

Table of Contents

Main body of the report

Annex I: List of participants

Annex II: Strategic Review 2000: Recommendations and Proposals for action

Annex III: Tunis Declaration by the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development for the Contracting Parties

Annex IV: Summary of conclusions adopted by the participants

Introduction

1. In accordance with the decision taken at its fifth meeting (Rome, 1-3 July 1999), the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development held its sixth meeting at the "Le Palace" hotel in La Marsa (Tunisia), from 14-17 November 2000, at the kind invitation of the Tunisian government.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by the following thirty members of the Commission: Algeria, International Association of Mediterranean Forests (IAMF), Mediterranean Association of national agencies for energy control (MEDENER), Spain, MED FORUM, Mediterranean Wetlands (MEDWET), Monaco, Morocco, Municipality of Naples, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Municipality of Calvia, Cyprus, European Community, Egypt, Environnement et Développement au Maghreb (ENDA), WWF International, France, Greece, Group of Chambers of Commerce for the Development of the Greek Islands (EOAEN), Mediterranean Water Institute (IME), Italy, the Lebanon, Libya, Malta, MEDCITES network, MEDCOAST, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey.
3. The following Regional Activity Centres and other components of MAP also attended the meeting: Blue Plan (BP/RAC), Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC), Specially Protected Areas (SPA/RAC), Environmental Remote Sensing (ERS/RAC), Clean Production (CP/RAC), the Secretariat of the 100 historic sites, and the MED POL programme; the MAP Coordinating Unit acted as Secretariat to the meeting.
4. The following United Nations Specialised Agencies, inter-governmental organisations and other partners attended the meeting as observers: Mediterranean Environment Technical Assistance Programme (METAP), UNIDO-ICS, World Health Organisation (WHO), City of Rome/ECOMED, League of Arab States, Arab Network of NGOs for the environment and development (RAED), RAMOGE, Tunisia-Mediterranean Association for sustainable development (ATUMED), Friends of the Birds Association, as well as the Palestinian Authority in accordance with the decision taken by the Eleventh meeting of the Contracting Parties.
5. A full list of participants can be found in Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the Meeting

6. Before officially opening the meeting, H.E. Mrs. Faiza Kefi, Minister for the environment and land planning for Tunisia, and outgoing President of the MCSD, invited participants to observe one minute's silence in memory of two of the great architects of MAP, Mr. Franjo Gasparovic and Mrs. Bani Layachi, as well as Mrs. Maria de Balle, a former member of the Commission, representing ASCAME, and who had sat on its steering committee, all three having recently passed away. All those who had followed the development of MAP since its launch would be fully aware of the tireless work put in by Mr. Gasparovic on behalf of Croatia, and Mrs. Layachi for Morocco in order to promote the MAP cause in the Mediterranean.
7. Moreover, Mrs. F. Kefi announced at the meeting that UNEP's Sasakawa prize for the environment was to go to Mr. Michel Batisse. The ceremony, to be held at United Nations headquarters in New York on 17 November, would honour this French scientist's eminent contribution to conserving our planet's natural resources, and protecting the marine and land environment. Mr. M. Batisse, who is particularly known for having organised the interdisciplinary research programme on Man and the Biosphere, (MAB), had from the outset played a very active role within MAP as President of the Blue Plan, and later within the MCSD. The honour being bestowed

upon him thus reflected on the Mediterranean as a whole, its scientific community and its cooperation programme for the environment.

8. In her opening statement, Mrs. F. Kefi welcomed all participants to Tunisia and wished them a pleasant stay. She recalled the role which her country had played in implementing the concept of sustainable development at regional level, particularly through organising the MED 21 ministerial conference in Tunis in November 1994, which was to give rise to the MCSD and its first meeting in Rabat in 1996. Five years on the time was now ripe to draw up the first frank assessment. This meeting would therefore be called upon to answer some fundamental questions, by approving or rejecting the content of a major document drawn up by the Secretariat of MAP/MCSD, thanks to the contributions made by the members of the Commission and several consultants: what was the state of play, where did our successes and short-comings lie, how could more impetus be given to the current process and, given the unprecedented links created between the States and civil society within the Commission framework, how could a more united partnership be achieved? In this respect, the Tunis Declaration to be submitted to the high level segment of the meeting for adoption represented a new commitment to push ahead.
9. Mr. Lucien Chabason, MAP Coordinator, thanked the Tunisian authorities on behalf of the Secretariat for their warm welcome and excellent organisation of the meeting. He particularly thanked Mrs. Kefi for the efficiency with which she had led the work of the MCSD's Steering Committee and guided the process of preparing the Strategic Review, the recommendations and the Tunis Declaration, which were to be submitted to the meeting. Having run through the various initiatives taken towards sustainable development in the region since 1994, he then briefly presented the agenda for the meeting, which focused initially on an examination of the Strategic Review 2000. Referring to the conference on climate change due to open in The Hague, Mr. Chabason pointed out that the major issues being discussed at world level also existed in the Mediterranean, and therefore in the Strategic Review, raising questions concerning our consumption and production patterns, and the tricky exercise of using the triangle composed of "economic development, equity, and safeguarding the environment" as the cornerstone for all our activities.

Agenda item 2: Election of the Steering Committee

10. In accordance with article 17 of the Rules of Procedure, and once the President of the outgoing Steering Committee had invited the representatives of the Contracting Parties and each of the three categories to present the outcome of the customary consultations amongst themselves, the Commission duly elected its new Steering Committee, the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Malta) being a full member; its composition is as follows:

President:	H.E Mr. Bernard Fautrier	(Monaco)
Vice- Presidents:	H.E. Mrs. Faiza Kefi	(Tunisia)
	H.E. Mr. Francis Zammit Dimech	(Malta)
	Mr. Alex Lascaratos	(Greece)
	Mr. George Giourgas	(EOAEN)
	Mr. Magdi Ibrahim	(ENDA)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Armando Mauro	(Naples Municipality)

Agenda item 3: Adoption of the Agenda and organisation of work

11. Assuming his role as president, H.E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Minister Plenipotentiary for Monaco, thanked the members of the Commission for the honour they had bestowed upon him, and added that since its inception he had enjoyed the privilege of regularly participating in the activities of the MCSD, and in its meetings as the representative of his country. This was particularly true of the most recent past, which had been marked by the intensive preparation of the Strategic Review, an essential element for the future, and whose steering committee Monaco had hosted.
12. The Secretariat pointed out that at the request of several members, there was a proposal to amend the draft agenda in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG. 170/1 by rolling into one the two ad hoc groups foreseen for "regional and international cooperation" and "recommendations and proposals for action", and retaining the other group on "The Tunis Declaration". Since the ad hoc session scheduled for the next morning had been converted into a plenary in order to examine the outcome of the groups, this would leave more time for the examination of the thematic activities and pre-feasibility studies. The meeting adopted its agenda thus amended.

Agenda item 4: Examination of the Strategic Review

13. The Deputy Coordinator introduced the Strategic Review in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG. 170/3, recalling the main phases of a preparation process which had left the Secretariat facing some very tight deadlines: initiation of work in December 1999, the drafting of five preparatory documents examined at the 3rd meeting of the Steering Committee in January 2000, the preparation of the national reports and the three regional studies, the meeting of the steering committee for the Strategic Review in May, the 4th meeting of the Steering Committee in June, working sessions of the drafting team comprised of the Secretariat and two experts/consultants, the sending out of the initial version of the report in late July, and finally the preparation of the report's final version in September, in the light of comments submitted by the MCSD members.
14. Before the general discussion was opened the Deputy Coordinator explained what was expected of it: an examination of the structure and content of the Review, and an insight into what the members of the Commission felt should become of this document post Tunis. Obviously it was a veritable mine of information, which it had not been possible to exploit to its full potential, since some of the reports had only come in once the initial version was awaiting dispatch. Several of the national reports were themselves worthy of distribution, in a format which participants were invited to propose. As for the Review itself, comments should be made on the amendments to the initial version, as well as on any further reworking still required, and its status as a MAP contribution to the second Earth Summit. Moreover, the recommendations and proposals for action comprising the second section were not to be discussed in the course of this exercise, since they were a separate item on the agenda, to be dealt with in an ad hoc session and in plenary.
15. All those who took the floor during the general discussion welcomed the quality and scope of the work accomplished, stressing the limited time available for its preparation as well as the relevance of the analyses, the wealth of information collected, and the major improvements made both in structure and content as compared with the initial version. Thanks were due both to the Secretariat and consultants, who had managed to pull off a very difficult summary by focusing on inter-activity, as well as to the countries themselves, who had taken their contribution most seriously. Even in its current form the Review already largely met the aims assigned to it at the outset.

