



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.140/4  
28 September 1998

Original: ENGLISH

---

---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

Fourth Meeting of the Mediterranean  
Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)

Monaco, 20-22 October 1998

**PROGRESS REPORT OF THE THEMATIC GROUPS  
BY THE TASK MANAGERS**

## **Table of Contents**

- I. INDICATORS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN**
  - II. TOURISM AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN**
  - III. INFORMATION, AWARENESS, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
  - IV. FREE TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT**
  - V. INDUSTRY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**
  - VI. URBAN AND RURAL MANAGEMENT**
- FOLLOW - UP RECOMMENDATIONS**
- I. MANAGEMENT OF WATER DEMAND**
  - II. SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF COASTAL ZONES**

## **I. INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN**

The last meeting of the MCSD saw confirmation of the approach and the preliminary report on indicators specifying the types of indicator and how they fit in with the main problem areas of Agenda 21 and Med 21.

It recommended that the working group should draw on the work of the UNCSD, where indicator tests are applied at national level, such as France and Tunisia.

### **A) Progress Report**

#### **1. Progress and assessment**

Since October 1997, the Blue Plan has analysed various lists of indicators such as those produced by the UNCSD, as well as the indicators developed by the Blue Plan in the course of its work, and within the framework of the METAP project on environmental performance indicators.

This analysis, which involved assessing the pertinence and availability of the indicators (250), was made easier by the studies on environmental indicators and statistics already carried out by the Blue Plan. This analysis led to a first set of indicators being proposed at the Tunis workshop (June 1998), during which the set was discussed and adopted.

The main results of the Tunis workshop were:

- The adoption of a classification framework for indicators of sustainable development (in 6 chapters), which will serve both as a contents page for the report on indicators for sustainable development in the Mediterranean, and as a guide for the selection of the first minimum common set of indicators;
- The selection of a minimum common set of some 75 indicators for the Mediterranean, 39 of which were chosen from amongst the 134 UN-SDIs;
- The adoption of a first list of eight proposals on the implementation in the Mediterranean region of indicators of sustainable development and their use, for future approval by the MCSD (in October 1998), and then the MAP Contracting Parties in 1999.

Simultaneously, since 1997, the test of UN-SDI in Tunisia has been run by the OTED, the IFEN and the Blue Plan. The results of this test, to be presented in the near future, provided solid input to the work on the common set.

#### **2. Proposals and recommendations**

During the workshop it was stressed that:

- The cultural dimension requires discussion by high-level experts to pick out which cultural indicators are closely tied in with the environment and sustainable development; UNESCO will be contacted for this. The indicators on consumption patterns and production also require thorough work.

- The sea: the MAP bodies responsible for MEDPOL will be invited to propose some indicators, the most important ones, which have emerged from work over the last 20 years, for example on land-based pollution and bathing waters. The effort will be made to produce these on a country by country basis, and according to MEDPOL's marine areas. The GFCM will also be contacted concerning fisheries resources.
- Actors and strategies: the importance of actors in civil society as reflected by their mention in some 10 chapters of Agenda 21 only comes across in one single heading on the list of indicators. A further working session will be necessary to examine this seriously.
- Trade and Mediterranean cooperation also need to be completed.
- Certain qualitative type indications (to which no useful figure can be attached) would complete the indicators in terms of the standards adopted in the countries, the existence of adequate rules and regulations, or the ratification of international agreements.
- It is felt necessary to set up a concertation mechanism for those points for which no indicators have been proposed, as well as a training programme for experts and users.

During the workshop, the problem of attendance at working group sessions (payment of travel expenses) was also stressed.

The detailed minutes of the workshop were sent to all participants, and the main conclusions are provided as an annex.

The following programme of activities is proposed.

### **3. Programme of activities**

It is proposed that a workshop be organised in Sophia-Antipolis in September 1999 with French backing.

In the meantime, the Blue Plan, in close cooperation with the task managers and members of the working group, will:

- Improve the definitions of the indicators chosen during the workshop (using the data sheets which served as a basis for discussions).
- Work with the various institutions and experts on tightening up the definitions of certain indicators (or indicator sheets) which were proposed during the workshop.
- Attempt to stop the gaps on indicators for certain themes, once again working with the pertinent institutions and experts.
- Work, with the other MCSD working groups, on defining and drawing up thematic indicators.
- Begin to calculate the indicators on the basis of the statistics available from the international organisations.
- Make available to the countries, if possible on an internet server, both the "definition" sheets and the first indicators calculated.
- Gradually complete the parts of a report on "indicators for sustainable development in the Mediterranean".

### **4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

The workshop was held in Tunis on 9 and 10 June 1998, those having volunteered to take part in the working group having been duly invited by letter dated 13 April 1998. The workshop was chaired by the two task managers- Tunisia (Mr.Mohammed Ennabli) and France (Mr.Serge Antoine).

Attached hereto are the points which emerged from the Tunis workshop on "Indicators for sustainable development in the Mediterranean".

These points concern:

- The initial proposals from the working group.
- The thematic framework chosen for the common core of indicators of sustainable development in the Mediterranean region.
- The indicators selected for the common set of indicators of sustainable development at national level for the Mediterranean region.
- The summary of the Workshop's decisions.

The detailed minutes of the workshop along with the summary of the presentations and discussions from Tunis will be sent to the members of the MCSD at a later date or distributed during the MCSD meeting in Monaco.

### **Summary report of Tunis meeting:**

#### **1. Proposals on Indicators for a Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region**

Since the Rio Conference, it is expected that the States and the civil society make regular presentations, in the international arena, of the situation of the region in the light of sustainable development. For this purpose, indicators constitute an important tool for monitoring the main trends (social, economic and environmental ones). Each Mediterranean country forms part of this planet, and has something to gain from knowing better its relative position in the world, and from keeping everyone informed of its status and efforts with regard to sustainable development. The United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development advocates this approach.

