Finally, he mentioned tasks to be performed by the Secretariat relating to cooperation with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, (UNCSD), the United Nations, and other partners.
40. A general exchange of views took place on the issues raised by the Deputy Coordinator, who stated that the discussion would give MAP an opportunity to evaluate the situation and trends in the Mediterranean region. RACs would have the opportunity to suggest new activities to be included in the next biennium. "An assessment of the implementation of Agenda MED 21" could be carried out for June 2000, to show what are the actual trends and gaps. It would show that trends are not so positive on a number of issues such as transport, energy, etc. This could be a "Tunis + 6 Report". He offered that BP be the main support Centre for this exercise. The Blue Plan Centre could be the principal actor in preparing a report for the year 2000, with the assistance of other Centres, to identify the current situation, gaps and trends.
41. Mr Benoit, Director of Blue Plan, explained that such exercise would be difficult. It should be connected to all works done in indicators, so as to show the current situation, which was quite well underway, and to make analysis of the issues

(problematics), which was more difficult. Furthermore, he noted that the choice of the issues would be very delicate, as a wrong choice could lead to miss the point.

42. Mr Trumbic, Director of of PAP/RAC, expressed his interest in participating in such an exercise, but proposed that an outline of the document first be prepared as soon as possible.
43. The Deputy Coordinator said that more time was required. The document could be prepared for the year 2001 (12th Meeting of the Contracting Parties). In the meantime, a first draft could be prepared for June 2000 and an outline for the Fifth Session of the MCSD (Rome, July 1999).
44. Mr Hentati, Director of SPA/RAC, supported the idea of preparing a report on the implementation of Agenda MED 21. He emphasized that they were delays in implementing Agenda MED 21, particularly on the part of countries and suggested that after, completing the study of the eight themes of the MCSD, an evaluation exercise be initiated.
45. The following topics were proposed for incorporation as new themes:
 - agriculture as it relates to the environment and water policies;
 - natural resources (soil, water, desertification);
 - wastes;
 - urban centres;
 - costs-related with health and environment;
 - information.
46. Following the conclusion of the discussion on the first part of the paper on the MCSD, the meeting focused on the following six individual themes of the MCSD:

Indicators

47. The Deputy Coordinator referred to the relevant issues and decisions and defined the main tasks of the Secretariat and the Task Managers and the BP Centre as:
 - reviewing the list of indicators according to their relevance to sustainable development in the Mediterranean and availability in the largest number of countries;
 - "proposals for commitments" to be reviewed, with brief guidelines for implementation and follow-up procedures and steps, including the testing of indicators at country level;
 - the holding of a major Workshop on 10 and 11 May 1999, with broad participation by MCSD members and partners/observers, in Sophia Antipolis, probably with the support of France.
48. During the brief discussion on this item, Mr Benoit, the Director of Blue Plan pointed out that his Centre would complement the list, in particular with indicators on the sea and consumption patterns. Then tests should be run at country level for all indicators, to determine what is feasible, what can be calculated in view of the

availability of data, and what is not. This exercise had just been completed for Tunisia, at the occasion of a twin exercise jointly carried out by France and Tunisia with the assistance of Blue Plan. Next countries in this test could be Morocco and Slovenia. Further, the manner of illustrating the indicators was to be explored as well. The Blue Plan would organize a workshop in France in April/May, and the number of people invited would depend on the availability of funds.

49. The Coordinator informed the meeting that UNDP had produced a valuable report on consumption and that the Secretariats of various Conventions also had good data banks as did the international organizations and other relevant sources. Work on indicators was fundamental to MAP's activities, therefore, comprehension of the work on this theme should be a priority. He also raised the question of timing of the discussion to be devoted to each indicator.
50. Mr Hentati, Director of SPA/RAC, suggested that two or three indicators be defined to describe the process of development, using information available at MAP (MEDPOL).
51. In order to gauge opinion among the public in Mediterranean countries, the Director of PAP/RAC proposed that an enquiry be undertaken in Mediterranean countries to ascertain the public's views on the selected indicators.
52. Mr Raimondi, Director of ERS/RAC, emphasized that remote sensing was a tool that could act as a guide and provide answers and information on the relevant indicators in the Mediterranean region.
53. The Deputy Coordinator summed up the discussion by expressing the view that the establishment of a working group on indicators would not be appropriate as there was already a group on indicators. An alternative would be to exchange views among all groups and the Blue Plan in order to identify indicators on which to focus. With regard to the sea/coastal area, global reflection on the pressure of the sea, status and response was required and it would be good to have two or three indicators in this regard. Indicators on biodiversity relevant to catching were also needed.

Tourism

54. The Deputy Coordinator informed the meeting of the main issues discussed and the decisions of the latest meeting of the MCSD concerning Tourism and sustainable development. He also identified the principle tasks to be undertaken by the Secretariat, the Task Manager and the BP/PAP Centres:
 - Task Managers and Support Centres to identify indicators of carrying capacity and impact;
 - Task Managers and Support Centres to identify mechanisms to improve cooperation and partnership between tourism partners;
 - To collect information on good practices/success stories, assess their replication and means for their promotion;

- To study in greater detail eco-labelling, eco-taxes and voluntary systems of contribution and define the appropriate level for such measures;
- To develop more detailed recommendations and proposals for action;
- For these tasks, it would be useful, or even necessary, to hold a meeting of the Working Group before submitting the relevant report for adoption by members of the MCSD.