16. From an organisational point of view, workable deadlines should be set for the preparation of such documents in the future. As for the actual structure of the document, it could be rendered more “light-weight”, for example by transferring the remedies and proposals which were “drowned” within the body of the text into an annex. Concerning follow-up of the Commission’s work, this was a unique opportunity to assess how countries had implemented the recommendations already adopted on the first five themes. Finally, some specific comments were raised concerning certain points: the lack of a contents page, the shortcomings of annex 3 compared with annex 4, contradictions or linkages which cropped up here and there (tourism/leisure), the lack of any reference to certain organisations (UNIDO-ICS) which were nonetheless active in the region, or to some socio-economic actors in the partnership and their networks, the need to make more systematic use of indicators, and more thorough treatment of some issues barely touched upon such as the wetlands and other specific eco-systems, climate change, the seriousness of which for the Mediterranean was highlighted by the world conference due to open in The Hague, the growing divide between the mainland and the islands, the importance of sub-regional agreements (the Adriatic initiative, RAMOGE), and the essential synergy of all work going on within the region. Finally, two national delegations felt that the Review placed too much emphasis on the environmental dimension of sustainable development, to the detriment of the “economic growth” dimension, which was of crucial importance to the countries to the South and East of the basin, which were striving to raise their standards of living, and to eradicate poverty. In this respect, the notion of “shared but differentiated responsibility” needed to be stressed, since countries at very different stages of development could not be expected to put in identical efforts.
17. Regarding the future of the Review and the use to be made of it, most speakers were in favour of preparing a summary or synthesis in brochure form- possibly including some boxes or data sheets- endeavouring to make it accessible to as broad an audience as possible, by using every possible opportunity to circulate it at international, regional, and national level. The summary should also provide the basis for MAP and the MCSD’s contribution to future international conferences, such as UNEP’s Governing Council, the meetings of the UN/CSD, and in particular the 2nd Earth Summit in 2002. A consultation procedure should be set up for this purpose. As it stood, the Review was already sound and useful. It could doubtless be further enriched by using updated information to complete the tables in the annexes, but without actually changing its substance. Clear and workable deadlines should be set for written comments. Moreover, three participants supported the idea expressed by the EC representative, of drawing further on the national reports and the data contained within them, which shortage of time had made it impossible to use, in order to produce “success story” country profiles or data sheets. Another participant felt that the “Strategic Review should be changed into a review strategy”, in other words that its findings and conclusions should be used to build up an action strategy for the future, taking care to associate it as closely as possible with other similar efforts being undertaken in the region, such as the Euro-Mediterranean conference currently being held in Marseilles. Spain indicated on this point that it was ready to host an extraordinary meeting of the representatives of the Contracting Parties in 2002 prior to the Earth Summit, to finalise and approve a draft strategy for the region. Finally, two participants stressed that the preparation of the Review had set in motion a movement of participation and interaction, which should be revitalised for further initiatives, rather than simply allowing it to peter out.
18. The Deputy Coordinator responded by saying that the Secretariat would take account of the comments made by participants. Certain shortcomings or deficiencies should be seen within the context of preparation, since some of the contributions had arrived too late for them to be put to full use, despite the deadline having been extended by two months. Although as a whole the quality of the country reports was cause for

satisfaction- even though they differed in length in such a way as to make it impossible for them all to be used as “profiles”, which in any case would need to be officially validated by the national authorities- the reason behind several shortcomings noted in the very limited number of responses received from non-Contracting Party members needed to be looked into (6 out of a total of 30 old and new members). This pointed to a lack of participation, of which the Commission should be made aware. The discussions gave rise to a consensus on the possibility of using the Review in summary form and with attractive presentation for multiple purposes. As for the few modifications to be made to the Review itself, the same consensus existed on not changing the actual substance; the new, slightly amended version would be prepared in the light of comments already made or to be submitted in writing by 31 December at the latest.

Agenda item 4: Examination and adoption of the draft recommendations and proposals for action, and the draft Tunis Declaration

19. As agreed, the two working groups met separately in ad hoc sessions on the afternoon of Tuesday, 14 November, the members of the Commission being left free to join the group of their choice. Each group appointed a chairperson and a rapporteur.

Recommendations and proposals for action

20. The working party on recommendations and proposals for action met under the chairmanship of Mr. Giourgas (EOAEN), with Mr. Ben Mansour (Tunisia) acting as rapporteur. The Secretariat was represented by Mr. Arab Hoballah. The recommendations would be used to lay the foundations for the preparation of a draft strategy to be submitted to the Contracting Parties, and would thus help structure MAP's work in this field over coming years. This section of the Strategic Review was therefore presented separately, and was the only part to be submitted to the meeting for official adoption in the plenary, with note simply being taken of the rest of the document.
21. One participant pointed out that some passages in the Review gave the impression of also being drafted in recommendation form, and should therefore be reworded in order to dispel this impression, and to clearly separate the body of the Review from the section currently being dealt with by the working group. The use of acronyms which were not widely known should be avoided, as should the confusion stemming from the use of terms such as “the Barcelona system”, which could refer both to the Euro-Mediterranean process and the renewal of the Convention and its Protocols which had occurred in the same year- 1995- and the same city- Barcelona.
22. The Secretariat recalled that the decision had already been taken to produce the Strategic Review, including the recommendations, in a more legible summary form for the various groups within society, and the public in general. The Group's remit was to examine and approve the recommendations for the Contracting Parties. Three speakers supported this point of view. A further participant challenged the actual term “recommendations”, which he felt exceeded the MCSD's purely advisory remit: “proposals” struck him as being a more advisable term.
23. On several occasions, the Group's chairman took the floor to avoid the discussions simply becoming an exercise in “linguistic polishing”, and concentrating rather on comments of substance, since any problems of form or of concordance between the two working languages could be solved by forwarding written proposals on wording to the Secretariat; the Group should not become a drafting committee.

24. The issue of a regional legal instrument on the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas, the study of which was foreseen in one of the paragraphs of the recommendations, sparked a long and lively discussion. Several speakers refused to reopen a dossier which they felt had already been turned down by the Contracting Parties; there were within MAP methodological instruments and sufficiently explicit provisions on coastal management, starting with the MCSD's recommendations adopted on this theme. Other speakers felt on the contrary that the explosive urbanisation of the coastline, with all that it entailed for the environment and the quality of life called for a binding instrument, which could take the form of a new Protocol to the Barcelona Convention. The meeting finally agreed on a compromise solution.
25. Following a first careful reading on a paragraph by paragraph basis, which it was not possible to conclude in the ad hoc session, discussions resumed in plenary the following morning- 15 November- under Mr. B. Fautrier's chairmanship, to complete examination of the recommendations.
26. In the course of this examination, the Commission looked at the draft recommendation on the conditions for appointing MCSD members. Following consultation with a small drafting group, it adopted the compromise formula based on wording proposed by the representatives of Cyprus and the EC.
27. Once certain substantive amendments had thus been made to the whole of the initial text in ad hoc session, then in plenary, the meeting adopted the recommendations and proposals for action to be found in annex II to this report.

Draft "Tunis Declaration"

28. The Working Group met in ad hoc session under the chairmanship of Mr. B. Fautrier, with Mr. L. Caplat (France) acting as rapporteur, and Mr. L. Chabason, MAP Coordinator, representing the Secretariat.
29. The representative of Greece wondered whether it was possible for the MCSD to adopt a Declaration without its members being accredited to this end. This was a tricky issue of remit, apart from the fact that by conferring a more political note upon the Declaration it would give the impression that the other members from the 3 categories were being excluded.
30. The Chairman, backed by the majority of members, felt that point 3.f of the MCSD's remit gave it the authority to "provide reports and appropriate recommendations to the meetings of the Contracting Parties". To make this interpretation of the Declaration more explicit, the Group changed its title to "Draft Tunis Declaration by the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development to the Contracting Parties".
31. Having read through the text in depth on a paragraph by paragraph basis, and having made the few changes required, the ad hoc Group approved it as a whole.
32. During the session on the afternoon of 15 November, which was chaired by Mr. A. Lascaratos (Greece) the "Tunis Declaration" as reworked and approved by the ad hoc Group was submitted to the plenary. The Chairman proposed that the text be re-read, with each member of the Commission being free to make any comments or to propose amendments.
33. The representatives of Monaco, Spain and Italy advocated that the entire draft Declaration be approved as such. The representative of France added that the last meeting of the MCSD had validated the method of working in small groups for the

specific purpose of enabling the Commission to work more rapidly, whilst the representative of Tunisia pointed out that the members of the Commission who had not participated in the ad hoc Group on the Declaration had submitted certain written comments to him, which the Group had taken into account when reworking the text. There were therefore no grounds for reopening discussions.

34. The representative of Cyprus had no specific comments to make on the text, but stated that no member of the MCSD could be denied the right to examine and amend a text submitted for adoption. The representative of Malta supported this opinion, stating that it was a question of principle. For her part, the representative of the EC, whilst admitting that she had submitted some comments in writing to the ad hoc Group, which had been taken on board, proposed three further substantive amendments as well as other minor ones, and felt that the procedural argument used to avoid discussion and validation by the plenary could well give rise to many problems in the Commission's future work.
35. The Chairman, whilst admitting that the method of working in small groups had been adopted in order to accelerate work, stated that, as chairman of the session, he could not condemn anyone to silence. The Coordinator of MAP moved that a short speaking time be granted to all those wishing to propose amendments.
36. The representative of France added that the Commission could not become a standing drafting committee, all the more so since in this case the Declaration was to be re-read and no doubt reworked by the Ministers and Heads of Delegation during the following day's high level Segment. The French delegation left it to the Steering Committee in its wisdom to ensure that in future discussions total spontaneity of expression would be guaranteed, so that the Commission could devote more time to substantive issues. The representative of Tunisia went along with this, pointing out that this was an opportunity for the Commission to try out a new method which it had adopted following due reflection.
37. Having weighed up and included some of the proposed amendments from the EC and Egypt, the meeting then approved the Tunis Declaration as a whole, to be submitted to the high level Segment for adoption.

