



# United Nations Environment Programme



Distr.  
RESTRICTED  
UNEP/IG.36/INF.4  
3 March 1982  
ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

Extraordinary Meeting of the Contracting  
Parties to the Convention for the Protection  
of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution

Geneva, 29 March - 1 April 1982

## PRELIMINARY REPORT ON INCREASED CONTRIBUTION TO CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

1. At the Meeting of the Contracting Parties in Cannes in March 1981, it was recommended that the Contracting Parties should contribute to co-operation in the Mediterranean, without thereby increasing the general administration costs (recommendation No. 5), by:

"Jointly developing programmes of interest to the Mediterranean;

Increasing the part played by the mobilization of national efforts in the common endeavour, by providing studies, the results of pilot experiments, training, etc.; and

Identifying their own efforts and annually notifying thereof the other Mediterranean coastal States and the international organizations concerned, such identification relating in particular to the institutes, laboratories and research workers taking part in national, regional and subregional programmes, and indicating, as far as possible, the nature and purpose of their work together with any relevant bibliographic data available, with a view to their dissemination and the facilitation of fruitful co-operation." <sup>1/</sup>

2. The Bureau and the Co-ordinator have studied this question on a number of occasions under various headings. They submit herewith some preliminary information, accompanied by some proposals for recommendations.

### 1. Secondment by States of experts to the Co-ordinating Unit in Athens

3. The straightforward secondment to the Co-ordinating Unit in Athens of national staff who would continue to be paid by their States would appear to be out of the question. In order to join the Unit headquarters, experts would have to have United Nations status in order to carry out particular tasks under the authority of the Director of the Unit, and would have to be covered (for entry, residence and duty travel) by the headquarters agreement concluded between Greece and the United Nations.

<sup>1/</sup> UNEP/IG.23/11, annex VIII.

4. Four possible courses of action are open, however.

Alternative A

- (i) A job description could be drawn up in consultation between the donor country and the Unit;
- (ii) The donor country could pay to UNEP in Nairobi an amount in convertible currency to cover all the expert's costs for one year;
- (iii) The expert could be selected by UNEP from a list of candidates submitted by the donor country.

Alternative B

- (i) A job description could be drawn up;
- (ii) The appointment of an expert recommended by the donor country could be approved by UNEP;
- (iii) A consultant's contract (SSA) could be drawn up in the expert's name for a symbolic amount (e.g. \$1), all his salary, travel expenses, etc., being paid directly by his national administration. (Under the Staff Rules, such contracts must be for a period not exceeding six months within 12 consecutive months).

Alternative C

Part of the costs under alternative "B" could be borne by the Mediterranean budget. In this case, the post would be approved by the Meeting of the Contracting Parties, and the costs to be charged to the budget would have to be specified by the donor country concerned.

There are precedents for methods "A" and "B". Method "C" would have to be examined on a case-by-case basis, since fairly substantial mission allowances are paid by certain countries.

It would be useful to obtain from the major donor countries concerned with the above arrangements information on the availability of such experts and on possible costs chargeable to the budget.

Alternative D

UNEP could, of course, without any major problem, strengthen the Co-ordinating Unit by transferring some international staff to Athens. The same would apply to the other international organizations.

2. Use of experts seconded by States under subprogrammes of the Mediterranean Action Plan

5. The secondment of national experts on a long-term or more limited basis, or even on a probationary basis, would be useful. Such secondment should, however, be subject to the agreement of the official in charge of the subprogramme, who should, in particular, ensure that remuneration systems remain balanced and that a harmonious balance of staff among the various areas of the Mediterranean is maintained.

3. Exchange of information and technical co-operation

6. While in no way altering the long-established direct relations among the countries concerned in the field of technical co-operation, the best possible liaison should be obtained between the Action Plan and the various national and subregional programmes in using such programmes for the objectives of the Action Plan. The idea is to draw the attention of the technical co-operation services to specific and co-ordinated activities to which support could be given under the Action Plan. Such activities are projects which have in most cases benefited from thorough technical preparation, and on whose priority rating unanimous decisions have been taken by the coastal States. This will be a guarantee of the effective and coherent use of any investment in expertise and equipment.

7. It is important to emphasize that the Co-ordinating Unit has neither the desire nor the means to provide programming, and much less to execute the projects thus identified. Its role will have to be limited to leadership and encouragement, and the dissemination of any positive results.

8. For the exercise to be of benefit to coastal States, a declaration of intent should be made by the Contracting Parties able to provide technical or financial assistance in order to guarantee that requests, once made, will be given sympathetic consideration.