He said that work on this theme, had progressed satisfactorily. He suggested that a small meeting of restricted members of the Thematic Working Group on Tourism, be convened before the Fifth Session of the Commission, perhaps in Split in April 1999.

55. Mr Benoit, Director of BP/RAC proposed that the working group focus on the set of recommendations put forward by his Centre and identify success stories in a report to be published for the meeting of the Contracting Parties (October 1999).
56. The Coordinator of MAP recommended that the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites be involved and that there be close cooperation between BP and PAP. He suggested that the issue of pleasure boating and the necessary facilities be taken up, with the involvement of all Centres and MEDPOL. More information was also required in this field.

Information

57. The Deputy Coordinator introduced the main relevant issues and decisions. He also identified the principle tasks to be carried out by the Secretariat and Task Managers:
- To review the report, taking into account relevant decisions;
 - To collect information on good practices and success stories to be assessed for lessons and replication;
 - The Secretariat to encourage other partners/participants, particularly from Governments, to participate actively in the Working Group;
 - Better definition of what was expected of the Working Groups and the production of more concrete results;
 - Convening of a meeting of the Working Group in April/May, giving more time to prepare these tasks.

He also informed the meeting that the above tasks would be related to the MAP Information Strategy. While recognizing that MIO/CREE, and the Task Managers had done a lot of work, MAP and the countries had not become sufficiently involved. A meeting with the countries, not limited to NGOs, would therefore be organized. The Task Managers would be asked to prepare a substantive report on this topic.

Free trade and environment

58. The Deputy Coordinator referred to the main relevant issues and decisions and the principle tasks to be carried out by the Secretariat, Task Managers and the BP:

- The Task Manager and Support Centre to set clear and realistic objectives, define better the approach to be adopted and identify the various stages for the next MCSD meeting (with the view to submitting a final product to the Contracting Parties meeting in 2001);
- To undertake an in-depth analysis of free trade and environment, respective impacts and policies for better euro-Mediterranean partnership;
- To collect regional and national experiences, analyse and draw lessons for the Mediterranean;
- To analyse the dynamics of key sectors within the framework of free trade and environment interactions;
- To organize a Workshop in April/May 1999, probably in Beirut with the support of France (Foreign Affairs).

He noted that this was a new subject for MAP and was also a sensitive issue politically. By the year 2000, it was expected to have a final report on the issue. He also observed that the Geneva meeting was important because it opened the door to contact with other countries and partners.

59. Mr Patruno, director of REMPEC, pointed out that an important component of free trade was transport, but it was not mentioned anywhere.
60. Mr Benoit, Director of BP/RAC said that further reflection was required before taking major decisions in this field, so as not to make mistakes. There would have to be an assessment of the regional and national experience. There would be a general discussion of the theme in Geneva with experts from the Mediterranean and relevant organizations. Case studies had also been selected based on the experience of Spain, Greece and Portugal, and a consultant would prepare a report on the issue. He promised that a timetable covering the next period would be sent to all participants in the RAC meeting.
61. Mr Dharat suggested that MCSD use the experience of the Arab countries, which were now working on the establishment of a free trade zone in the Arab world by the year 2010. He also suggested that a country from the South be selected as a case study.
62. Mr Hentati, Director of SPA/RAC said that METAP was organizing a meeting in Tunis, from 25-29 January 1999, on the issue of trade and environment, covering 12 countries.

Industry and sustainable development

63. The main issues and decisions relating to this theme were presented by the Deputy Coordinator, who also referred to the principle tasks of the Secretariat, the Task Managers and MEDPOL:
- To define clearer objectives, with concrete programmes for implementation;
 - To extend and improve the analysis of the regional and national industrial contexts;

- To collect and analyse information on case studies on cleaner production and successful environmental management, and draw lessons;
- To identify information, awareness and capacity-building needs;
- To organize a Working Group meeting, with experts and concerned institutions, in April/May 1999, to discuss the above tasks, with a view to the subsequent holding of a major workshop with Italian support.

He informed the meeting that the latest meeting of the MCSD had decided that the work programme for this theme had to be planned for a longer term perspective, with the results being transmitted to the Contracting Parties meeting of 2001 and a meeting of experts to be held in Masa Carrara, Italy, during April/May 1999.

64. Mr Civili, MEDPOL Coordinator, pointed out that there were already a lot of data on industry relevant to the Mediterranean region. The proposed meeting of experts to be held in Italy, would review these and the various issues relevant to industry and sustainable development. Tasks would then be distributed to the various actors. He noted that cooperation with CP/RAC, the UNEP/Paris office and with UNIDO was good and a document on regional assessment of industrial pollution would be prepared by MEDPOL. It was planned to organize a debriefing meeting with industrial sectors in Italy, Greece and Spain to present SAP. Moreover, national and regional Workshops would be organized in cooperation with UNIDO and CP/RAC and it was expected that in the year 2000, a workshop on this theme would be organized with Italian support.
65. Mr Macià, Director of CP/RAC, drew attention to the need to ensure that there was no overlap between task managers and the Support Centres and other activities within the framework of GEF/SAP and the LBS activities.