Agenda item 5: High level Segment on sustainable development in the Mediterranean, vision for the region and role of the MAP/MCSD

Opening of the Meeting

38. At the start of the morning session on November 16, H.E. Mrs. Faiza Kefi, Minister for the environment and land planning for Tunisia, expressed her thanks to H.E. Mr. Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, the President of the Republic of Tunisia, for the lively interest which he was showing in this meeting being held under his high patronage, as well as to the Prime Minister of Tunisia, Mr. Mohamed Ghannouchi, who had agreed to grace the Commission meeting with his presence in order to open the high level Segment.
39. Addressing H.E. Mr. Mohamed Gannouchi, Mr. Lucien Chabason, MAP Coordinator, stated that his having come to this forum was a great honour for all members of the Commission. Everyone was aware of the highly active part which Tunisia had taken in MAP since its launch in 1975, the constant support it had provided, the important role it played in hosting the Centre on protected areas, and the exemplary nature of its environmental policy and of the institutions responsible for its implementation. Following the Rio Summit in 1992, it had once again been Tunisia which played a pioneering role, hosting the MED 21 Conference two years later, which was to lead to the adoption of the Agenda 21 and the setting up of the MCSD.

40. Having recalled the MCSD's achievements to date, Mr. Chabason then underlined the stage marked by the holding of its 6th meeting in Tunis. With the Strategic Review 2000 which had just been submitted to it, and to which all the riparian states as well as other members of civil society had largely contributed, the Commission was now in possession of an objective and contrasted analysis of the state of play of sustainable development in the Mediterranean, which meant that the successes could be flagged up, but at the same time any loopholes and shortcomings identified, which would need to be corrected by the region's political leaders. The Review also provided a basis for a specific contribution to be made by the Mediterranean to the 2nd Earth Summit to be held in 2002. Finally, the draft "Tunis Declaration" which Ministers and Heads of Delegation were invited to adopt that very day represented a new commitment on their part to push ahead with renewed impetus along the path opened up in Rio in 1992, and thereafter confirmed in Tunis in 1994.
41. H.E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Minister plenipotentiary for Monaco and President of the MCSD's Steering Committee, stressed the originality of the MCSD, being open to local authorities, socio-economic actors and non-governmental organisations, which meant that all those who had a decisive role to play in striving towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean could be brought together in one single forum for dialogue and reflection. He paid tribute to Mrs. F. Kefi and her colleagues whose energy and competence in serving the Mediterranean cause were trump cards in terms of the success of this meeting.
42. H.E. Mr. Mohamed Ghannouchi, Prime Minister of Tunisia, opening the work of the high level Segment, expressed to participants the on-going interest shown by the President of the Tunisian Republic in the sustainable development cause in the region. Recalling that the Mediterranean, the cradle of the most prestigious civilisations over thousands of years, acted as a link and melting pot for the most varied cultures, he stressed that at the dawn of this new millennium Tunisia was actively militating in favour of a new model of environment-friendly development. The work of the Commission which Tunisia was proud to be hosting had allowed the main issues in the region to be identified: over-exploitation of natural resources, worsening of the phenomena of desertification and erosion, loss of biodiversity both on land and at sea, and the seriousness of pollution in all its guises. Moreover, the eradication of poverty and exclusion were both requirements of sustainable development. The call made by the President of the Tunisian Republic for the creation of a world fund for solidarity and combating poverty was part and parcel of this approach. Mr. Ghannouchi invited the Mediterranean countries to support this initiative and to strive to achieve it, in order to establish the values of solidarity between States and peoples. In conclusion, the Tunisian Prime Minister stated that this meeting represented a major and positive step towards the preparation of the 2nd Earth Summit in 2002, given the opportunities it provided for the Mediterranean countries to coordinate their efforts and to define their objectives on the basis of a balanced assessment of the development process within the region.

Attendance

43. During the meeting of the high level Segment, the following heads of delegations took the floor: H. E. Mr. Mohamed Ghannouchi, Prime Minister of Tunisia, H. E. Mrs. Faiza Kefi, Minister for the environment and land planning for Tunisia; H. E. Mr. Francis Zammit Dimech, Minister for the environment for Malta and President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention; H. E. Ramiz Mehmedagic, Minister for land planning and the environment from Bosnia and Herzegovina; H. E. Mr. Jaume Matas Palau, Minister for the environment from Spain; H. E. Mr. Elias Efthymiopoulos, Deputy Minister for the environment from Greece; H. E. Mr. Michel

Moussa, Minister for the environment from the Lebanon; H. E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Minister plenipotentiary from Monaco and President of the MCSD's Steering Committee; H. E. Mr. Farouk Adli, Minister for the environment from the Syrian Arab Republic; H. E. Mr. Fevzi Aytekin, Minister for the environment from Turkey; H. E. Mr. Daniel Contenay, French Ambassador to Tunisia; Mr. Mohamed Si Youcef, Director General, Ministry of the environment, Algeria; Mr. George Giourgas, European Affairs Adviser, EOAEN; Mrs. Margarita Najera-Dranzabal, Mayoress of Calvia; Mr. Andrija Randic, Head of Unit for marine and coastal protection, Ministry of the environment from Croatia; Mr. Nikos Georgiades, Director for the environment, Ministry of agriculture and the environment, Cyprus; Mr. Christoph Bail, Head of the Development and Environment Unit, European Commission; Mrs. Amal M. Mourad, Director of the environment and sustainable development department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Egypt; Mr. Magdi Ibrahim, Coordinator of Environnement et Développement au Maghreb (ENDA); Mrs. Selmin Burak, Mediterranean Water Institute (IME); Mr. Matteo Barada, Director General for marine protection, Ministry of the environment, Italy; Mr. Abdul Fattah Boargob, Head of the Cooperation Office, General environment Authority, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; Mr. Joan Parpal Marfa, Secretary General of MedCités; Mr. Rafael Madueño, Secretary General of MED Forum; Mrs. Lamia Mansour, Medwet Regional facilitator; Mr. Abdelfetah Sahibi, Head of the Planning and Prospection Division, Ministry of the Environment, Morocco; Mr. Mitja Bricelj, Adviser to the Slovenian Government; B. Bassel Torjeman, Counsellor, Embassy of the Palestinian Authority in Tunisia.

Statements by Ministers and Heads of Delegation

44. H. E. Mr. Ramiz Mehmedagic, Minister for land planning and the environment from Bosnia and Herzegovina, expressed his gratitude to the Tunisian authorities for their warm welcome, before stating that his country gave high priority to environmental issues, and had begun to set up an institutional and legislative mechanism for tackling them. A framework law on the protection of the marine environment had been drawn up, containing a series of anti-pollution provisions. Bosnia and Herzegovina was also striving to protect its river catchments under the Stability Pact for South-East Europe. At Mediterranean level, his country was actively involved in some of MAP's activities, for which it had opened an information bureau, and it fully subscribed to the framework of recommendations for sustainable development set out in the Tunis Declaration. The Minister expressed the wish that this collaboration could be further increased, and that Bosnia and Herzegovina receive United Nations support for implementing priority action.
45. H. E. Mr. Elias Efthymiopoulos, Deputy Minister for the environment from Greece, pointed out that his country provided MAP with effective support since as of 1982 it had hosted the Coordinating Unit in Athens. Over the years MAP had proved to be a body for peaceful cooperation between all Mediterranean countries without exception. As one of the four Mediterranean countries which were members of the European Union, Greece felt particularly responsible vis a vis the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, and felt that in this respect the process launched in 1995 had still not achieved the scale which could reasonably be expected of it. Timing had it that this meeting was being held at the same time as the one in The Hague on climate change, and a link should be created between the two, since this issue was of the utmost interest to the Mediterranean due to its effects on water resources, desertification, the disappearance of species of flora and fauna, and coastal erosion. The Greek Minister proposed that a message from the MCSD should be sent to the World Conference in The Hague, recalling the commitment of its members to the environment and sustainable development, and their desire to see new negotiations resulting in compromise.