Mediterranean co-operation stands to gain a better understanding, through using figures whenever possible, of the common ground and the differences that exist within what is called the "Mediterranean Basin". The Mediterranean region, as a world « eco-region », initiates a coherent regional strategy in the field of indicators for sustainable development, just as it did previously for the Barcelona Convention, the Mediterranean Action Plan, Agenda MED 21 and the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development.

In each country, and therefore at a national scale, indicators can be very useful for preparing initiatives and central or decentralised decision-making (for local authorities, companies, or associations). The indicators which measure pressures, state, trends, possible forecasts and the so-called "responses", are precious instruments for the

Ministries in charge of sustainable development, for the National Commissions responsible for co-ordination, and for all actors in development or management.

As a result the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

- shall link the indicator system for the region to the United Nations system;
- shall identify those indicators which are of Mediterranean interest;
- shall take steps to facilitate sustainable development being taken into account in the indicators and statistics for each bordering country.

In order to achieve this, the Working group submits to the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development the eight following proposals of engagements which could be transmitted to the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention:

1. Producing a Report based on Indicators for Sustainable Development.

The Mediterranean States and the civil society shall set to work in active co-operation for the periodical presentation of a report on the state, trends and future of the Mediterranean region, in which the unity and diversity of situations is made clear as well as their efforts towards sustainable development. This report shall be produced every 5 years; it shall be prepared under the Blue Plan technical co-ordination.

It shall be published at the very least in French and in English ; each Mediterranean State shall undertake to ensure its widespread dissemination and, if necessary, its further translation. Each year, the report can be supplemented by an overview of the efforts carried out by one or two countries to advance sustainable development.

2. The Approval of a Set of Common Indicators for the entire region.

75 quantified indicators, supplemented by information sheets referring mainly to national institutions and standards, make up the common core set of information for all countries.

These indicators which, for most of them, form part of the list of 134 indicators of the United Nations, also include specific indicators tailored to the Mediterranean region.

The choice of the common set of indicators takes into account both their relevance for an overall understanding of sustainable development in the region, and the availability of these indicators in the largest possible number of countries.

They are sorted into a system made up of 6 main headings and 30 issues defined for the most part on the basis of Agenda 21 and MED 21. Appended hereto is the full list of the indicators selected with their sort codes. For those countries where a part of their land area is not considered as being Mediterranean, these national indicators shall be available in individualised form for their Mediterranean regions.

3. Monitoring and Updating the Common Core Set of Indicators.

These indicators shall be constantly calculated until the next complete review of the list which shall follow Mediterranean monitoring meetings, to be held under the aegis of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development.

These meetings shall allow exchanges on successes and difficulties encountered in the collection and interpretation of indicators.

4. Improving Statistical Tools.

Each State shall undertake to arrange for quantitative data to be available and of the highest possible quality, and to make every effort towards this objective, in particular by using the resources of national statisticians and accountants.

At present some issues are hardly covered by the priority indicators; therefore the working group suggests to the Commission for Sustainable Development that it considers certain subjects as calling for a « remedial » Mediterranean program to ensure that the issue be better covered over 3, 5 or 10 years. Special efforts shall be made for those indicators which assess "heritage" and for those which identify responses and their monitoring

5. Training.

The calculation of these indicators and their correct use involve national efforts which the States, and also their partners from the civil society, shall undertake to make. In addition, training sessions shall be organised at Mediterranean level for operators, statisticians, and other indicator users; the Blue Plan shall be responsible for this, in accordance with the resources allocated to it for this purpose and in the framework of MAP Mediterranean Environmental and Development Observatory.

6. Decentralised Indicators.

In each of the Mediterranean countries, and on a voluntary basis, there shall be developed indicators suitable for more refined regional subdivision (by province, metropolitan districts, natural areas, etc.), or for sectors where issues need some indicator sub-sets; this could for example be the case for coastal areas.

7. National Observatories, whenever they exist, shall form an essential component in the Mediterranean capacity for approaching sustainable development, for preparing decision-making, as well as a useful channel for implementing the overall resources engaged.

Research work calling on universities in particular, shall be welcome. These works shall contribute to identify good practices in the Mediterranean.

8. Availability, Dissemination, and the Internet.

In each country efforts in education and in promoting awareness shall be undertaken to make the use of the indicators more familiar. This involves a suitable dissemination system using various media. Recourse to Internet networks shall obviously be considered as an essential component thereof.

**2. Adopted Thematic framework of Sustainable development Indicators in the Mediterranean Region**

**1 POPULATION AND SOCIETY**

1.1 Demography and population

1.2 Standard of life, social inequities, poverty, employment, unemployment

1.3 Education, training, sensibilisation

1.4 Health, public health

1.5 Culture

1.6 Consumption and production patterns

1.7 Information, communication

## **2 TERRITORY AND HUMAN SETTLEMENTS**

2.1 Habitat and urban systems

2.2 Rural and dry areas, mountains and hinterland

2.3 Littoral and "littoralisation"

## **3 ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AND SUSTAINABILITY**

3.1 Global economy

3.2 Agriculture

3.3 Fisheries, aquaculture

3.4 Mines, industry

3.5 Services and trade

3.6 Energy

3.7 Domestic and international transports

3.8 Tourism

## **4 ENVIRONMENT**

4.1 Freshwater et waste water

4.2 Sea

4.3 Soils, vegetation and desertification

4.4 Forests

4.5 Biological diversity, ecosystems

4.6 Solid, industrial and hazardous waste

4.7 Air quality

4.8 Natural and technological risks

## **5 THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT : ACTORS AND POLICIES**

5.1 Actors of the sustainable development

5.2 Policies and strategies of the sustainable development

## **6 EXCHANGES AND COOPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN**

6.1 International trade, Free trade zone and environment

6.2 Others mediterranean exchanges

6.3 Mediterranean cooperation in the fields of environment and sustainable development

### **3. Indicators proposals:**

Following table summaries the indicators selected by the working group



### 3. TABLE OF SELECTED INDICATORS DURING THE TUNIS WORKSHOP - JUNE 98-

(The figures in parentheses express respectively the political pertinence and availability for the calculation)