Management of urban/rural development

66. The Deputy Coordinator informed the meeting that the latest session of the MCSD had decided that the Group's work should focus on urban development and management, in the context of land use planning, in cooperation with MedCities and Turkey (as joint TM), and with greater participation by NGO's, local authorities and socio-economic actors. A background paper, together with clear objectives and related programmes, would be prepared by Support Centres (BP, PAP and ERS) and discussed at an expert meeting to be held in April 1999 (probably in Egypt or elsewhere, depending on the financial support).
67. With the support of Tunisia and Cyprus, draft TOR for a working group on rural development would be prepared for submission to the next MCSD meeting. It would be considered as a possible new subject, to be selected first by the Steering Committee, and then by the next MCSD meeting.
68. Mr Benoit, Director of BP/RAC, informed the meeting that MedCities and France had agreed to participate actively in the Working Group. His Centre would participate in the forthcoming conference to be held in Seville by Med Cities. It would exchange views and collect information on Mediterranean cities and identify Mayors to be contacted subsequently. Two consultants had been selected to help

prepare the basic documents for the Working Group, notably a report on "The evaluation of urbanization in the Mediterranean". "Managers" in specific Mediterranean cities, local actors, and Mayors should be involved in future work on this theme.

69. The Coordinator suggested that the approach to this theme be defined. It would be a valuable contribution to the efforts of the Working Group and the MCSD. The Group should identify where progress could be achieved from the operational and management sides of specific areas related to this issue, while the industrial group concentrated on the production aspects.

Agenda item 5: MAP information strategy

70. The discussion on this item commenced with an opening statement by the Coordinator, who explained his views concerning the information issue within MAP. When he first took up his post, he had the impression that MAP was totally absent and unknown to the people within and outside the region. Such a situation was no longer acceptable as the Mediterranean was a well known area for tourism and attracted a lot of attention worldwide. There, therefore, had to be an appropriate information strategy. The Bureau of the Contracting Parties had a mandate to monitor this important issue. In response to a decision of the latest meeting of the Bureau, a small meeting of information experts would soon be convened in Athens to review the draft Information Strategy prepared by the Secretariat. The objective was to present a concrete proposal on the issue to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties. However, it was not necessary to wait until then. Certain activities relevant to information had to continue and be strengthened.
71. The Deputy Coordinator briefly introduced the document on the "MAP Information Strategy" which had already been circulated to all RAC Directors. He referred to the Bureau decision and informed participants that the meeting of the group of information experts would be held in Athens in early April 1999, and he invited all RACs to participate in its work. He then introduced the draft set of recommendations referred to in the document. Finally, he requested all Directors to send, their outputs to the MAP Library on a regular basis.
72. Mr Patruno, Director of REMPEC, considered that the information document was very interesting one. He confirmed that many people were still not aware of the Barcelona Convention. More needed to be done in this field using experts in the subject. He suggested that Contracting Parties be asked to contribute in kind towards the goal, by contacting professionals and experts. In this respect, a questionnaire could be prepared and sent to Contracting Parties to seek their views on the matter.
73. Mr Hentati, Director of SPA/RAC stressed that information was a fundamental issue for MAP. MAP should recruit an information professional to cover this subject. Without the necessary financial resources, however, little could be done. He therefore, proposed that the MAP budget allocate reasonable funds for this purpose. Non-scientific documents to promote public awareness should be

prepared in addition to the scientific material already published. A new method of distribution of information material had to be created.

74. Mr Benoit, Director of BP/RAC, underlined the need to establish a dynamic relationship between MAP and the Regional Activity Centres, which should meet on a regular basis. There had to be more dialogue and more emphasis on the Mediterranean per se rather than MAP. He also suggested that one event on a specific topic related to the Mediterranean region be organized. Finally, he informed that he had appointed one of the Centre's officials (Mr Muller) to deal with information.
75. Mr Trumbic, Director of PAP/RAC, said that he had also appointed an official of his Centre to deal with information (Ms Ljiljana Prebanda). With regard to the set of recommendations in the information document on information, he explained that his Centre was implementing most of them. He suggested that a special logo be designed for MAP.
76. Mr Macià, Director of CP/RAC, agreed with the suggestion by the MAP Coordinator to urge RAC Directors to contribute in writing articles on specific issues related to their Centres. Each Centre could provide MEDU with a list of interested and related mass media corporations. In this connection, he also suggested that information be provided to the media before the convening of a MAP meeting, and supported the idea of involving the national focal points in this exercise.
77. Mr Aksel, MEDU Computer Operations Officer, referred to the importance of Internet technology which should be utilized by all MAP components. Information about MAP already appeared on the Internet.
78. The Coordinator suggested that the occasion of the ratification and entry into force of the MAP legal instruments, be utilized to hold a ceremony in collaboration with Spain or Tunisia to inform the public about MAP. The opportunity afforded by the meetings to be held in 1999 should be used to disseminate information about MAP to the media and the public, in a new and attractive presentation.
79. Mr G.P. Gabrielides, MEDU Senior Programme Officer, informed the meeting about the new document being prepared by the European Environment Agency (EEA) in cooperation with MAP. He urged all participants and RACs to contribute to this document. It would not evaluate environmental policy, but describe the state of the environment, without any assessment. The English version would probably be published early in the summer of 1999.
80. At the end of the discussion on this agenda item, the Deputy Coordinator said that the MAP Information Strategy document was a first draft. Two groups of activities could be selected; one for the immediate term and the other for the longer term, with their financial impact. The intention was not to recruit a professional at this stage, but rather to recruit an information consultant to assist MEDU in dealing with this issue. He agreed with those advocating that countries and their national focal points should play an important role in the field of public awareness and

dissemination of information. He informed the participants that a meeting of information experts representing countries Members of the Bureau, would be convened in early 1999. He considered that each Centre should continue publishing its information material and utilize the avenue available to them through the MAP Technical Reports Series (MTRS).