46. H. E. Mr. Jaume Matas Palau, Minister of the Environment for Spain, stated that the time was ripe to effectively apply all the fine words, given the worrying picture presented by the region, and the multiple pressures being exerted on the region's essential activities such as agriculture, fisheries and tourism. A real "state of alert within society" needed to be created if there was a wish for a prosperous future in harmony with human development. At that precise moment, he stressed, more than 180 countries were meeting in The Hague to discuss climate change, the effects of which on our region were widely enough known: spread of desertification and erosion and a shortage of water resources, to the detriment of national economies which were largely dependant on tourism for their income. Spain had itself experienced the seriousness of these threats, but was making its own experience available to the entire region in areas where it was determined to take drastic measures, such as water management, wastewater treatment, and rational coastal planning. Mr. Matas Palau announced that Spain was proposing to organise an extraordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties in 2002, in order to adopt a strategy for sustainable development, the preparation of which would be based on the Review currently before the Commission. The speaker thanked the Coordinating Unit and the MAP activity centres for their efficient work towards cooperation between the riparian states on such crucial issues. The ratification of the new or amended instruments in the Barcelona system was a priority, in order to provide the essential legal basis for the efforts which the region would need to undertake over the coming years. For its part, Spain proposed that the Tunis Declaration become part of the Mediterranean contribution to the 2nd Earth Summit in 2002.

47. H. E. Mr. Francis Zammit Dimech, Minister of the environment from Malta, and President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, pointed out that people around the globe had now long been convinced of the need to reconcile environment and development. Prompted by the Brundtland report, the sustainable development concept had progressively become established during the early 90s, and the Mediterranean region had provided a remarkable example of this development. But the obstacles had still not disappeared, and there was still a lack of understanding as to what sustainability actually meant in practice. The speaker expressed his full support for the concept of solidarity put forward by the Tunisian Prime Minister, since sustainable development could only be achieved with the unqualified backing of peoples and public opinion. Malta, for its part, had taken steps to this end. A national Commission on sustainable development was to be set up in the near future, in order to implement the Environmental Protection Act; moreover, some local authorities and councils were empowered to take decisions in application of the subsidiarity principle, and numerous training programmes had been organised, particularly within the framework of MAP's Coastal areas management programme. In this respect, the speaker added, a regional Protocol on integrated coastal management would be a great asset. Environment ministers had been the first to feel the effects of globalisation, since pollution knew no borders. It was up to them today to respond to the new challenges by creating effective solidarity amongst themselves, of which this meeting provided tangible proof.

48. H. E. Mr. Michel Moussa, Lebanese Minister of the environment, pointed out that his country had drawn up the guidelines for an action plan intended to protect the environment. Besides the problems shared by the riparian states, his country also faced reconstruction following long years of conflict. In his investiture speech the Lebanese Prime Minister had recently brought the environment back onto the agenda by strengthening the powers of the ministry responsible for it. Thus, an environmental code was currently being discussed in the Lebanese parliament, and once the implementing decree had come into force, all reconstruction projects would have to meet certain requirements, such as carrying out an initial impact assessment. Similarly, a planning programme was being prepared in cooperation with MAP, and

would be launched in the near future for the coastline of Southern Lebanon. The Lebanon was also studying the impact of accession to the Euro-Mediterranean partnership on the various sectors of its economy. In this context, the speaker emphasised, it was to be hoped that the work initiated in the Commission on the theme of "Free Trade and the Environment", for which the Lebanon was a joint task manager, would mean that it would be possible to identify what restructuring was required to allow accession to the free trade area under more equitable conditions for the countries on the Southern and Eastern banks. Finally, Mr. Moussa referred to the model for environmental protection and management provided by Tunisia, a prime reference for the Lebanon given the historical ties which had linked the two countries since their common Phoenician ancestors had founded Carthage.

49. H. E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier, Minister plenipotentiary for Monaco, having noted that there was widespread conceptual awareness of the need for sustainable development, wondered about how it was actually being applied. There was no doubt that the growth achieved in the second half of the past decade had facilitated this increased awareness, but we should not lose sight of the fact that there were still pockets of tension or even conflict in the region, which stood in the way of any development. Whilst it was our basic desire to bring levels of development more closely into line, particularly through a Euro-Mediterranean partnership, there was no doubt that this would be a long term effort, which would require increased means, particularly of a financial nature. There was nothing utopian about striving for a free trade area, when one recalled that barely forty years ago the European area was still strewn with customs barriers and other restrictions to trade. But beyond the economic and social dimension, there was also the environmental one, with the acute pressures and problems common to all countries in the region. That was why Monaco, which had long been endeavouring to redress the situation, particularly at sub-regional level under the Ramoge agreement, was delighted to note the imminent launch of the SAP, would like to see the Emergency Protocol revised, and biodiversity protected, as was the case with the Accobams agreement on cetaceans, which was due to come into force in the near future, and which the countries concerned were urged to ratify. To conclude, the speaker stressed the seriousness of climate change for the Mediterranean, and the decisive step which the Twelfth Meeting of the Contracting Parties would represent, to be held in one year's time in Monaco following the 7th meeting of the MCSD and before the deadline of Rio + 10.
50. H. E. Mr. Farouk Adli, Minister of State responsible for environmental affairs in the Syrian Arab Republic, thanked the Tunisian authorities, and the MAP and MCSD Secretariat for the efforts they had made through this meeting towards the environment in the region, in cooperation with international organisations. Syria was particularly grateful since it was exposed to certain specific risks as a result of its geographical location, the semi-closed nature of the Mediterranean Sea, and the current flows in the Eastern Basin, which transported a heavy pollution load towards its coasts. Syria had focused its development strategy on sustainability, and had also adopted a national strategy on the protection of biodiversity. It was our duty to future generations to protect our common sea. The Coastal Areas Management Programme which MAP had conducted in Syria had allowed the local actors to learn some useful lessons and to pick up the baton. But there were still further studies to be carried out, and Syria was counting on genuine support for projects in the field. Given the surroundings within which it lived- with numerous infringements of international law, such as the dumping of toxic substances and the threats raised by nuclear weapons- his Government urged the Mediterranean states to adopt a mechanism to guarantee the region's integrity. Under the leadership of President Bachir el-Assad, Syria was now more committed than ever before to peace, prosperity and mutual respect prevailing in the region.

51. H.E. Mr. Fevzi Aytekin, Turkish Minister of the environment, expressed his gratitude to Mrs. Faiza Kefi, the Tunisian authorities and the Secretariat for their excellent organisation of the meeting, and was delighted at the important step which Tunis represented for Mediterranean cooperation. The creation of the MCSD, and the work it had carried out had enabled us to reassess our vision of sustainable development, by linking the Euro-Mediterranean process to the Barcelona system. Turkey laid great store by the strengthening of cooperation mechanisms within the Mediterranean, particularly with the international financing institutions. As for Turkey, its main preoccupation these days was to integrate environmental concerns into all aspects of sustainable development. Submission of the Strategic Review would prove to be a decisive achievement for our common work in the future. It should be finalised and used as the basis for a strategic framework, whilst providing material for the MCSD's contribution to forthcoming major international conferences. The speaker confirmed his country's offer to host the seventh meeting of the MCSD in Antalya; he personally along with his colleagues would ensure that the next meeting continued along the path being embarked upon in Tunis today, and that it was a success.

52. H. E. Mr. Daniel Contenay, French Ambassador in Tunisia, provided a message of hope, optimism and determination on behalf of his country. The increased efforts being made by countries to implement sustainable development policies was cause for satisfaction, as was the fact that links were being forged between those responsible at European and Mediterranean level for land planning, who had met this year for the first time, and also the role played by the NGOs and socio-economic actors, which had become involved in the work of the MCSD. However, recognition of what had been achieved should be tempered by what still remained to be done: after 25 years of regional cooperation, the Mediterranean still had no regional instrument for combating de-ballasting and accidental or deliberate maritime pollution, and countries were still inadequately prepared for facing the free trade area planned for the long term. This meant that there was a need to mobilise efforts over coming years, to invent new working methods and new linkages- such as between the Euro-Mediterranean process, MAP and the MCSD. Gradually, a Mediterranean strategy was being built up. The Strategic Review was a further step in this process, heralding the Rio + 10 encounter.

53. H. E. Mrs. Faiza Kefi, Tunisia's Minister for the environment and land planning, who chaired the first session of Ministerial statements, spoke in her capacity as representative of her country, under Mr. B. Fautrier's chairmanship. She presented her country's main achievements within the perspective of balanced sectoral development, with a strong social component, thus answering the call made by the President of the Tunisian Republic: national Agenda 21, studies and implementation of procedures aimed at managing fragile eco-systems, integrated management of the coasts and the hinterland, land planning with the target of 9 m² of green area per inhabitant, the rational use and consumption of natural resources, programmes for protecting biodiversity, controlling urbanisation along a coastline where 30% of the population was concentrated, construction of sewage works, with Tunisia's rate of provision matching that of developed countries. Numerous speakers had emphasised the role played by Tunisia at regional level in the adoption of Agenda MED 21, and the setting up of the MCSD. This meeting already had some notable achievements to its credit, such as the adoption of the recommendations and the Tunis Declaration- for which those experts and participants who had added to its value should be congratulated. The Minister supported the proposal to send a message from the MCSD to The Hague, underscoring the concern of Mediterranean peoples regarding climate change, and their desire to respect the commitments made in Kyoto. Finally, she warmly thanked all those Ministers who had made the journey to Tunis in spite of their heavy schedules due to the virtually concomitant organisation of the climate conference and the meeting in Marseilles on the Euro-Mediterranean process.