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
<b>1 POPULATION AND SOCIETY</b>			
1.1 Demography and population	7. Population growth rate (4,4)		9. Total fertility rate (4,4)
1.2 Standard of life, social inequities, poverty, employment, unemployment		20. Women per hundred men in the labour force (4,4) 228. Social disparity index (4,3)	
1.3 Education, training, sensibilisation	229. School enrolment ratio (net) (4,4)	19. Difference between male and female school enrolment ratios (4,4)	
1.4 Health, public health		24. Life expectancy at birth (4,4) 26. Infant mortality rate (3,4)	
1.5 Culture			
1.6 Consumption and production patterns	47. Annual energy consumption (4,4) 213. Number of passenger cars per 100 inhabitants (4,4)	129. Main telephone lines per 100 inhabitants (3,4)	
1.7 Information, communication			
<b>2 TERRITORY AND HUMAN SETTLEMENTS</b>			
2.1 Habitat and urban systems	34. Rate of growth of urban population (4,4) 206. Loss of arable land caused by the urbanisation (4,2)	37. Percent of population in urban areas (4,4) 39. Floor area per person (3,2)	
2.2 Rural and dry areas, mountains and hinterland	84. Population change in mountain areas (3,4)		208. Existence of program concerning the less favoured rural zones (3,4) (sheet)
2.3 Littoral and "littoralisation"	137. Artificialized coast line / total coastline (4,3) 205. Number of tourists per km of coastline (4,4)	72. Population growth in coastal areas (4,4) 209. Population density on the littoral (4,4) 230. Coastline erosion (4,3) (sheet)	212. Protected coastal area (3,3)
<b>3 ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>			
3.1 Global economy	246. Distribution of GDP (Agriculture, Industry, Services, Tourism) (4,4)	57. External debt / GNP (3,4) 231. Saving / investment (4,3)	59. Environmental protection expenditures as a percent of GDP (4,2) 221. Number of employment linked to the environment (direct and not) (3,1)
3.2 Agriculture	88. Use of fertilisers per hectare of arable land (4,3) 89. Irrigation in percentage of arable land (4,4) 138. Agriculture water demand per irrigated area (4,3)	91. Arable land per capita (4,4) 232. Ratio of agricultural dependence (4,4)	
3.3 Fisheries, aquaculture		217. Fishing production (4,4)	
3.4 Mines, industry	172. Industrial Releases into water (3,2)	52. Intensity of material use (3,3)	151. share of industrial waste water with treatment (4,2)

3. TABLE OF SELECTED INDICATORS DURING THE TUNIS WORKSHOP - JUNE 98-  
(The figures in parentheses express respectively the political pertinence and availability for the calculation)

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
			233. Number of mines and carries rehabilitated after exploitation (4,2) (sheet)
3.5 Services and trade			
3.6 Energy	234. Energy intensity (4,4)		54. Share of consumption of renewable energy resources (4,3)
	235. Energy balance (3,4)		
3.7 Domestic and international transports	223. Average annual distance covered per passenger car (4,4)	236. Structure of transport by mode (3,4)	224. Share of collective transport (4,4)
		237. Density of the road network (3,4)	
3.8 Tourism	201. Average annual growth rate of lodging capacity (3,4)	198. Share of import covered by the international tourism (3,4)	
<b>4 ENVIRONMENT</b>			
4.1 Freshwater et waste water	65. Annual withdrawals of ground and surface water (4,3)	141. Exploitable water resources per capita (3,2)	23. access to safe drinking water (3,3)
	182. Share of polluted water resources (3,2)	149. Share of distributed water not conform to quality standards (4,2)	70. Wastewater treatment coverage (4,3)
		241. Percent of population served by units distributing not conform safe water (4,2)	146. Index of diversification of water provisioning sources (reuse, desalination, import) (4,3)
4.2 Sea			
4.3 Soils, vegetation and desertification	242. Ratio of land exploitation (4,4)	77. Land use change (4,3)	
		186. Losses of arable land in percentage of the total (4,3)	
4.4 Forests	94. Wood harvesting intensity (3,3)	95. Forest area change (3,4)	97. Protected forest area as a percent of total forest area (4,4)
4.5 Biological diversity, ecosystems	175. Loss of coastal habitats (4,2)	98. Threatened species as a percent of total native species (4,3)	99. Protected area as a percent of total area (4,4)
4.6 Solid, industrial and hazardous waste	108. Generation of industrial and municipal solid waste (4,3)	117. Area of land contaminated by hazardous wastes (4,2) (sheet)	111. Waste recycling and reuse (4,3)
	115. Generation of hazardous wastes (according the definition of Basle Convention) (3,2) (sheet)	244. Distribution of waste (4,3)	243. Percent of population served by a waste collecting service (4,3)
	116. Imports and exports of hazardous wastes (according the definition of Basle Convention) (3,2) (sheet)		245. Minimisation of waste production (3,3) (sheet)
	247. Generation of industrial solid waste (4,3)		
4.7 Air quality	102. Emissions of greenhouse gasses (4,3)	106. Ambient concentrations of pollutants in urban areas (3,3)	107. Expenditure on air pollution abatement (3,1) (sheet)
	103. Emissions of sulphur oxides (4,3)		
	104. Emissions of nitrogen oxides (4,3)		

### 3. TABLE OF SELECTED INDICATORS DURING THE TUNIS WORKSHOP - JUNE 98-

(The figures in parentheses express respectively the political pertinence and availability for the calculation)

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
	<b>105. Consumption of ozone depleting substances (4,2)</b>		
4.8 Natural and technological risks			
<b>5 THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT : ACTORS AND POLICIES</b>			
5.1 Actors of the sustainable development		<b>124. Potential scientists and engineers per million population (2,4)</b>	
5.2 Policies and strategies of the sustainable development			<b>154. Existence of economic tools to recover the water cost in various sector (3,3)</b>
<b>6 EXCHANGES AND COOPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN</b>			
6.1 International trade, Free trade zone and environment	<b>44. Sum of exports and imports as a percent of GDP (3,4)</b>		
6.1 Others mediterranean exchanges	<b>8. Net migration rate (4,3)</b>		
6.2 Mediterranean cooperation in the fields of environment and sustainable development			

#### **4. Summary of main decisions and directions of the Tunis Workshop on Sustainable Development Indicators**

The main decisions and directions taken at the Workshop are summarized here below:

1. Adoption of a first list of eight proposals related to the implementation of sustainable development indicators and their use in the Mediterranean region.
2. Adoption of a thematic framework of sustainable development indicators (with six headings).
3. At this stage, adoption of a list of 75 national indicators which make up a « common core set » of sustainable development indicators.