9. Further information concerning current projects of interest to coastal States, and directly connected with the various sections of the Action Plan, might be provided by the Contracting Parties.

10. On the basis of the above considerations, it is suggested that activities within the Action Plan which receive the support of other programmes should be identified. The list could easily be furnished by the Contracting Parties. A draft questionnaire for this purpose is contained in annex I.

11. The questionnaire, which has been revised on the basis of suggestions by the Bureau, would be distributed to the Contracting Parties for completion within three months. The Parties would undertake to provide information on their general availability of, or requests for, experts, training, equipment, etc. and would, at the same time, indicate how further contacts might be made.

12. Identification of the requirements in the various technical fields should, on the other hand, be left to the technical meetings already planned, and to existing regional centres of activity.

13. Under the MED POL programme, for example, the Working Group on Scientific and Technical Co-operation, together with the Co-ordinating Unit and the national MED POL co-ordinators in their regular contacts, could, as in the past, determine needs for experts, training, supplies and equipment, vessels, etc. for the Long-term Monitoring Programme.

14. Offers by the parties to undertake research projects at their own expense, either alone or jointly, could usefully be discussed by technical experts.

15. The Regional Oil Combating Centre in Malta is best able to determine the needs for further assistance on a country-by-country basis in respect of any accidental pollution caused by hydrocarbons and other harmful substances.

16. The Regional Activity Centres for the Blue Plan, the PAPs and the Protected Areas could also provide lists of projects, by country, after discussion with their respective focal points.

17. Lastly, the Co-ordinating Unit could provide information on training, ballast discharge stations and exchange of information and would be responsible for compiling the document containing all the information referred to in paragraphs 13-17.

18. A preliminary analysis should be made of the basic information received by the Co-ordinating Unit in order to obtain a clear and coherent presentation. This work would be the responsibility of the programme official (economist), whose post was approved at Cannes, and who is to be recruited within the next few months.

19. The document might be distributed to serve as a basis for direct negotiations among interested countries. It might also constitute a working document for a meeting of representatives of the co-operation services of the various Contracting Parties.

20. Specific proposals are:

- (i) A preparatory mission by the Co-ordinator or a high-level consultant to the main sources of co-operation among the Contracting Parties, to be followed by;
- (ii) A meeting, held at the invitation of one of the Contracting Parties and at its expense so as not to burden the MAP budget. The aim of this meeting would be to match the various offers of, and requests for, co-operation and to identify projects in detail.

An agreement in principle would thereby emerge and serve as a basis for direct agreements in accordance with the outlines established for the various co-operation programmes. This meeting might be held in January 1983 and the report submitted at the meeting of the Contracting Parties in February 1983.

21. Decisions to be taken by the Contracting Parties.

Contracting parties should agree to this initiative, decide on the meeting and decide whether they wish to invite representatives of other interested countries and non-governmental organizations (foundations etc.) which might finance activities in the Mediterranean.

#### 4. Exchange of documents

22. States having available in their countries material (papers and recordings), produced on their own initiative or otherwise, which may be relevant to Mediterranean co-operation are invited initially to transmit all documents they might deem useful to the Co-ordinating Unit in Athens as from September 1982.

23. At a later date it would be recommended that a working meeting should consider plans to strengthen the exchange of documents between States, universities, research centres, etc., for example by establishing address lists, classifying documents, preparing lists of selected works, and so on.

5. Hosting of meetings and conferences

24. During recent years a number of countries have agreed to host, and in some cases organize, working meetings on Mediterranean topics. Greece and Tunisia, for example, have hosted two Blue Plan seminars. Algeria, Italy, Morocco, Spain and Yugoslavia will do likewise in the first half of 1982.

6. Providing facilities for centres

25. Greece has recently made a substantial effort to provide facilities for the Co-ordinating Unit in Athens. Similarly, France is providing facilities for the Blue Plan centre at Sophia Antipolis and is providing to Mèdeas, which supports the Centre, logistic assistance estimated at FF 900,000 for 1982. Yugoslavia, too, is providing complete financing for the PAP centre, while Tunisia has just selected premises near Tunis for the Centre for Specially Protected Areas.

7. Bilateral exchanges

26. The development of bilateral exchanges in the Mediterranean region on environmental topics, such as the exchanges between Yugoslavia, Italy and Greece and between Tunisia and France, is proving very advantageous. This development is useful and should be given greater recognition. To this end countries collaborating in this way might notify other countries accordingly, either directly or through the Co-ordinating Unit, so as to improve co-ordination of those initiatives with the Action Plan and thus avoid any duplication.