54. Mr. Mohamed Si Youcef, representing Algeria, noted his country's determined commitment to implement sustainable development, with reference to the MCSD's principles and recommendations. He added that the MAP Secretariat deserved to be thanked for the quality of its work both prior to and during this meeting under Mrs. F. Kefi's aegis and that of the Tunisian delegation. Algeria was facing particularly serious ecological problems, such as desertification which, by reducing the area available for cultivation, was threatening the food security of its population. It was also faced with the challenge of globalisation, unable to find the resources needed for the adjustments required because of the constraints stemming from repayment of its debt. Within this context, the priorities established by the country would at the very least require the setting up at regional level of mechanisms allowing for information exchange and technology transfer. The recent creation of the Algerian Ministry for the environment did in any case prove his country's will to set up institutions which were capable of mobilising efforts in order to tackle the most urgent issues.
55. Mr. Bassel Torjeman, Counsellor in the Palestinian Authority's Embassy in Tunisia, announced that he would be making his statement on behalf of the Authority's Minister for the environment, who had been unable to make the journey to Tunis as a result of the current crisis. He briefly mentioned the events which in 1967 had led up to the occupation and splitting up of the Palestinian territory into two parts- the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. This state of affairs had also sparked environmental repercussions: the arbitrary drawing on natural resources- including water-, health risks, and the laying of landmines. Since the setting up of the Authority many initiatives had been undertaken in order to shape a legal and statutory framework with a body of inspectors, to bring in inter-institutional coordination, and to improve waste collection, in spite of the intense pressure generated by high unemployment and the very young average age of the population. The links recently forged with MAP, particularly within MED POL, were the basis for cooperation which the Palestinian environmental leaders were hoping to consolidate in the long term.
56. Mr. George Giorgas, representing EOAEN, stated that he would be brief in order to more clearly highlight two notions which he felt should be the focus of reflection over the coming days: companies and civil society. If one were to envisage the scenario of the ideal Mediterranean, having rehabilitated its environment and ensured its sustainable development, but in the absence of any companies, it was clear that this would be catastrophic. Also, it was obvious that in the future civil society would continue to play an ever-increasing role at all levels of decision-taking. The speaker expressed his satisfaction at the fact that the proposal he had made the previous day to organise informal meetings between socio-economic actors, local communities and NGOs which were members of the MCSD had been favourably received by the meeting.
57. Mrs. Margarita Najera- Dranzabal, Mayoress of Calvia, brought with her the greetings of her town, a popular international tourist resort in the Balearic islands which, as such, had faced enormous pressure on its environment, as well as a serious deterioration in the quality of living of its population. This explained why Calvia had been the first municipality to introduce a local Agenda 21 in a tourist context in the Mediterranean, backed by civil society. Mrs. Najera-Dranzabal appealed for increased joint responsibility on the part of regional and local agents, and asked for the work of the Strategic Review to be included within the perspective of a regional action strategy to be presented at Rio + 10.
58. Mr. Andrija Randic, representing Croatia, stated that the Mediterranean should be seen as a unique eco-region by all of its components, and be resituated within its global context. There was a need for increased funding to correct environmental

deterioration: cooperation within MAP should be seen as a bridge between the national and regional level, roles and priorities needed to be clearly defined, and the hiatus between theory and practice filled if it were to be effective. The sub-regional level was also of major importance, as was shown by the initiative for the protection of the Adriatic, in which Croatia was actively involved in cooperation with Italy and Slovenia.

59. For Mr. Nikos Georgiades, the representative of Cyprus, the very importance of the Strategic Review meant that the diagnoses and proposals which it set forth needed to be discussed in greater depth, going beyond this meeting which had not had sufficient time for anything more than a brief examination. The study of the relations between free trade and the environment revealed many contradictions, which we should endeavour to resolve. His country, which had benefited from being associated with MAP, and which was applying a voluntaristic policy in preparing for accession to the EU, felt that the financial cost of the measures to be taken should be assessed. The framework on which to build the future was there, but the success of MAP and the MCSD would depend on our ability to tackle the problems faced by the region's least favoured countries. The speaker concluded with a quotation from Einstein: " We will have the future we deserve".
60. Mr. Christoph Bail, representing the EC, stated that the issues being discussed at this meeting reminded him of the vision of Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman of reconstructing Europe after the Second World War on the basis of regional cooperation and common objectives. There was no doubt that the situation in the Mediterranean was different, but the region could draw inspiration from the European precedent with its difficulties and its successes. Within the partnership gradually being built up, each individual role required clear definition. The role of the MCSD was that of a generator of ideas and new approaches rather than of a decision-maker. To reach the common objectives as regards our vision for the Mediterranean, we should base our policies on coherent regional and national strategic planning (including funding), promotion of win-win situations, complementarily and synergies among different programmes and stakeholders, broad consultation and participation process and a preventive and precautionary approach. Over recent weeks five projects had been signed under the SMAP, and it was to be expected that EC aid would be granted under speedier approval procedures for all projects eligible under its financial instruments.
61. Mr. Magdi Ibrahim, representing the ENDA, explained that since the Stockholm conference in 1972 his organisation had been striving for social equity in development, the integration of the environment and development, combating erosion and desertification, and controlling urbanisation, particularly through pilot activities. The speaker stressed the specific Marseilles Declaration which had just been issued by the NGOs during the civil forum which they had held from 10-12 November as a prelude to the Euro-Mediterranean conference.
62. Mrs. Selmin Barak, representing the IME, pointed out that the aim of her organisation was to build up exchange with different actors working in the field of water and the environment in the Mediterranean. The Institute provided the technical secretariat for MEDTAC, whose aim was to assist in drawing up a global water vision for the countries in the region. It had also contributed to the implementation of study, research and training programmes in the riparian states, which were needed for the integrated management of water resources, and was proposing to make its know-how available to its partners, particularly within the framework of the MCSD.
63. Mr. Matteo Barada, representing Italy, stated that his country had endeavoured to respect the Kyoto Protocol by stimulating initiatives from both the public and private sectors. The Italian Minister for the environment had asked him to inform the Commission of his great interest in its work. Management of the marine and coastal

environment could not be separated from that of the hinterland, and should continue to be a priority action area. Italy would continue to be actively involved in MAP's activities, as it had been in the past by contributing to the organisation of numerous meetings on both technical and legal issues.

64. Mr. Abdul Fattah Boargorb, representing the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, pointed out that the MCSD, of which he had been a member since the first meeting in Rabat, should take time out with the Tunis Declaration to think about its aims, and to give priority to the development of the human being within the framework of sustainable development, in other words the social dimension. The MCSD had already produced an impressive volume of recommendations, and the time was now ripe to start to apply. However, Libya was grateful to MAP and its Athens Unit for their support in implementing numerous activities. It was also banking on multilateral and bilateral cooperation, particularly with its neighbours.
65. Mr. Joan Parpal Marfa, representing MEDCITES, stressed that good governance was crucial to any sustainable development policy, in other words the striking of a balance between the national authorities, local communities and the partners in civil society. This had proved possible when Agendas 21 had been set up at national level, but it should be further built upon at local level, as had been done by Morocco, the Lebanon and Turkey. The aim of better positioning action at local level also applied to the MCSD.
66. Mr. Rafael Madueño, representing MED Forum, stated that his organisation was something of a "child of MAP". From 8 NGOs at the outset, its network now numbered 104, based in 23 countries around the Mediterranean basin. It had been possible to set up this participatory process thanks to the assistance provided by MAP, the EU and the national authorities. The speaker called upon riparian states to apply the new provisions of the Barcelona system, and therefore for those who had not already done so to ratify the amended and new instruments. MAP and the MCSD had, beyond the shadow of a doubt, provided added value by opening up their structures and activities to civil society, but the countries were not always aware of this. MED Forum supported the EOAEN's initiative on civil forums between the members of the 3 MCSD categories besides the Contracting Parties.
67. Mrs. Lamia Mansour, MEDWET representative, outlined the efforts deployed by her organisation to protect the Mediterranean wetlands. MEDWET had also played an active role in the preparation of the SPA/Biodiversity Protocol. As she saw it, there were three essential points for improving cooperation: regional tools and methods needed to be developed in order to build national capacity; regional cooperation projects should be conducted in the Mediterranean in conjunction with the EC and MAP's RACs, as was the case for the MedWet coastal project, embracing 6 countries; and finally, MAP's endeavours to involve the NGOs in its programme should be further enhanced.
68. Mr. Abdelfetah Sahibi, representing Morocco, pointed out that for his country, despite the undeniable achievements from cooperation, the environmental situation for the Mediterranean as a whole was still of great concern, due to intense demographic, urban, commercial and tourist pressure, sometimes with irreversible effects, not forgetting the serious threat which climate change posed for the countries on the Southern rim. On this latter point Morocco, which had long been aware of the danger, was to host the next conference of the Parties to the framework convention on climate change, in 2001. Faced with this situation, the best investment public authorities could make was to raise public awareness. With the prospect of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and the free trade area, the countries on the Southern and Eastern rims were being forced to upgrade, which they could ill afford to do in spite of their good will.