Moreover, some other decisions and directions have been taken :

4. Submission to the MCSD of the question of participation in the working group sessions (travel financing).
5. Priority to response indicators and to performance monitoring (cost-advantages-efficiency), to those retained by the international community but being of interest for the Mediterranean, to indicators linked to prospective analysis or trends.
6. Request to the representatives of the States having volunteered for the working group on Indicators but not having attended to the Tunis Workshop (June 9-10 1998), to address to MAP or the Blue Plan a brief note on sustainable development indicators in their country.
7. Having noticed some gaps in the selection and collection of indicators, the following points shall be deepened :
  - The cultural factor would need a high-level-experts debate in order to identify cultural indicators specifically linked to environment and sustainable development; Unesco's contribution will be called on. Indicators on consumption and production patterns also need to be sharpened.
  - The sea: MAP authorities in charge of MED POL will be requested to propose the most important indicators resulting from the last 20 years work, and concerning for instance land-based pollution or bathing water. Efforts will be done for producing this information by country and according to MED POL marine zones. Besides, for halieutic resources, the GFCM will be approached.
  - Actors and strategies: the importance given by 10 chapters of Agenda 21 to civil society actors has been only translated in just one heading in the indicators list. A serious examination needs another working session.
  - Issues on Mediterranean exchanges and cooperation shall also be completed.
8. Some indications of qualitative nature (for which quantification would be unuseful) would complete the indicators as regards standards adopted in the countries, appropriate legislation-regulation, international agreements ratification.
9. It is considered necessary to set up an exchange mechanism on issues for which

there are no indicators proposed, and a training program for experts and users.

As regards the working program :

- Further to this workshop, the report will be sent to all the members of the working group, and after integration of corrections, a presentation will take place at the fourth MCSD meeting in Monaco, October 1998.
  - A workshop could be organised at Sophia Antipolis in September 1999 (France's support will be requested).
  - The conclusions of the latter workshop, including more specific recommendations will be submitted to the Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention in 1999.
10. In the meantime, the Blue Plan will
- Sharpen the definitions of the indicator selected during the workshop (on the basis of the sheets having supported the debates).
  - Precise, in close collaboration with various institutions and experts, the definitions of some indicators (or indicator-sheets) which have been proposed during the workshop.
  - Try to fill, together with the institutions and experts concerned, the gap of indicators for certain issues.
  - Work, together with the other MCSD working groups, on the definition and development of thematic indicators.
  - Begin to compile the indicators on the basis of statistical data available from international agencies.
  - Will make available to the countries, if possible through an Internet server, both the « definition »-sheets and the first indicators compiled.
  - Prepare, progressively, the elements of a report on « the indicators for a sustainable development in the Mediterranean region ».

original french

## **II. TOURISM AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN**

### **1. The main problems and summary of previous recommendations:**

When it was set up in Rabat in December 1996, the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development picked out the most important areas of study in the Mediterranean for the introduction of a process of sustainable development.

Because of its economic and social importance and its impact on the environment, tourism was selected for an in-depth study from which recommendations would emerge, which would then go before the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MCSD in June 1999.

At the 2<sup>nd</sup> MCSD meeting in May 1997 in Majorca, Spain as task manager proposed a working programme, one facet of which centred on the type of destination (well-established, run-down, emerging), whilst the other covered the tourist industry (tour operators, hotel owners, etc.) and the role of the civil society in this sector.

With the 3<sup>rd</sup> MCSD meeting (October 1997, Sophia-Antipolis) the working group was able to better classify the problems and to agree on both a procedure and a working method. This was based on the drawing-up of questionnaires in order to collect the information which would then be used as the basis for a workshop, following which recommendations would be formulated. According to the procedure, restricted expert groups would think out the questionnaires and the Workshop's programme.

### **2. Progress and assessment**

Two restricted expert meetings have been held, one in Monaco in December 1997, the other in Sophia-Antipolis in April 1998. Meanwhile, in February 1998 a technical advisory meeting was held in Athens with the MCSD's task managers. Through these various meetings it has been possible to:

- better define the aims of the activity,
- develop a coherent and progressive working approach (draw up a list of problems, think out questionnaires and identify their recipients, work out the underlying framework for the Workshop, based on exchange of experience, and draft recommendations based on the results of the Workshop).

Generally speaking, the preferred approach is one of participation for the entire duration of the activity: consulting experts, collecting opinions and suggestions, exchanging experiences, comparisons and discussions, then consensus.

The questionnaires, which were recipient-specific, were sent out between mid-May and late July

(depending on the stage at which experts were nominated) to the country-designated experts, NGO members of the MCSD, tour operators, and hotel-owners' federations.

The answers will form the basis of the Workshop to be held in Antalya (Turkey) from 17-19 September 1998, the main aims of which are as follows:

- to identify the problems and the main conditions which would provide for better linkage between tourism and sustainable development in the Mediterranean, and
- to assist the working group in defining the follow-up to its work, and a first set of recommendations.