Agenda item 6: Any other matters

81. On the issue of "Host Government Agreements" to be signed by MAP and countries hosting Regional Activity Centres, Mr Dharat informed the meeting that three drafts of Host Government Agreements had been prepared and sent to the Regional Centres of Blue Plan, Environment Remote Sensing and Cleaner Production for their comments before finalizing them and sending them to the National Focal Points of France, Italy and Spain respectively. He noted that informal discussion had taken place with the Directors of ERS/RAC and CP/RAC in order to verify few issues in the draft agreements. He urged the Directors in the three Centres to send their comments to MEDU as soon as possible.
82. Mr Macià, Director of CP/RAC, confirmed that an informal discussion had taken place with Mr Dharat during which some changes had been proposed and he promised to send in his comments soon.
83. The Coordinator urged the relevant RAC Directors to send their comments to MEDU as soon as possible to allow the Unit to finalize the agreements and send them to the countries.
84. MEDU Senior Programme Officer Mr Gabrielides, referring to the MAP/GEF project in which MEDPOL, PAP, SPA and CP were involved, said that the period for receiving contributions from all actors involved in the project was drawing to an end and he urged all actors that had not yet done so, to send in their contribution.
85. The Coordinator took the opportunity to thank SPA/RAC and PAP/RAC for their contributions to the MAP/GEF project.

Agenda item 7: Closure of the meeting

86. The Coordinator thanked all participants for their contributions and declared the meeting closed at 13.00 hours, on Tuesday, 12 January 1999.

ANNEX I

**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**

**REGIONAL MARINE POLLUTION EMERGENCY
RESPONSE CENTRE FOR THE
MEDITERRANEAN SEA (REMPEC)
CENTRE REGIONAL MEDITERRANEEN
POUR L'INTERVENTION D'URGENCE CONTRE
LA POLLUTION MARINE ACCIDENTELLE**

Mr Roberto Patrino
Director, REMPEC
Manoel Island
Malta

Tel.: 356 337296-8
Fax : 356 339951
E-Mail:
rempecdirector@waldonet.net.mt
Cables: UNROCC Malta

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

Mr Guillaume Benoit
Director
Regional Activity Centre for Blue Plan
15 Avenue Beethoven
Sophia Antipolis
06560 Valbonne
France

Tel.: 33 4 92387131
Fax : 33 4 92387131
E-Mail:gbenoit@planbleu.org

Mr Christian Muller
Administrative Officer
Regional Activity Centre for Blue Plan
15 Avenue Beethoven
Sophia Antipolis
06560 Valbonne
France

Tel.: 33 4 92387131
Fax : 33 4 92387131
E-Mail: christian.muller@planbleu.org

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

Mr Ivica Trumbic
Director
Regional Activity Centre for
Priority Actions Programme
Kraj sv. Ivana 11
P.O. Box 74
58000 Split
Croatia

Tel.: 385 21 591171
Fax : 385 21 361677
E-Mail: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr

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

Mr Mohamed Adel Hentati
Director
Regional Activity Centre for
Specially Protected Areas
Boulevard de l'Environnement
1080 La Chargaia
Tunisia

Tel.: 216 1 795760
Fax : 216 1 797349
E-Mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org

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

Mr Michael Raimondi
Director
Centro di Telerilevamento
Mediterraneo
Regional Activity Centre for
Environment Remote Sensing
Via G. Giusti 2
90144 Palermo
Italy

Tel.: 39 091 308512
Fax : 39 91 308512
E-Mail: ctm.ersrac@ctmnet.it

Ms. Monique Viel
Responsible for Operational
Activities
Centro di Telerilevamento
Mediterraneo
Regional Activity Centre for
Environment Remote Sensing
Via G. Giusti 2
90144 Palermo
Italy

Tel.: 39 091 308512
Fax : 39 91 308512
E-Mail: ctm.ersrac@ctmnet.it

**CLEANER PRODUCTION
REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
POUR UNE PRODUCTION PROPRE
(CAR/PP)**

Mr Victor Macià
Director
Cleaner Production/Regional Activity
Centre
Travessera de Gracia 56,1
08006 Barcelona
Spain

Tel: 34 93 4144582
Fax: 34 93 4147090
E-Mail: prodnet@cipn.es

**MAP SECRETARIAT FOR 100 HISTORIC
SITES
SECRETARIAT DU PAM DE 100 SITES
HISTORIQUES MEDITERRANEENS**

Mr. Daniel Drocourt
Coordinator
100 Sites Historiques méditerranéens
Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville
de Marseille
10 Square Belsunce
1301 Marseille
France

Tel.: 33 4 91561461
Fax 33 4 91907874

**REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS SPECIALIZED AGENCIES
REPRESENTANTS DES INSTITUTIONS SPECIALISEES DES NATIONS UNIES**

**WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE
(OMS)**

Mr George Kamizoulis
Senior Scientist
WHO/EURO Project Office
Coordinating Unit for the
Mediterranean Action Plan
P.O. Box 18019
48 Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
11610 Athens
Greece

Tel No.: (30) (1) 7273105
Fax No.: (30) (1) 7253197
E-Mail: gkamiz@unepmap.gr

UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND SECRETARIAT UNITS

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

Mr Lucien Chabason
Coordinator
E-Mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Mr Arab Hoballah
Deputy Coordinator
E-Mail: hoballha@unepmap.gr