In this respect, the GEF/SAP which was part and parcel of implementation of the "LBS" Protocol, could prove a good example of cooperation if it was put across in specific and effective action.

69. Mr. Mitja Bricelj, representing Slovenia, recalled that his country shared part of the North-Eastern Adriatic coast with Italy and Croatia. It was negotiating accession to the EU, which was both a challenge and an opportunity to make better use of its endeavours towards sustainable development. Within MAP, Slovenia had focused its activities on the sub-regional level, setting up an Adriatic Commission with Italy and Croatia, which was dedicated to the protection of this sea. As far as the MCSD was concerned, Slovenia had drawn on the recommendations adopted on its first themes for many of its own institutional and legislative provisions, and had every intention of actively participating in its work, as it had already done on the indicators for sustainable development theme.
70. Mrs. Amal M. Mourad, representing Egypt, extended greetings from H. E. the Egyptian Minister of State for the environment to the meeting. She underlined the pioneering role of the Mediterranean region through the Mediterranean Action Plan over the past 25 years in the field of environmental protection and sustainable development, which went beyond developments on the international level in that field. The unique structure of the MCSD is an example of this pioneering role. She emphasized that the MCSD had proved to be a forum for fruitful dialogue, but also stressed that the challenges of contributing to a comprehensive approach to sustainable development that takes into account all the components of this concept are major ones that still lay ahead of that body. She welcomed the agreement to prepare a work program over the coming year to develop the region's contributions to Rio + 10, for which the Strategic Review will form the basis, and emphasized Egypt's interest and commitment to an active participation in this regional preparatory process.

Adoption of the "Tunis Declaration"

71. At the end of the first set of official statements, the draft "Tunis Declaration" as approved in plenary the previous day was submitted to the meeting of the high level Segment for adoption.
72. Several delegations tabled proposed amendments to the draft concerning climate change, the solidarity fund, the use of existing funding mechanisms, and improving their accessibility. After a short debate, it was decided that the Secretariat would reword the paragraphs in question in conjunction with the delegations concerned.
73. The new text thus modified was approved by all members of the Commission. It was officially adopted by the high level Segment in the form to be found in annex III to this report.
74. When the meeting of the high level Segment reconvened for its afternoon session on the last official statements, Mr. Bernard Fautrier read out a six-point message sent on behalf of all participants to the highest Tunisian authorities, thanking them for their welcome and their constant support, acknowledging the actions and initiatives undertaken by Tunisia towards sustainable development, supporting the call made by the President of the Tunisian Republic for a global solidarity fund to be set up, and wishing the Tunisian people progress and prosperity. The message was approved by the meeting.

Agenda item 6: Presentation of the activities of the thematic working groups***Thematic Group on "Industry and the Environment"***

75. Mr. G. Guerrieri (Italy), joint task manager for this theme along with Algeria, gave a progress report on the work of the Group since the fifth meeting of the MCSD, specifying that the approved work schedule had been completed. As had been agreed, the Group had endeavoured to produce practical tools which could provide the basis for modernising the industrial sector- particularly the SMEs- within the context of sustainable development.
76. Mr. G. Guerrieri pointed out that, given the very limited resources available, the decision had been taken to identify those activities carried out by the organisations operating in the Mediterranean context, i.e. MED POL, the CP/RAC, and the UNIDO-ICS, and to develop initiatives (studies, workshops, training courses) in favour of the SMEs. These actions had been considered as a first set of activities in order to sensitize the SMEs on the importance of the integration of environment as a tool of competitiveness. Moreover UNIDO/ICS had been called upon for the first version of a regional Internet information system (ICSnet site), which whilst in need of further improvement already provided a channel for the exchange of information on experts, technology, trends, links and events.
77. Close contact had been established with the industrial sector, with tangible progress being made in the cleaner production sector, where the CP/RAC was coordinating activities. There were, however, also other clean production centres in Croatia, Greece, Malta, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey, and the aim was to have them in all countries.
78. Finally, the workshop which it had been scheduled to hold in Como (Italy) in the second half of 2000 had to be postponed until spring 2001; CP/RAC will support the organisation of the mentioned workshop, during which the various aspects of the work will be examined with all the members of the Group and with the representatives of the prominent Mediterranean SMEs Associations; given that it was due to complete its activities at the Antalya meeting, where it would submit its final report. It would be interesting to see whether this type of "practical" approach would also suit other themes in the future.
79. Completing the examination of the activities of the "Industry" thematic working group the following day, Mr. Guerrieri, the joint task manager, pointed out that the work of the "industry" group posed very different problems to those of the other Groups, both by the nature of the theme under scrutiny and the methodology applied: it was not possible to plan work at regional level, or to establish principles and guidelines as with the other themes.
80. Mr. F. S. Civili, MED POL Coordinator, then added that the Group had done some good work, but the fact remained that it had still not been able to present any results. This was due to the nature of the theme and the different approach which had been followed, which quite obviously had still not been clearly explained. Rather than recommendations, the Group had gone for producing practical tools which had been tested. The workshop scheduled for spring 2001 should make a substantial contribution to progress on the "industry" theme.
81. After this additional presentation, which helped to clarify the approach, the Commission would expect added value to come from the planned workshop, along with some substantial output for the next MCSD session.

Thematic Group on “Free Trade and Sustainable Development”

82. Under the chairmanship of Mr. M. Ibrahim (ENDA), Mr. S. Antoine (France), the joint task manager on this theme along with the Lebanon, presented the group's activities, pointing out that it was still thinking about “leads”, and therefore for the time being no decisions needed to be taken on the second stage of the programme.
83. Mr. G. Benoit, Director of the Blue Plan- the thematic group's support centre- briefly ran through the outline of the activity report. Work on this theme, he pointed out, was both new and difficult for MAP. A two-stage working programme had been adopted in Rome, the first of which was being completed today. The theme had mobilised some fifteen experts from a dozen countries, whose work and proposals had been presented at a regional workshop held in Montpellier-Mèze in October 2000, in the presence of representatives from international organisations and NGOs. A retrospective analysis of the free trade areas in Northern America and Europe had been conducted, and some studies carried out in the countries on the Southern and Eastern rims had been considered. As headway was being made on this theme it seemed to be emerging that the impact of free trade on the environment was of an indirect nature, since it led to changes in the volume and composition of production and consumption, thereby affecting society and the environment.
84. The representative of Libya recalled that at its last meeting in Rome, the MCSD had wondered about the social repercussions of free trade. This was an essential issue, and to its credit the Blue Plan report had spoken out frankly on certain points. It was also well known that many people and movements in society were more vigorously expressing their opposition to the new rules intended to govern international trade, refusing to be at the mercy of the law of profit alone. It should be said that the impact of free trade was concentrated on the Southern rim- not only on Libya, but also on all the other countries in the region.
85. The task manager (France) pointed out that the prospect of free trade had been envisaged within a limited scope. The Montpellier workshop had been well attended, and it had been possible to pick out certain leads. But we should be cautious in going about this theme: four Mediterranean third countries had entered association agreements with the EU and a further one- Algeria- was under negotiation, including in particular a chapter on the environment. Events were therefore in full swing, and the specific characteristics of the Mediterranean needed to be taken into account. The Group had a clear remit: it involved studying the relations between free trade and the environment/sustainable development, but not judging free trade, since the association agreements foresaw the introduction of a Mediterranean area. As far as impact was concerned, many sectors and ministries were implicated: land planning, economy and finance (particularly on tax matters, since reconversion of public income would be required). Thus as many partners should be involved as possible, “inter-ministeriality” being the key, and it was also essential to involve private firms; it would be particularly interesting to hear their reactions to the proposal for a code of good conduct for companies. The Lebanon and France, through Blue Plan support, needed all possible backing.
86. The representative of Cyprus noted that the report made no mention of the effects of free trade on multilateral and bilateral relations. The representative of Egypt pointed out that although it had been raised by many participants in Montpellier, there was scant mention of the impact of environmental standards on the South and East Mediterranean Countries access to EU market. She emphasized the importance of the work of this group for Egypt and the keenness to be more closely involved in it.

87. The task manager (France) admitted that there was a major impact on the environment, but that the opposite was also true, since the environment could be a driving force behind development, as in tourism.
88. According to the EC representative, a member of the Group's steering committee, the decision had been taken to restrict the study because of limited funding. But the EC was about to launch a study, which would shed further light on the points raised by Cyprus and Egypt. For his part, the representative of METAP pointed out that the latter had looked at more specific aspects such as the rules of trade, and that the results of this work would be made available to the Group.
89. For the MED Forum representative, one aspect needed to be underscored: all the mathematical models intended to assess the impact of free trade showed a drop in the standard of living in the short term, and compensatory measures should therefore be planned. In terms of cooperation in the Mediterranean, this should lead to an increase in aid and investment, whilst the trend was currently to reduce them. Moreover, we should be careful in trying to learn from the comparative studies of free trade areas set up around the world in the past, because the Mediterranean had its own very specific characteristics.
90. At the close of these discussions it was agreed that the working group would push ahead with its activities, taking account of the comments made by members in order to submit its final results to the next meeting of the MCSD.