Through cooperation with the members of the MCSD a series of case studies has been drawn up, which will serve as an information base for the working groups. They have also provided some interesting information about the geographical framework, attractiveness factors, the main protagonists, market organisation, a retrospective overview of tourist development, system regulation, tools for tourist development and its integration in sustainable development, on-going developments, future issues and, finally, lessons to be learnt from the case study.

These studies cover:

The Balearic Islands, the Estartit and the management of the Ils Medes marine reserve, Calvia Municipality-Balearic Islands, the ECOTUR Programme (Spain), Vendres, the Luberon Regional Nature Park, the Belgodere Territory(France), the Principality of Monaco, the Slovenian Adriatic coast, the Cres-Losinj Archipelago(Croatia), the Saranda-Butrinti coastal area(Albania), the Antalya-South tourist development project(Turkey), the Akamas Peninsula(Cyprus), the north-west coast(Libya), Djerba(Tunisia), the Le Kala National Park(Algeria), Agadir(Morocco).

### **3. Organisation of the workshop:**

The programme for the Antalya workshop to which all members of the MCSD and representatives of international organisations, tour operators and hotel owners' federations have been invited, is as follows:

#### Plenary session on Thursday 17 September

The aim of this day's work is to examine the challenges and stakes raised by the proper integration of tourism within sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Examples of policies from different levels will illustrate the importance of these questions and the responses applied.

#### Group work on Friday 18 September

Mediterranean tourism is highly diversified. There are many different situations and each type of destination has its own actors, problems and different responses.

The primary aim of the group work is to draw up a diagnosis for each of the main destination types, identifying present trends, foreseeable conflicts, problems and issues, as well as development processes and the actors involved. Case studies illustrating the different situations will be presented.

The groups will then go on to identify those aspects of possible responses which public and private actors could promote in order to encourage better integration of tourism within sustainable development.

In the late afternoon the groups will be invited to draw up a first set of proposals in the form of a selection of indicators, recommendations to be discussed, and possible follow-up to work on this activity.

#### Plenary session on Saturday 19 September

The final half-day will be used for presentation and discussion of the results of the groups' work, and the initial conclusions of the workshop.

#### **4. Programme of activities**

At the close of the Antalya workshop, a report will be drafted to go to the MCSD in October 1998. It will be sent out to participants two weeks prior to the Monaco meeting.



### **III. INFORMATION, AWARENESS, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Thematic Group has been extended to include more members. The formal representative of CREE (co-Task Manager) has been replaced by Mrs. Christina Daoussis, Director.

It should be noted that the object of the Thematic Group is formally and informally gaining support and recognition in political agendas universally. Perhaps the most encouraging example is that of the 4<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Conference "Environment for Europe" which took place in Arhus, Denmark (June 1998) where the "Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters" was signed by 35 countries and the European Community. Among them, nine are signatory parties to the Barcelona Convention.

Since the last meeting of the Thematic Group (December 10, 1997) its members have concluded and proposed the following:

- a. Given the diverse conditions in the Mediterranean countries, the future steps of the Thematic Group should be ambitious yet realistic, based in a clearly defined and closely followed methodology and timetable. The step-by-step approach should be proposed without compromising, however, the final scope of the participatory process.
- b. An overall assessment of the present legal-institutional status of issues related to Participation in the Mediterranean countries should be elaborated as a useful step, provided that funds will become available for carrying out such work. This will also help to better understand the situation and to demonstrate to the governments as well what the methodology followed by the Group is. Recommendations should then be drafted and discussed about the needed adaptations at national level. The Task Managers will try to secure funding for this study from external sources.
- c. A matrix and/or respective manual with the best practices of NGO involvement in participatory processes in the Mediterranean should be compiled, studied and evaluated. MIO-ECSDE undertook the responsibility to facilitate this task through the drafting, dissemination among NGOs and analysis of a questionnaire. Funds are also required for the compilation and publication of the document.
- d. The dissemination of information and training on existing participation tools, methodologies and techniques for information, collection of opinions and consultations is necessary and can best be achieved through publications, CD ROMs and seminars.
- e. In order to efficiently provide information to the general public on the state of the environment and the measures taken to improve it, a well prepared exhibition concisely depicting the state of the Mediterranean Environment and the measures and mechanisms in place should be organised at a regional level.
- f. The Task Managers should try to secure adequate funds from every possible appropriate source for the functioning of the Thematic Group.

The main work carried out by the Thematic Group since the third meeting of the MCSD (Sophia Antipolis, 28-30 October, 1997) is briefly presented below:

14-18 November 1997, Tunis, Tunisia

11<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties, organized by MAP/UNEP

Presentation and approval of the MCSD Report and of the TDA containing public participation components

6-7 December 1997, Porto Carras, Greece

Mediterranean NGO Workshop on Environmental Education and Participation, organized by MIO-ECSDE

Preparation of the Mediterranean NGO position to be presented at the Unesco International Conference

Assessment of the situation on the issues of environmental Education, environmental information and awareness, and public participation in the Mediterranean countries

Presentation to representatives of 50 Mediterranean NGOs of the work of the Thematic Group

8-12 December 1997, Thessaloniki, Greece

International Conference 'Environment and Society: Education and Public Awareness for Sustainability', organized by Unesco and the Greek Government

(MIO-ECSDE was responsible for the Secretariat of the International Conference)

Major event of the decade on the issue

Thessaloniki Declaration

10 December 1997, Thessaloniki, Greece

Meeting of the Thematic Group, organized by MIO-ECSDE together with CREE, with the support of MAP/UNEP

5 February 1998, Athens, Greece

Technical Consultation Meeting concerning the activities of Task Managers and the Thematic Working Groups of the MCSD

Brief report of activities of the Thematic Group on Information, Awareness, Environmental Education and Public Participation.

Continuation of the work of MIO-ECSDE on the issue of public participation and consensus building in drafting sustainability plans (with focus on tourism on islands) through the SUDECIR programme (supported by DGXI of the CEU).