Mr Ibrahim Dharat
Senior Programme Officer
E-Mail: idharat@unepmap.gr

Mr F. Saverio Civili
MED POI Coordinator
fscivili@unepmap.gr

Mr François Tissot
Fund/Administrative Officer
ftissot@unepmap.gr

Mr Adnan Aksel
Computer Operations Officer
aaksel@unepmap.gr

Ms Athena Davaki

Librarian

adavaki@unepmap.gr

48 Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue

P.O. Box 18019

11610 Athens

Greece

Tel No.: (30) (1) 7273100

Fax No.: (30) (1) 7253196-7

E-Mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr

ANNEX II

AGENDA

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Preparation of the Programme and Budget for the 2000-2001 biennium
4. Review of the results of the fourth session of the MCSD and preparation of the Fifth Session and the various thematic working groups
5. MAP Information Strategy
6. Any other matters
7. Closure of the meeting

ANNEX III

**DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2000-2001
(NEW STRUCTURE)****Introduction**

1. Even before the adoption of MAP Phase II with its new approach of introducing the sustainable development component within the MAP structure, the Contracting Parties have repeatedly requested the Secretariat to present the programme budget in a more holistic and transparent way.
2. Since then, the Secretariat has been in a continued process of improving the presentation of the programme and budget document. The last of which was the presentation of the 1998-1999 programme budget which has been modified to better reflect the reality in as far as the payment of contributions was concerned, streamlining of the Secretariat work, improving managerial process, synergy and transparency in its work, in order to reflect the revised or new legal instruments approved by the Contracting Parties and the establishment of the MCSD.
3. While the new presentation was appreciated by the meetings of the Contracting Parties, nevertheless, there are still gaps in the coordination and integration between the various components and in identifying clearly the necessary responses to these gaps.
4. Therefore, the purpose of the present proposal is to tackle this issue and try to present to the forthcoming meeting of the Contracting Parties, through the National Focal Points meeting, a better presentation which will help the countries as well as the MAP system to immediately pin-point the major issues and related problems, the responses by MAP in the form of a progress report for the on-going biennium, gaps that remain to be

bridged and specific integrated recommendations relevant to the issue in question so as to better tackle the problems and gaps, with its budgetary allocation.

5. On the basis of the new structure there will be only one document covering the two previous documents, namely the one on the "Progress Report by the Coordinator" and the other document on the "Recommendations and Programme Budget".
6. On the basis of the above-mentioned factors, the following is a revised structure for the 2000-2001 programme budget:

Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001

Revised Structure

INTRODUCTION

1. The introduction will give a clear background information on the reasons for changes, explaining the different sections of the document, and why certain topics were selected and others were not.

It will be mentioned here that the document will be divided into three sections:

- I. Substance
 - II. Coordination
 - III. Budget
2. The substance part will deal with major Mediterranean environment and development issues, in the MAP II framework, including all activities (components) to be incorporated in the biennium, to be mainly implemented by MAP programmes and RACs.

The coordination part will deal with activities related to the general coordination of MAP, such as:

- meetings and conferences organized by MAP
- meetings of the MCSD
- coordination with IGO & NGOs
- coordination with international funding institutions (EC, GEF, WB etc.)

- general legal issues
- information and participation

The budgetary part will be a separate section (under each component), with the same presentation as that of the 1998/1999 biennium, but structured in accordance with the new components and where the external funds column will not be just wishful thinking but already obtained or with good expectations.

3. There also will be only four components under the substantial part of the documents, namely:

- I. Protection of Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean
- II. Pollution Prevention and Control
- III. Sustainable Management of Coastal Zone
- IV. Integrating Environment and Development

Illustration example of the revised structure of each component
(Taking the legal issue as an example)

COORDINATION

- a.
- b.
- c. Legal issues
- d.

I. Problems/issues at stake

Under this section, various issues and problems related to MAP legal framework will be recalled, such as:

1. The provisions of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols commit the Contracting Parties "to take all appropriate measures... to prevent, abate and combat pollution... and to protect and enhance the marine environment". Enforcement of the provisions of these instruments lies in the hands of each Contracting Party. They have to report regularly to the Secretariat about measures taken, permits issued, level of pollution in their waters, legislation adopted to implement the Convention and the Protocol.
2. Article 27 of the Convention implies that meetings of the Contracting Parties shall assess the compliance with the Convention and the Protocols as well as the measures and the recommendations by the Contracting Parties and shall recommend the necessary steps to bring about their full compliance by the Contracting Parties. Still, the compliance approach has not been fully materialized.
3. During each meeting of the Contracting Parties, recommendations were

adopted requesting all Contracting Parties, that have not done so, to ratify, accept or approve of, or accede to the various MAP legal instruments.

It can be clearly noted from the list of ratifications, that there is a serious delay in the ratification process.

4. In accordance with Article 16 of the amended Barcelona Convention, it is required that appropriate rules and procedures for the determination of liability and compensation for damage resulting from pollution of the marine environment in the Mediterranean Sea Areas is to be prepared. Since the adoption of the Convention in 1976, this issue has not been finalized.

II. Responses (Progress report covering the 1998-1999 period)

1. In compliance with the various decisions of the meetings of the Contracting Parties and the Bureau, various contacts with the Contracting Parties have been undertaken urging them to speed-up the ratification process. The president of the Bureau, on behalf of the Bureau, sent urgent messages to all Contracting Parties, that have not done so, urging them to speed up the ratification process. The Secretariat has also been in constant contact with the Contracting Parties with a view to assisting them to comply with the various recommendations in this regard.
2. With a view to implementing Article 26 of the Convention related to the issue of liability and compensation and further to the convening, in 1997, of the first meeting of legal and technical experts on liability and compensation, a consultation meeting of well known legal experts was convened in Athens, on 1999, with the objective of advising the Secretariat on the future steps to be undertaken towards this issue, keeping in mind the various negotiations being undertaken in the international fora concerning the issue.
3. In conformity with the decision of the last meeting of the Contracting Parties (Tunis, November 1997), concerning the reporting system, a consultant was recruited with a view to preparing a draft systems of coherent reporting. The draft reporting system was finalized by the Secretariat and was submitted to the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (April 1998) for its consideration. The draft reporting system is contained in document: UNEP(OCA)/MED
4. The status of signatures and ratifications of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols as of 31 April 1999 is attached as Annex to this report.