Thematic Group on "Urban Management and Sustainable Development"

91. Mr. Joan Parpal Marfa (MEDCITES), joint task manager for the Group along with Egypt and Turkey, presented the working document on the theme drawn up by the BP/RAC, as well as the report prepared by PAP/RAC on the first meeting of the Group's steering committee (Paris, April 2000), which was currently before the Commission. The work plan agreed upon in Rome had been respected: questionnaires had been sent out to around one hundred Mediterranean towns; five sub-regional studies were nearing completion in PAP/RAC. A regional workshop was scheduled for April 2001. This first round of work had shown that a different situation prevailed between the towns in the North and those in the South in terms of growth, urban sprawl, environmental effects, and forecasts; thus, for the Southern countries alone, the cost of the policies to be implemented in order to rationally organise housing amounted to one third of their GDP.
92. Mr. I. Trumbic, Director of PAP/RAC, pointed out that the working document was a summary which somewhat simplified the comparative situation of North and South. The five studies currently underway on the Near East, North Africa, Israel, Malta and Cyprus would reflect the various different situations. As for the questionnaire, it had initially been sent out to the towns, generating a disappointing 30% rate of response, and thereafter to the national focal points, inviting them to forward them to their respective authorities.
93. According to one Tunisian delegate, the diagnostic study was rather superficial and not critical enough, because the important point was to find solutions for those problems which, generally speaking, directly affected the quality of life. The recommendations to be made by the MCSD should be on a practical level, recommending pilot rehabilitation activities, for example. Moreover, the document did not even touch upon the legal and statutory aspect.
94. According to the representative of Cyprus, urban development was governed by countless factors, and regulations were constantly changing as a result of private

sector pressure. Rational though an urban planning project may be, investors with leverage at decision-taking level would get around it, and in the long run it was not the local authorities who took the real decisions.

95. According to the French representative who agreed with the Tunisian delegate, it was operational proposals that were needed, taking account of what all of us could do together, or each of us on our own, because there were country to country differences at institutional and legal level (particularly in terms of regrouping). The planned workshop in Barcelona should provide some quantitative data on health aspects amongst others. It would be a good idea to set up a network for the exchange of experience between towns on matters such as waste management and combating poverty. Finally, the questionnaire should be sent out again to all the national focal points and actors concerned.
96. The PAP/RAC Director informed the MEDWET representative who was questioning the reliability of a 30% response rate for producing an inventory and setting priorities, that the questionnaire had not been the sole source of information, and that the main aim had been to involve the towns to a greater extent, but that many other sources had been used.
97. The delegate of Cyprus pointed out that there were essentially three actors involved with this aspect: the central authorities, the local or regional authorities, and the population. The first two should be supported in their endeavours towards rational planning, but this should depend on the will of the population. In other words, planning should be inhabitant-oriented in order to win their backing, rather than just remaining a dead letter.
98. At the close of these discussions, the task managers and Support Centres were invited to take account of the comments made by members and to complete the current analysis as a consequence, endeavouring to have more questionnaires filled in and to collect a greater volume of relevant, quantified information for the planned workshop, given that the recommendations and proposals for action would be presented to the next meeting of the MCSD.

Agenda item 7: Examination of the Pre-feasibility Studies for new Themes

99. Mr. A. Hoballah recalled the new procedure adopted for selecting future themes. From past experience, he pointed out, it appeared that it had been difficult for the Commission to deal with certain themes, which had led to the idea of allowing a maturing process to run its course, using pre-feasibility and then feasibility studies, before selecting 2, 3, or 4 new themes in Antalya, so that a second working programme could be launched there without any vacuum being created. At this stage the nine pre-feasibility studies, which had been submitted under separate cover, should mean that the first classification according to priorities could be carried out. Some themes already stood out, for which there was the capacity and an added value.
100. The EC representative noted that all the themes in this first round of assessment were important. But we should tread carefully, and avoid overlap- for example, one case study had already been conducted on erosion and desertification. The potential input from the regional Centres should also be taken into account, as should their availability. For the time being, the European Commission's preference would go to "local management", "agriculture and rural development", "urban waste management", and "health and the environment".
101. The Greek representative stated that he had asked for the floor in order to air the grave concerns of his delegation, which had requested a long time back that no new

themes be launched until those currently underway had been completed. The Greek delegation challenged the approach adopted. The MCSD had a more important remit: to bring MAP closer to civil society- local authorities, socio-economic actors and NGOs. It would be fair to say that involvement of the former two categories had been virtually non-existent. There was the impression of being on a document or dossier production line. What could be learned from all of this? What had been learned from the "participation" theme, for example? This was a general question: the fact that the socio-economic actors and the local authorities were virtually absent from discussions should raise serious questions. Where were the representatives of networks of industry, and influential chambers of commerce, which would give some meaning to discussions? The MCSD was cut off from the world, it was working in a vacuum, wallowing in self-satisfaction. It had lost its essential vocation, which was one of contact and inter-action with civil society. Was it our aim to amass some thirty dossiers in our libraries, each of which had a life expectancy of one or two years, given the constantly evolving situation? The Greek delegation refused to play this game, and to examine any question of selecting new themes, even on a provisional basis.

102. According to the French representative, this was a fundamental issue, and his delegation also had reservations about any idea of a dossier. Sustainable development, he pointed out, should be seen as a jigsaw, where no piece could be seen in isolation, on its own. To be achieved, operational networks would need to be set up. The MCSD had just solemnly adopted the idea of a Mediterranean strategy, with the wish to accelerate; care should be taken to ensure that the themes squared with this idea, fed into it. Decisions should be revised with the prospect of enriching the strategy.
103. The representative of Cyprus felt that the frustration shared by several delegations stemmed from three shortcomings which could not be settled overnight: firstly, the MCSD addressed its recommendations to the Contracting Parties, in other words basically to the Ministers for the environment, who had neither the powers, resources nor influence for most of the themes being dealt with; secondly, the MCSD had left the initiative for operations up to the Contracting Parties, forgetting that it had other partners from the three categories on board, which had not taken participation as seriously to heart as they should have; and thirdly, the MCSD had not produced the innovation and added value it was claiming for most of the themes.
104. Most of the speakers raised the previous points of discussion, recognising that a debate had just been started on the Commission's approach, which was essential-self-questioning was always positive (WWF)- but which should be pursued in Antalya (MED Forum, EC), that all themes were of interest on condition that that they involved the actors from civil society (Tunisia), and increased their role within the MCSD (EC), that there should be more action in the field in the future (Libya), that rational and holistic approaches should be adopted (WWF), as well as a follow-up and implementation strategy on recommendations (EC, Italy, Tunisia and France), that what should first and foremost be guaranteed within the MCSD was fruitful, useful reflection, along with effective results towards sustainable development, if interest and active participation were to be generated amongst the local authorities (Municipality of Naples), or that activities already up and running should be assessed, and specific programmes be developed (Morocco), but that the constant repetition of this discussion four years after Rabat showed that something was wrong (Italy).
105. However, in response to the comment made by the chairman (ENDA) that a choice had to be made on the options concerning the possible selection of new themes before them, several members stated: that the process underway could not just suddenly be brought to a halt (Tunisia, Morocco, MED Forum), that choices needed to be made but depending on more global criteria, and in relation to the Mediterranean Strategy to be

developed (France, Italy), and that the themes should be dealt with under an inter-sectoral approach (Italy); failing to select any themes for fear of excessive sectoralisation, however, or of “splitting up” sustainable development, would be going too far. The selection should be made using an integrated method, and inviting the Secretariat to clarify the added value (EC). Finally, subjects should not be seen purely as such, but rather in their development, their strategic role as a function of increasing globalisation, of growing free trade in a constantly evolving world (MED Forum).