Of the future programmed activities of the Thematic Group:

- The **Final Report of the Thematic Group** is in its final stages and will be disseminated

for evaluation to its members prior to the **informal meeting of the Thematic Group**, which will be held on 19 October 1998 on the occasion of the MCSD meeting in Monaco. Also the draft questionnaire designed to provide the necessary information for the creation of a matrix with the best practices of NGO involvement in participatory processes in the Mediterranean will be finalised during this meeting.

- Presentation of the Final Report of the Thematic Group will be done in December 1998, during a Thematic Group meeting organised in parallel to the MIO-ECSDE NGO Workshop on the promotion of Education and Public Awareness for Environment and Sustainability in the Mediterranean (Athens, 17-18 December, 1998).
  
- The publication of the Guidelines for Public Participation for Assisting the Organisation of Round Table Discussions on the Issue of Public Participation with Various Partners in the Mediterranean has been delayed. The Guidelines, currently finalised by MIO-ECSDE, with the support of MAP/UNEP, will be completed before the end of 1998.

The work of the Group has been carried out until now by MIO-ECSDE without any special support. The meeting of Thessaloniki was only partly supported by UNEP-MAP. It has been proposed and accepted that the work of the Group will be financed by the UNEP-MAP budget but this has not yet been materialized.

#### **IV. FREE TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT**

During the third meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development held in Sophia-Antipolis in October 1997, Lebanon proposed and it was accepted to be the task manager for the Free Trade and Environment theme, after the withdrawal of FIS (Malta).

The Lebanese Ministry of Environment started working on this theme at the national level in cooperation with UNDP-Capacity 21 Programme. Several meetings were conducted with the Ministry of Economy and Trade, Chamber of Commerce and concerned organizations to coordinate activities relevant to the study. Also an attempt was made in order to coordinate between the MCSD study and the METAP case studies on Trade and Environment.

In order to efficiently implement this activity the Ministry of Environment funded a study to define activities and scope of work relevant to free trade and environment in the Mediterranean. A local consultant team prepared the terms of reference set for this purpose.

In January, MAP/UNEP provided the task manager with financial support to cover some of the expenses related to free trade activities.

In February 1998, a technical consultation meeting was held in Athens in order to discuss relevant activities of MCSD Task Managers and Thematic Groups. During the meeting, the Lebanese Task Manager introduced a progress report on the discussed activities and programme of work relevant to the free trade theme. It was clarified that the Blue Plan and MAP/UNEP office in Athens will be the support centers. At the end of the discussion, it was agreed that an expert group meeting is to be organized in Geneva. Also a working group meeting at the end of September 1998 in Beirut (Lebanon) will be organized.

A questionnaire was elaborated and sent to mainly members of the working group. This aimed at gathering information related to economic and environmental issues in the Mediterranean countries. Upon request from the task manager, the MCSD members assigned a technical focal point (economist or environmental economist) to complete the questionnaire. Unfortunately (when this report was prepared, 2/9/98) answers were only limited to questionnaires received from Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, EU, Lebanon, Tunisia and Turkey.

A first presentation about the MCSD activity over the Mediterranean was done through the Eco-efficiency Workshop organized by Capacity 21, Sustainable Business Associate and the International Chamber of Commerce, on May 7-8 in Beirut.

On May 18, 1998, a one-day brainstorming meeting was organized in Geneva in collaboration with MAP/UNEP. Funded by Athens Office, the aim of the meeting was to design a framework of activities leading to better understanding of the major issues and problems related to the development of free trade initiatives and their relevance to Mediterranean specific context. During the meeting, the different activities included in the questionnaire were thoroughly discussed and evaluated and several comments were made. It was suggested that the questionnaire should isolate between overall GDP of a country to include specific components and more product categories within a specific sector. Restrictions to each of these categories should be specified in terms of legislative, economic or other constraints. This would help in specifying products that could be export extensive but are inhibited by a certain reason. Also, and as for import intensity, it was suggested that this should be broken down as well to include more sensitive categories. This would help in specifying commercial opportunities of certain products in the Mediterranean, mainly those that could be preferred due to environmental reasons as well as products that could be under negotiations for causing environmental constraints.

It was noted that the questionnaire tackles the product approach globally, sticking mainly to trade policies. More consideration should be given to environmental issues. This would highlight how free trade and the nature of consumption could pose a burden on the environment or alleviate environmental problems, both directly and indirectly.

The economic data gathered from this questionnaire could be used to draw correlation to other environmental data (biodiversity, wetlands, water quality...). The economic data could include tools, instruments as well as financial assistance provided to combat the effect of free trade on the environment. This will allow for balance between trade and environment in the light of free trade agreements.

Additional information that could be necessary would include steps identified under direct environmental intervention to overcome environmental degradation caused by free trade, such as packaging, eco-labels, environmental standards, as well as indirect steps such as rational use of energy, water...

From the discussion on the Mediterranean stakes and related environmental problems, it was obvious that the concerned MCSD Working Group should first proceed to a selection of limited but most relevant products through which the trade and environment questions will be tackled; it was recognized that necessary accompanying measures for the benefit of developing partners countries should be given due consideration, together with the scales aspect (country, local, enterprise, etc) and the typology of countries in relation with trade (for the selection of pilot cases), without neglecting the crucial subject of information and communication to concerned Mediterranean actors. In order to avoid duplication and learn from existing experiences all around the world, it was decided to start with a good analysis of on-going bi-lateral and multi-lateral cases so as to draw lessons for the Mediterranean.

Finally, it was agreed that a framework note would be prepared prior to the Workshop that will be held in Beirut end of September.

Considering that this subject will require for substantial technical and financial support, a project document was prepared on Lebanon's initiative regarding "promoting synergy between trade and Environment in the Mediterranean". The anticipated results would include, among other, the completion of the proposed work that will lead to identifying environmental repercussions on export and underlying preliminary measures to increase market access. It will also lead to providing concerned stakeholders with a decision-support system software that integrates economic/environment policy and management tools. It was submitted to EC/MEDA/SMAP consideration in June 1998. It would be important to look for other sources in close cooperation with other members.