8. Programmes of Mediterranean interest

27. In addition to bilateral co-operation, there appears to be an opportunity to promote collaboration among a number of countries, for example for the purpose of protecting subregions. In this respect co-operation has developed between Adriatic coastal States and between Monaco, France and Italy (RAMOGE project).

28. On a broader scale it would also be possible for one State to propose to the other coastal States that a model environment project or integrated planning project should be classified as a "project of Mediterranean interest", so that it would become an observation site or a place of operations open to other States. Priority action programmes would have everything to gain from these proposals which, in order to acquire such status, could be listed at the Meeting of the Contracting Parties on the proposal of the Bureau.

29. Projects of this type embarked upon by two or more Mediterranean States would be of even greater interest.

9. Non-governmental initiatives

30. A great deal would be gained by not restricting initiatives for Mediterranean co-operation to States or international organizations. Co-operation among Mediterranean towns, non-governmental associations and qualified persons might profitably be encouraged. The report on activities should list successes in this area.

31. It may also be possible to enlist the participation of part of the local population and thereby develop "Mediterranean good citizenship". This could take on the form of pilot operations, exchanges and fund-raising. A proposal for joint activities with WWF is contained in annex II.

Proposals

32. Having considered this document and the range of possibilities for assistance in addition to contributions to the fund for the Mediterranean, the Contracting Parties hereby decide:

To develop this assistance in various forms;

To inform the Co-ordinating Unit of the various initiatives adopted or expected to be adopted in 1982 and 1983 in the various environmental fields.

ANNEX I

Questionnaire on co-operation within the context  
of the Mediterranean Action Plan

ASSISTANCE FROM STATES IN ADDITION TO THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS  
TO THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION FUND

1. Co-ordinating Unit: support for headquarters, secondment of officials.
- 2.1 MED POL: monitoring
- 2.2 MED POL: research
- 2.3 MED POL: equipment
3. Pollution by hydrocarbons
4. Ballast discharge station
5. Training and exchange of information
6. Blue Plan
7. PAP
- 8.1 Aquaculture
- 8.2 Renewable energy forms
- 8.3 Water
- 8.4 Soils
- 8.5 Human settlements
- 8.6 Tourism
9. Specially protected areas
10. Other

Further details on each of the above items will be provided concerning offers of, and requests for, experts, training, equipment and joint projects of direct interest to the Action Plan.

ANNEX II

Campaign for the voluntary raising of funds in tourist resorts  
along the Mediterranean coasts in favour of ecological  
improvement and conservation efforts undertaken  
by MAP/UNEP and WWF jointly

1. In order to attain the vital and far-reaching objectives of safeguarding the environment and conserving the Mediterranean's natural resources as expounded in the 1976 Barcelona Convention, the "Signatory Powers" <sup>1/</sup> launched the "Mediterranean Action Plan", which is now in its fifth year of activity thanks to the direct participation of UNEP.

This first operative phase of MAP has proved three points in particular:

(a) That its action is essential in the struggle for the ecological improvement of the Mediterranean and for the conservation of its unique natural wealth;

(b) That the member States concertedly expressed their wish to make MAP the forum and instrument of close Mediterranean collaboration in order to solve the serious problems directly or indirectly connected with the basic ecological requirements;

(c) That there exists a wide gap between the numerous needs and action potential, on the one hand, and the scarcity of funds that have been raised up to now, on the other.

2. Despite the widespread awareness among MAP member countries of the need for much more substantial financial means, it does not seem realistic to expect an increase in governmental contributions at least until the squeeze due to inflation and recession has abated.

In contrast with this more or less forced governmental financial restraint, we are witnessing an increasingly positive attitude from public opinion. Ever-widening groups and circles of people who care about tourism and beach resorts along the Mediterranean are starting to wonder why, if Governments are not taking sufficient action, they do not create the conditions for more direct involvement.

If we consider that over 100 million tourists a year are estimated to spend their holidays by the Mediterranean (and are therefore directly interested in the ecological improvement of its waters and coasts), it seems logical to acknowledge the possibility - and actually the great necessity - of launching a far-reaching campaign for the voluntary raising of funds on an annual basis.

3. This campaign would be aimed at simultaneously fulfilling the following objectives which are of primary importance for the development of ecological activities in the Mediterranean:

(a) Substantial raising of funds (if only 10 per cent of the tourists who spend their holidays on the Mediterranean coasts were to contribute one dollar each, the income would amount to \$10 million a year);

---

<sup>1/</sup> That is to say the 17 coastal States - with the exception of Albania - and the European Economic Community.