III. Gaps

1. It is clear that certain gaps concerning the compliance by the Contracting Parties with the various provisions of the Barcelona Convention and its protocols still exist, such as:
 - a. Article 16 concerning liability and compensation has not yet been fully implemented. An appropriate rules and procedures for the determination of liability and compensation for damage resulting from pollution of the marine environment in the Mediterranean Sea Areas has to be established;
 - b. A Reporting System on the legal, administrative and other measures to be undertaken by the Contracting Parties for the implementation of the Convention and its protocols and the recommendations adopted by the various meetings of the Contracting Parties, has not been satisfactorily accomplished;
 - c. A Compliance Control system on the compliance by the Contracting Parties with the Convention and its protocols as well as the measures and recommendations has to be established;
 - d. The signatures and ratifications of the Convention and protocols is still encountered with continued serious delays, a matter which disrupts the smooth implementation of activities and projects within the MAP framework.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE CONTRACTING PARTIES

The Contracting Parties approve the following recommendations:

I. COORDINATION

(a)

(b)

(c) Legal Framework:

1. To notify to the Depositary, in writing, their acceptance of the amendments to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution, the Protocol for the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft (Dumping Protocol), and the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources (LBS Protocol).
2. If they have not done so, to ratify, accept or approve of, or accede to the Protocol concerning specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean and its three Annexes (SPA Protocol), the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution Resulting from Exploration and Exploitation of the continental Shelf and the Seabed and its Subsoil (Offshore Protocol), and the Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Hazardous Wastes Protocol).

3. To review their countries' position with respect to other pertinent international conventions, protocols and agreements and to ensure the early signature of those instruments which may have a positive influence on the Mediterranean Basin.
4. To adopt the Reporting System proposed by the Secretariat and recommended by the Bureau of the Contracting Parties, as attached in Annex ... to this report, and request the Contracting Parties and the Secretariat for its full implementation

B. RECOMMENDATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARIAT

1. To request the Secretariat (MEDU) to convene in the year 2000, a second meeting of legal and technical experts on the liability and compensation:

(To be completed with RAC's inputs)

V. BUDGET

Strengthening of the legal framework

Activity	Office	Approved budget (in US\$)					
		2000			2001		
		MTF	EU	EXT	MTF	EU	EXT
Legal assistance to the Secretariat	MEDU	17,000	-	-	17,000	-	-
Assistance to countries to develop their national legislation and national enforcement of control and compliance mechanisms	MEDU	20,000	-	-	20,000	-	-
Second meeting of legal and technical experts on liability and compensation	MEDU	50,000	-	-	-	-	-

ANNEX IV**REVIEW OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE MCSD -
RESULTS AND FOLLOW-UP****From 4th to 5th MCSD:****Major issues, decisions and tasks deriving from the report of 4th MCSD.**

The intersessional period between fourth and fifth MCSD is rather short as the next meeting will be held in 1-3 July 1999 (tbc) in Rome. Considering the minimum time required to send the Secretariat progress report to MCSD members, less than 5 months are left and all intersessional expert meetings, working group meetings and workshops will/should be held between March and May 1999 (early June the latest).

The major objective of this note is to assist the Secretariat, the Task Managers and the Support Centres in better planning, preparing and organizing follow-up activities. Basically a synthesis of the 4th MCSD report, this note will highlight major issues, decisions and tasks to be taken into account for further activities, together with some comments or suggestions.

Chaired by Tunisia and with Monaco as rapporteur, the Steering Committee comprises 5 other members which are: EOAEN, Cyprus, MIO-ECSDE, Municipality of Silifke and Spain.

Method of Work:

Issues and decisions:

- Contracting Parties solely responsible for implementing adopted recommendations.
- Reporting system to be established and summary information by Secretariat to be submitted to Contracting Parties.
- MCSD could reconsider an already studied theme to complete assessment and draw new proposals.
- Work of Task Managers and Working Groups completed once recommendations adopted by Contracting Parties.
- Secretariat to prepare a series of options for follow-up of recommendations.
- Mobilize resources to carry out and pursue the activities, and ensure larger participation.
- Work on a few subjects in depth rather than attempting to cover too much. Identify limited number of relevant priorities, well in advance.
- For each theme, prepare clear Terms of Reference and timetable, bearing in mind the periodicity of the Contracting Parties meetings.
- Working Groups will preferably have two Task Managers, with a balanced distribution between North and South, and with participation of qualified outside experts.

Tasks (Secretariat/ Med-Unit, mainly)

- Secretariat to prepare a report for mid-February on the method of work, including a series of options for follow-up of recommendations. Report to be discussed at next Steering Committee meeting before review and submission to 5th MCSD. Report to encompass, inter alia: organization of work (Working Groups, experts group, Task Managers, meetings, partners, means, etc.). communication/dissemination of results, procedures and options for follow-up of recommendations, guidelines/forms for reporting, follow-up and performance indicators, etc.