In July 28, 1998, a presentation headed by the Minister of Environment was given in collaboration with Capacity 21 Programme. The presentation aimed at introducing the MCSD, overviewing the results of the work completed and exposes the proposed activities of the case study over Lebanon. Local Ministries, Embassies, international organizations, NGO's, private sector associations, media and other concerned stakeholders participated and were involved in related

discussions.

In the same context, the Ministry of Environment, along with Capacity 21, is preparing a case study on "Free Trade and Lebanese Exports from an Environmental Perspective". This study is expected to be launched mid-September.

In August 24, 1998, an expert meeting was held in Marseille, organized by Blue Plan as a preparatory meeting for September meeting of MCSD working group.

A background paper on "Free Trade and Environment: a problematic for the Mediterranean" was prepared by a consultant. This meeting intended mainly to deepen/enlarge the brainstorming, get the views of some qualified experts and provide guidance for Beirut's meeting. It was decided to give due consideration, when looking at the relations between free-trade and environment, to agriculture, consumption patterns, macro-economic decisions and their impact at the micro/local levels, together with accompanying policies and measures, and their impact at an Euro-Mediterranean Strategy.

In parallel to all these activities, many meetings were held with ESCWA (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for West Asia) to coordinate activities of MCSD and ESCWA. It was agreed that cooperation would start by active participation in September meeting and in training courses to be organized on free trade and Environment in early 1999 by ESCWA.

Next step is the meeting of the MCSD working group on Free Trade and Environment, to take place in Beirut on 29-30 September 1998. This meeting will gather, other than working group members, international experts that will present the experiences of their respective organizations. Expenses of the meeting will be covered by the support centers, Ministry of Environment and Capacity 21 Programme.

Report of this meeting together with programme of activities for this MCSD subject will be prepared just after the meeting and sent to participants two weeks before the 4<sup>th</sup> MCSD meeting.

**V. INDUSTRY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

( REPORT TO BE SUBMITTED LATER)

## VI. URBAN AND RURAL MANAGEMENT

### Background Information

1. Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD) has decided that one of the priorities of its work will be the issue of urban and rural management within the context of the sustainable development in the Mediterranean Region. For that purpose, it has established a Working Group of its members. The Task Manager of the Group is Egypt, while the technical support is being provided by the Blue Plan (BP), Priority Actions Programme (PAP) and Environmental Remote Sensing (ERS) Regional Activity Centres (RAC).
2. The Group has held a number of consultative meetings, mainly at the margins of the MCSD meetings which were organised during the 1997-98 period, based mainly on related studies conducted under BP/RAC's coordination. At the last meeting of MEDU and RAC Directors, held in Athens in early February 1998, it was decided that a technical meeting of experts will be held in Split on June 24-25 1998. Their task would be to advise the Task Manager and supporting centres' management on the current issues in this field and help them devise a work programme and timetable for the Group.
3. The objectives of the Meeting could be summarised as follows:
  - to understand the evolution of urban/rural movements;
  - to review the concrete actions relevant to the urban/rural management in the region; and
  - to prepare relevant recommendations to MCSD and Contracting Parties.
4. In the discussions, various questions have been raised and proposals presented:
  - the experts should be involved through expert meetings as well as through the preparation of in- depth studies;
  - identify the relevant actors;
  - urban management should give due consideration to economy, transport and ecology;
  - local authorities should be more closely involved in related policies;
  - the role of cities in regional development should be enhanced;
  - changes in land uses should be continuously monitored.
  - the group has to take the advantage of many already existing studies;
  - there is a need to define more precisely the role of MCSD in this subject;
  - identify good practices in the region and publicise them widely;



- undertake pilot actions;
  - prepare the typology of situations in urban/rural management; engage equally the experts from the north and from the south; and
  - adoption of the position that the activities in this subject should not terminate after 1999, when the recommendations will be adopted by the MCSD.
5. Several papers were prepared and presented at the meeting. They concerned "Urbanization, Rural Development and Environment in the Mediterranean: State and Prospects", a sort of feasibility study for the working group's activity; "Rural Space, and Urban/Rural Relations in the Mediterranean: The State of the Art" and "Natural Zones, Marginal Zones, Littoralisation: State of the Art".
6. In addition to the above, a number of other papers/case-studies were presented: files on urban/rural areas for Spain, Egypt and Tunisia, with the use of long-term series of historical data, and a presentation of a corresponding method used.
7. In the discussion that followed a number of major remarks were made concerning :
- the area to be considered for the study. If Mediterranean coastal areas, and a national territories are to be considered, what is then, at least in some countries, national non-Mediterranean space?
  - the definition of the coastal area in this context;
  - the confusion between the rural world (cultural connotation) and the agricultural world (the economic connotation);
  - the need to study equally population issues between the social structures;
  - is the limit above 10000 inhabitants good enough to study the urban agglomerations;
  - the importance of the temporal scales.

It was also highlighted that both local and national systems should be studied simultaneously, from the scientific and practical viewpoint, that the regional dimension requires not only a geographic but also an economic approach and that the institutional issues need to be carefully studied .