(b) To awaken public opinion to ecological improvement and conservation objectives pursued by MIP/UNEP and WWF jointly, and consequently strengthen the "image" of these organizations among the general public, improving their proselytizing and their capacity to widen their structures and scope of action;

(c) To encourage the Mediterranean Governments - in view of the possibility of "levying" extra funds - to guarantee more consistent financial support for MIP possibly by gradually taking over, through the years, the raising of funds that, according to the present hypothesis, would begin on a voluntary basis.

4. The campaign mentioned in the present MIP/WWF agreement proposal should be launched during the summer in as many beach and tourist resorts as possible throughout the Mediterranean countries.

It should be preceded and supported by an appropriate publicity campaign based mainly on the following elements:

Short but trenchant articles written by experts and famous journalists to give impetus to the ecological safeguarding of the Mediterranean (a pamphlet could also be planned and translated into the most important languages);

Publicity flashes on radio and television and in cinemas in the holiday resorts that attract the greatest flow of tourists;

Posters and signboards - emphasizing the beauties and risks of the Mediterranean - that might emphasize the tourist's own interest and duty in helping MIP and WWF to make the Mediterranean (and its coastlines) increasingly more attractive, and conserve and enhance its exceptional natural resources;

Youth festivals and meetings in the holiday resorts (in close co-operation with specialized local centres and authorities); etc.

The fund-raising should be carried out throughout the summer period at fund-raising centres that should monitor the operation and, at most, be refunded for out-of-pocket expenses. These centres should also be adequately supported by governmental authorities.

The fund-raising centres could also include, for example: the largest travel agencies (also in the countries from which the tourists come) and their respective branch offices along the Mediterranean coasts; the most important camping sites; nautical clubs; fishing associations; well-known hotels and restaurants; beach facilities; etc.

During the "campaign period", on the 1st and 15th of every month (dates when holiday-makers usually start out on their journeys), WWF's young members and sympathizers should be rallied together for a local fund-raising operation on beaches and in the principal coastal resorts. This operation could also directly involve groups of schoolchildren. The fund-raising operation on the 1st and 15th of each month is expected to be carried out by means of simple and traditional fund-raising operations (for instance: anonymous donations in containers shaped and painted to look like something that represents a Mediterranean ecological symbol; sale of badges, souvenir flags and printed material on Mediterranean subjects; membership cards and certificates for the more generous donations; etc.).

5. The operative and financial agreements between the UNEP co-ordination units of MAF and the WWF could be drawn up on the following lines:

UNEP/MAF would be responsible for:

Official sponsorship of the fund-raising campaign;

Advance payment (to be withheld from the first funds collected) of the expenses to start the operation off to be agreed on the basis of an "estimate" presented by the WWF;

Specific deliberation of the "Conference of the Signatory Powers" at the 1976 Barcelona Convention that should commit all member Governments to supply - at both central and local levels - maximum support for the WWF and its individual employees in preparing and carrying out the fund-raising operations;

Supply of any necessary technical assistance as well as diplomatic mediation (in case it proved necessary) in compliance with the possibilities of the UNEP Co-ordinating Unit of MAF.

WWF would be responsible for:

Setting up the necessary organizational structures;

Signing of short-term contracts with publicity experts and with other fund-raisers;

Administration of the workers engaged;

Selection of "counterpart" associations that (in agreement with the competent governmental authorities and UNEP/MAF) could be in charge of fund-raising in those countries that still lack an adequate WWF organization, and conclusion of agreements therewith;

Management and implementation of specific fund-raising operations;

Accurate accounting and timely presentation of statements of accounts.

A central MAF/WWF Committee should guide the over-all operations while a separate committee would manage the operations carried out on the national territory of each single country. The latter would be formed by: a representative of the State concerned; a UNEP/MAF representative; a representative of the WWF; possibly a representative of the association appointed by the WWF to be in charge of the fund-raising operations in a given country.

6. The destination of the collected funds will be specifically stated (with reference to each of the two organizations) at the time the campaign is launched (for example: the creation of especially protected areas; conservation of rare or endangered species; specific anti-pollution measures in areas of particular tourist interest; technical and financial aid to developing countries; etc.).

The allocation of funds between MAF and WWF will be in the proportion of [to be determined], with real costs deducted.

In view of the limited time available for adequate launching of a campaign, a "rehearsal" will have to suffice for 1982, even though it could have a very high experimental value. Perhaps, to begin with, it could be limited to those countries where there is greater availability of adequate structures.

In connection with the timing, in case the present memorandum should be deemed "workable" by the WWF, a first discussion might take place in Geneva at UNEP. If agreement was reached, a more detailed programme would be drawn up and submitted at the next meeting of Contracting Parties, which should represent the official beginning of the Programme warranted by essential governmental support.