New Subjects:

Issues and decisions:

- Steering Committee to examine the interest and feasibility of each new proposed subject on the basis of a report or note to be drawn up by the Secretariat.
- New subjects not necessarily in the form of Working Group with a 2 to 4 years term.
- Strategic review for 2000, including implementation of Agenda MED 21, to be given priority.
- Proposed subjects: new opportunities for funding conservation initiatives (WWF), Islands and Sustainable Development (EOAEN, with background documents), Mediterranean Strategy on the conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity (Monaco).
- Other subjects mentioned: greenhouse effect, energy, soil conservation.

Tasks (Secretariat / Med Unit, mainly)

- Secretariat to prepare a note on criteria for selecting new themes, to be reviewed and used by the Steering Committee in appraising new proposals. Criteria could concern: coordination with CSD themes (ante, post or at same period), potential added value by MCSD, SD dimension of new theme, etc...
- Secretariat to prepare Terms of Reference for the Strategic Review with organisation of work, partners and responsibilities, tools and means, to be reviewed at 5th MCSD (if possible first draft to Steering Committee).

Cooperation with UNCSD, UN and Partners:

Issues and decisions:

- Strengthen cooperation with other bodies, through exchange of information and joint activities/meetings.
- Identify asap and associate relevant partners in each thematic activity.
- In addition to participation to activities implementation, cooperation could include cost-sharing and even association of partners/observers as co-Task Managers or co-Support Centre.
- MCSD and UN-CSD to organize a joint meeting on National Sustainable Development strategies in the Mediterranean Region.
- MCSD and CEDARE to organize jointly an advisory and consultative meeting among partners involved in Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean.
- Promote information on and development of National CSDs, and their cooperation with MCSD.
- Improve exchange of information and direct cooperation, with UNEP support, between MCSD and Secretariats of international organizations/agreements of interest for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean, particularly with UN-CSD.

Tasks (Secretariat/Med Unit, mainly):

- Secretariat to exchange with UN-CSD on the joint meeting on National Sustainable Development Strategies (options for dates and venues, budget, cost-sharing and sponsors, organization, etc.).
- Secretariat to exchange with CEDARE on the opportunity and possibility of Mediterranean Partners Consultative meeting (TOR, options for dates and venues, participants, cost, organisation etc.).
- Secretariat to prepare a form and collect information on National CSDs.
- MCSD, through Secretariat and/or members, to participate to CSD relevant intersessional meetings and annual ones.
- Secretariat, together with Task Managers and Support Centers, to look for better ways and means to strengthen cooperation and joint activities with concerned partners /observers.
- Secretariat to establish a list of all events and meetings related to Sustainable Development of the Mediterranean, of interest to MCSD.

Sustainable Development Indicators:

Issues and decisions:

- Final list to be harmonized with the work of other organizations.
- List of indicators to be tested and put into effect gradually.
- Task Managers of other thematic Working Groups to be associated.
- Statistical availability and capacity to be appraised at an early stage.
- As far as possible, look for dynamic indicators, not only status ones.

Tasks (Secretariat / Task Managers and Blue Plan, mainly)

- Task Managers and Support Centre (BP) to review list of indicators according to relevance to Mediterranean Sustainable Development and availability in largest number of countries.
- Proposals for commitments (8) to be reviewed with brief guidelines for implementation and follow-up procedures and steps.
- Major workshop, with large participation of MCSD members and partners/observers, to be held in May 1999 (probably in Sophia-Antipolis, with the support of France).

Tourism and Sustainable Development:

Issues and decisions:

- Develop indicators of tourist areas carrying capacity and indicators of tourism impact.
- Identify mechanisms to improve cooperation and partnership between tourists, NGO's, tour operator, professional, local and national authorities, etc.
- Collect information on good practices/ success stories and assess their replication and means for their promotion.
- Improve study of eco-labelling, eco-taxes and voluntary systems of contributions.
- Develop more detailed recommendations and proposals for action.

Tasks (Secretariat/Task Manager and BP/PAP, mainly):

- TM and Support Centres to identify indicators of carrying capacity and impact.
- TM and Support Centres to identify mechanisms to improve cooperation and partnership between tourism partners.
- Collect information on good practices/success stories and assess their replication and means for their promotion.
- Study in greater detail eco-labelling, eco-taxes and voluntary systems of contribution and assess the appropriate level for such measures.
- Develop more detailed recommendations and proposals for action.
- Considering above tasks, it would be useful, if not necessary, to have a meeting of the Working Group before submitting relevant report for adoption to MCSD members.

Information, Awareness and Participation:

Issues and decisions:

- More information required on good practices, successful local and national experiences and ways and means for replication.
- Broaden scope of activities (to awareness-raising and communication, public access to information, participation and mechanisms, etc,) and involve more partners.
- More specific results should be produced and greater attention should be paid to defining the practical product to be developed by the Working Group and submitted to MCSD.

Tasks (Secretariat / Med Unit and Task Managers).

- Report to be reviewed taking into account above decisions.
- Information on good practices and success stories to be collected and assessed for lessons and replication.
- Secretariat will induce other partners/participants, particularly from Governments, to actively participate in the Working Group.
- Define better the practical product to be developed by the Working Groups and produce more specific results.
- Meeting of the Working Group to be held in April/May, giving time for above tasks to be better prepared.

Free Trade and Environment:

Issues and decisions:

- Do not oppose eco-protection and free-trade and strengthen synergy between free trade, environment and Sustainable Development.
- Collect information on practical experiences and success stories to improve analysis of the subject.
- Set clear and realistic objectives, define better the approach to be adopted and identify the various stages to be involved.
- Involve more national, regional and international concerned institutions.