The following scheme was proposed to clarify the scientific and practical aspects of the future work:

Knowledge	Public Actions	
Global Regional • North C South and East Regional/local	States Local Authorities NGOs  <u>Priority Questions</u>	
Evolutions : retrospectives et prospectives Impacts and risks (fertile soils, coastline)	C Integration into different territories urban planning C protection of the agricultural potential C protection of the coast C dynamisation of the hinterland	Examples : • good practices • tools
Global and national • data management C analysis and interpretation		

8. Among the additional issues discussed, the question of agriculture and related policies was mentioned, as well as the appropriate information system.
9. Considering that the fifth MCSD would be held by June 1999, it was agreed that in April 1999 a workshop will be held where national reports on urban/rural management will be presented. To this end the following will have to be prepared:
  - A short synthesis note (4-6 pages) by a North/South team of consultants and the Blue Plan before the end of September 1998. It should be considered as an introduction to the Terms of Reference for the national reports.
  - The terms of Reference for the national reports to be ready before the MCSD meeting in Monaco (20-23 October 1998). These TOR should take into account the national reports prepared for Habitat II, in order to avoid duplication.
  - The National Reports for the April 1999 Workshop (to be held in Egypt or Bosnia and Herzegovina), to be prepared by an expert from each MCSD member country and selected by their focal points.
10. The national reports would consist of four major points:

Big problems which exist in the countries based on the priority problems identified in the feasibility study, such as:

- population, demography, migrations
- socio-economic development of the metropolitan cities
- competition for the water, land and the relations between city and rural areas
- socio-economic development of rural areas
- natural, marginal, island and hinterland areas
- urbanisation of the coastal areas.

Implementation of policies with a view to

- urban planning
- protection of the coast
- protection of the agricultural potential
- dynamisation of the marginal and hinterland areas

Coordination mechanisms

- effects of the lack of coordination
- examples and good practices

Necessary actions

- for better integration and efficiency
- for better participation of other actors, i.e. the civil society.

11. The participants proposed the following timetable for the above activities:

Synthesis note	end September 1998
Terms of reference for national reports	20 October 1998
4 <sup>th</sup> MCSD Meeting	20-22 October 1998
Contracts with the national experts to prepare national reports	November 1998
National reports	February 1999
Synthesis report	March 1999
Workshop	April 1999
Recommendations for the MCSD	May 1999
5 <sup>th</sup> MCSD Meeting	June 1999
Contracting Parties meeting	October 1999

## FOLLOW -UP RECOMMENDATIONS

original french

### I. MANAGEMENT OF WATER DEMAND

The last MCSD meeting provided the opportunity to confirm the assessment<sup>1</sup> that major water savings could be made in the Mediterranean through better management of water demand.

It recommended that the group focus its work on assessing water demand management strategies and take a closer look at the actual feasibility of the recommendations made to the Contracting Parties.

#### 1. Progress and assessment

Since October 1997 the many communications made, by the Blue Plan in particular, at international meetings such as the World Water Conference held in Paris in March 1998, or the Milan meeting of experts<sup>2</sup>, have provided the opportunity to discuss and confirm just how important it is to better understand and to assess demand management policies.

Thus the Paris conference, which brought together 80 countries, provided world-wide confirmation of the choices made by the MCSD, by defining a priority action programme focussing on three points:

- i. increasing the level of knowledge about water resources and their use
- II. encouraging the development of human and institutional capacity
- III. defining strategies for sustainable water management and identifying the appropriate means. To this end, the following work programme is proposed.

#### 2. Programme of activities

The follow-up to MCSD activity should lead to an initial assessment of strategies implemented in the Mediterranean aiming at better demand management.

To achieve this, the idea is to make a first assessment in the Mediterranean of water demand management strategies already being implemented, and any experience which has been built up, particularly in the agricultural and urban sectors.

This evaluation would be made at two levels and would hinge on the following activities:

---

<sup>1</sup>Established in particular during the Frejus workshop in September 1997

<sup>2</sup>Workshop on "Policies and Regional Instruments for Sustainable Management of Water Resources in the Mediterranean Region", Milan, 27-28 March 1998

### 1. At regional level:

A regional assessment of available information on strategies of better water demand management being applied in the Mediterranean. This would be drawn up by the Blue Plan in cooperation with PAP and would basically entail:

- a bibliographic assessment
- an interview with international bodies
- a number of case studies

The most salient issues in terms of better demand management in the Mediterranean should emerge from this assessment (policies being implemented, interaction with the different sectoral policies, constraints and limits on implementation,...) which could be presented at the next MCSD meeting in 1999.

The use of case studies would essentially look for identifying the conditions governing the choice of different alternatives for better demand management could be identified, as well as what each alternative would entail (volume of water which could be saved, cost-benefit analysis, implementing conditions). They should be selected from each of the four groups of countries defined by the MCSD working party. The idea is to start with Tunisia to establish the methodology, which would then be reproduced for other case studies.

On this aspect, to take account of experience built up by many bodies which are specialised in the water sector it is proposed that there should be close cooperation with such experts: international institutions (FAO, European Commission, EIB, World Bank, CIHEAM, World Water Institute, the SEMIDE Network), and that the work done by the Blue Plan amongst others (METAP programme, indicators) should be drawn on.

### 2. At country level : an analysis of water demand management policies

For two countries (Tunisia, Lebanon), a more in-depth analysis of policies influencing water demand management will be drawn up:

definition of a methodology for assessing water demand management strategies (definition of indicators and the terms of reference for national studies;) documentary study in the country, a critical analysis of the policy/policies which influence water demand, describing:

- the present situation: physical, human and economic context of water management.
- the institutions involved in water management and how they go about it: the different actors directly or indirectly involved with water management, their scope of intervention and their means of action.
- issues raised by water management based on national prospective analyses.
- present and planned national strategies: aims, priorities, action programmes, cost and financing of policies, international cooperation.

assessment.

For this section, France (the Water Directorate, Agence de l'Eau Rhone Mediterranee-Corse) has been approached with a request for funding which is at present being studied. Further

sources of funding could be helpful, and for this the assistance of the members of the MCSD is required. National studies could be contracted out to national consultants under Blue Plan coordination.

#### **COUNTRIES COVERED BY THE DIFFERENT PROGRAMMES**

Groups	EC,Polagwat	METAP	MCSD water follow-up
1:Others	TK;IT	TK;SL;CR;BO;AL	
2: ES; LB; MO; CY; SY	ES	LB; CY; MO	LB
3: IL; TN; MA; DZ	IL; TN	TN; DZ	TN
4: EG; LY;	EG	EG	

**II. SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF COASTAL ZONES**

(REPORT TO BE SUBMITTED LATER)