Tasks (Secretariat / Task Managers and Blue Plan - Med Unit):

- Task Manager and Support Centre to set clear and realistic objectives, define better the approach to be adopted and identify the various stages for the next MCSD meeting (in view of submitting a final product to the Contracting Parties meeting in 2001).
- Undertake an in-depth analysis of free trade and environment, respective impacts and policies for better euro-Mediterranean partnership.
- Collect regional and national experiences, analyse and draw lessons for the Mediterranean.
- Analyse dynamics of key sectors in the framework of free trade and environment interactions.
- A workshop to be organized in April/May 1999, probably in Beirut, with the support of France (Foreign Affairs).

Industry and Sustainable Development:

Issues and decisions:

- Work programme to be planned in a long term perspective with a final product for the Contracting Parties meeting of 2001.
- Many aspects of this theme still need to be explored including multinational enterprises, modernisation process, financing, transfer of technology, legal framework, incentives, etc.
- FID to act as joint Task Manager and improve coordination with other industrial federations.
- More precise definitions and objectives are required together with concrete programmes for their implementation, with LBS and SAP as framework.
- Need for in-depth analysis of the situation in the region and in specific countries.
- Bring out the practical side of this work and formulate realistic proposals for action.

Tasks (Secretariat/Task Managers and MEDPOL)

- Define clearer objectives, with concrete programmes for implementation.
- Extend and improve the analysis of the industrial regional and national contexts.
- Collect and analyse information on case studies of cleaner production and successful environmental management, and draw lessons.
- Identify information, awareness and capacity building needs.
- Organize a Working Group meeting, with experts and concerned institutions, in April/May 1999, to discuss above tasks, in view of a major workshop afterwards with Italian support.

Management of Urban/Rural Development:

- The Group's work should focus on urban development and management, in the context of land use planning, in cooperation with MedCities and Turkey (as joint TM), and with greater participation of NGO's, Local Authorities and Socio-Economic actors. A background paper, together with clear objectives and related programmes, will be prepared by Support Centres (BP, PAP and ERS) and discussed at an expert meeting in April 1999 (probably in Egypt or any other country, depending on the financial support).
- With the support of Tunisia and Cyprus, draft TOR for an eventual Working Group on rural development would be prepared for submission to the next MCSD meeting. It would be considered as a possible new subject, to be selected among other themes first by the Steering Committee, then by the next MCSD meeting.

11 January 1999

Provisional Agenda of Meetings in the MCSD framework or of interest
for MAP and MCSD -1999 -

Item and organisers	Dates and venue	Concerned persons/bodies
Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Sustainable Cities. World Federation of United Cities and the Municipality of Seville.	21-23 January Seville	MEDU/PAP/BP MCSD members
High level policy dialogue: "Trade Policy and Sustainability the Regional Approach". ICTSD	1-2 February Geneva	MEDU/BP
20 th Session of UNEP Governing Council. UNEP	1-5 February Nairobi	MAP/CP
UN - CSD Ad-Hoc Intersessional Working Groups (22-27 February - Tourism and Consumption Patterns 1-5 March Oceans and SIDS) UN-CSD Secretariat	22 Febr. - 5 March New York	MCSD members MAP/MED Unit
MCSD Steering Committee MAP- Med Unit/ MCSD Secretariat	Tunis 8-9 March (tentative)	Committee members MAP/MED Unit
UN - CSD - 7 - 19-21/4 - Tourism 21-23/4 - High level Segment 26/4 - National presentations 27-30/4 - Drafting groups. UN-CSD Secretariat	19-30 April New York	MCSD members MAP/MED Unit
Bureau of the Contracting Parties MAP-Med Unit	29-30 April Athens (tentative)	Bureau members MAP/MED Unit
5 th MCSD MAP-Med Unit/MCSD Secretariat	30 June-2 July Rome (tentative)	MCSD members MAP/Others
MAP National Focal Points MAP-Med Unit	6-9 September Athens	CP/MAP/Others
11 th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties MAP-Med Unit	27-30 October Malta	CP/MAP/Others

Item / responsible bodies and main activities	Dates and venue	Concerned persons/bodies
<u>MCS D Intersessional Working Groups</u>		
Sustainable Development Indicators France-Tunisia-BP	Workshop, May 1999, Sophia Antipolis (tentative)	Other concerned TM, WG members UN-CSD, National Observatories
Tourism and Sustainable Development, Spain-EOAEN-Egypt-BP-PAP	Working Group, April/May 1999, Venue? (suggested and tentative)	
Information, Awareness and Participation MIO-ECSDE - CREE - Med Unit	Working Group, Workshop if funds are enough April/May 1999, Athens (tentative)	
Free Trade and Environment Lebanon-BP-Med Unit	Working Group, early June 1999 Beirut (tentative)	
Industry and Sustainable Development Italy-Algeria-FID-MED POL-CP	Working Group April/May 1999 Masa Carrara (tentative)	
Management of Urban Development Egypt-Med Cities-Turkey-BP-PAP-ERS	Experts meeting or Working Group, April 1999 Cairo (tentative)	
National Sustainable Development Strategies in the Mediterranean Region UN-CSD and MCS D Secretariats.	Workshop, end 1999 early 2000	Qualified experts from Countries NCSD
Mediterranean Partners Advisory and Consultative Meeting MAP/MCS D and CEDARE	before June 99 (if possible)	