106. Under these circumstances, the majority of members expressed their preferences for various themes for pre-feasibility studies: international cooperation (Morocco, Tunisia, ENDA, MED Forum), agriculture and rural development (Morocco, France, MED Forum), waste management (Tunisia), desertification and erosion (Morocco, Italy, and Tunisia on the condition that it be related to agriculture), urban waste management (Tunisia, MED Forum, and France with the proviso that recycling was also discussed). Finally, local management was also mentioned (Tunisia) – but on the condition that it be related to urban management (current theme) and agriculture- as well as natural hazards, on which the Municipality of Naples expressed its readiness to contribute to work within a network.
107. In response, the Deputy Coordinator recalled that at the request of the Contracting Parties, and as was foreseen in the programme of activities, the Secretariat had already included the preparation of a strategy for the implementation and follow-up of recommendations on the agenda of the next MCSD meeting. As for the excessive sectoralisation of theme by theme treatment denounced by certain speakers, it could well be the term “theme” which was giving rise to confusion. If so, it would be better to speak about “issues”. Regarding themes currently underway, it was agreed that they should be completed by the next meeting in Antalya, thus bringing the Commission’s first programme of activities to a close. It was therefore a limited number of new issues which were being sought in order to do some more serious work.
108. According to the Blue Plan Director, some of the legitimate criticism levelled at the Commission’s work only applied to certain themes. Thus, for “tourism and sustainable development”, participation by the actors involved had been good, including by tour operators as socio-economic actors, and the added value had been generally recognised. It would appear that the same could be said of “agriculture and rural development”, given that its actors were becoming increasingly aware of the social and environmental aspects. “Waste management” was a growing issue in the Mediterranean, given the scale of the problem, with local experiences making a comeback. “Natural hazards” brought with it the added interest for the Commission of already having a competent member in the Municipality of Naples, and “local management” was the focus of the “urban management” group, and should complement it nicely.
109. The Director of PAP/RAC noted that “local management” was a multi-faceted theme, embracing water demand, waste, tourism etc.. Since most countries had centralised administrative systems, if this theme were to be dealt with it could assist local actors in implementing the standards and measures imposed upon them. Under the local Agendas 21 strategies already existed in this field.
110. At this stage of discussions, the Chairman (ENDA) noted that interest was centring on three issues: “agriculture and rural development”, “waste management”, and “international cooperation”, with “local management” in reserve, and to tie up with “town management” and “agriculture”. Other issues such as “natural hazards” needed to “mature”.

111. Several speakers stressed the importance of “international cooperation”, which emerged from the “Tunis Declaration”, and the concerns expressed by several delegations regarding the question of project eligibility, the use of existing resources, and access to funding. Moreover, this issue lay at the very heart of MAP and of the strategic vision. Another member felt that the notion of “the necessary maturing process” for a theme- such as “natural hazards”- was rather limitative: it was up to the MCSD to make certain themes mature, and to bring them on-line.
112. The Greek representative confirmed that he rejected any idea of selecting new themes, the Italian representative that he was taking note of the proposals made, but that there could be no progress made if the same working method was followed as in the past, and the EOAEN representative made known that he had no objections to the choice which was crystallising out, but that the major issue continued to be that of follow-up and implementation. The delegates from Tunisia, Morocco and MED Forum subscribed to the emerging trend, the latter two requesting that “desertification” be held in reserve.

Agenda item 8: Adoption of the summary of conclusions and decisions from the meeting

113. The summary of conclusions and decisions drawn up by the Secretariat in conjunction with the Rapporteur was submitted to the meeting for approval.
114. At the start of the examination of the “Thematic Groups” item- of the 7 points in the initial summary- the delegate from Greece expressed great surprise at not finding any reference in the text to the extremely lengthy discussions which had taken place that very morning on the role, aims, and working method of the MCSD. Indeed, although no consensus had been reached, many delegates had raised substantive points which were essential to the MCSD’s future, usually from a self-critical viewpoint.
115. The Coordinator of MAP recalled that the majority of members of the Commission, when consulted in writing, had approved a decision taken by the Steering Committee at its 3rd meeting in Tunis (January 2000) that in future at the close of their meetings a simple summary of conclusions and decisions would be adopted, rather than an exhaustive report (which would in any case be prepared and sent out for comment over the next few weeks), which made an extra day’s meeting necessary.
116. Whilst agreeing that under the circumstances it was difficult to immediately submit a detailed report of proceedings, the delegate from Greece felt that this crucial point could at least have been briefly reflected in the form of a short paragraph, which was accepted by the Commission.
117. Mrs. F. Kefi, on behalf of Tunisia, urged participants to seek compromise in line with the priorities set by the Strategic Review and the recommendations, as long as all the necessary precautions were in place to avoid any delegation being faced with a binding choice. Thus, the impetus created by the adoption of the basic texts from this meeting in Tunis would not be interrupted, and we could go to Antalya with progress reports which would allow the choice to be finalised. It was a question of logic and being consistent with the commitments made earlier by the meeting.
118. As to the MCSD’s role and means of operating, participants agreed that, after the long and frank exchange which had just been sparked by this matter in the meeting, an item should be included on the agenda of the next and 7th meeting on specific ways of actively involving the other groups in the region in the Commission’s work. In this respect, the meeting was anxious to see effective participation by the NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic players, as well as the networking of its former

members, and it approved the proposal to organise a forum on the role of the partners from civil society within the Commission. Finally, regarding the selection of new issues, participants invited the Secretariat to prepare some additional reports for the 7th meeting on the 3 major issues chosen, bearing in mind the added value which the MCSD could provide, the prospect of preparing the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, and the concern for specific action. The Secretariat got together with the various delegates who had tabled proposals for wording and prepared compromise drafts on all these points.

119. With the new drafts along with the handful of amendments made during the paragraph by paragraph examination having been adopted by all members (the representative of Greece having finally given his approval in writing on 21 November 2000), the meeting adopted the summary of conclusions and decisions as included in annex IV.

Agenda item 9: Seventh meeting of the MCSD

120. Turkey confirmed its offer to host the seventh meeting of the MCSD in Antalya, to be held prior to the Twelfth meeting of the Contracting Parties, scheduled for Monaco from 14-17 November 2001. Early October 2001 would appear to be the most suitable time, so that the Contracting Parties could be apprised of the outcome of the meeting, and the Turkish authorities would decide on the final dates in conjunction with the Secretariat.

Agenda item 10: Closure of the Meeting

121. After the customary exchange of courtesies, Mrs. Kefi, Vice-President of the Steering Committee, declared the meeting closed at 21.00 hours on Friday, 17 November 2000.

ANNEX I

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
MCSD MEMBERS
MEMBRE DE LA CMDD**

ALGERIA - ALGERIE

M. Mohamed Si Youcef

Directeur général
Direction générale de l'environnement
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire, et de
l'environnement
Palais Mostapha Pacha
blvd de l'indépendance
16000 Alger
Algérie
Tel: 213 2 676360
Fax: 213 2 676693
Email: sdai@environnement-dz.org

M. Tayeb Namane

Councillor
Embassy of Algeria, Tunis
1002 Tunisia
Tel: 216 1 783166

**ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE FORÊTS
MÉDITERRANÉENNES (AIFM)**

M. Mohamed Labri Chakroun

Président
Association Internationale Forêts Méditerranéennes
14, rue Louis Astouin
13002 Marseille
France
Tel: 33 4 91907670
Fax: 33 4 9190716
Email: foretmed@free.fr

**BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA
BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE**

H. E. Mr Ramiz Mehmedagic

Minister of Physical Planning and Environment
Tel: 387 33 663548

Ms Dalila Nuhif

Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment
Hydro Engineering Institute
71000 Sarajevo
S. Tomica 1, B i H
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Tel: 387 33 207949
Fax: 387 712079
Email: mapbh@bih.net
Email: dnuhic@utic.net.ba

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

M. Georges Giourgas

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

**MUNICIPALITY OF CALVIA-
MUNICIPALITE DE CALVIA**

Margarita Najera-Dranzabal

Mayor of Calvia
Email: mnajera@calvia.com

Mr Sebastian Lora Sanchez

Cabinet of the Mayor
Tel: 003471139145
Email: slora@calvia.com

Ms Carolina Suau

Local Agenda21 Coordinator

Mr Fernando Prats

Municipality of Calvia
07 184 Calvia
Can Vic h 29
Calvia 07180 Mallorca
Spain
Tel: 34 971 139100
Fax: 34 971 139161
Email: agenda21.calvia@bitel.es

CROATIA - CROATIE

Mr Andrija Randic

Head
Unit for the Marine and Coastal Protection
Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning
Uzarska ulica 2/I
51000 Rijeka
Croatia
Tel: 385 51 213499
Fax: 385 51 214324
Email: arandic.randic@duzo.tel.hr

CYPRUS - CHYPRE**Mr Nikos Georgiades**

Director for Environment
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and
Environment
Tagmatarhou Poulidou 17 , Ayios Andreas
Nicosia 1411

Cyprus

Tel: 357 2303883

Fax: 357 774945

Email: rocperiv@cytanet.com.cy

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
COMMUNAUTE EUROPEENNE****Mr Christoph Bail**

Head of the Unit
Development and Environment
DG ENV BU9 5/175
Commission Européenne
200 rue de la Loi, 1049 Bruxelles
Belgique

Tel: 322 2955002

Fax: 322 2963440

Email: christoph.bail@cec.eu.int

Ms Athena Mourmouris

Coordinator of MCSD, METAP and SMAP
DG ENV. A4 (BU9 5/194)
European Commission
200 rue de la Loi
B-1049 Bruxelles
Belgique

Tel: 322 2963951

Fax: 322 2963440

Email: athena.mourmouris@cec.eu.int

Mr Ronan Uhel

EEA Project Manager
Kongeni Nytow, 6
Copenhagen
Denmark

Tel: 45 33367231

Fax: 45 33367128

Email: ronan.uhel@eea.eu.int

EGYPT - EGYPTE**Ms Amal M. Mourad**

Director of Environment and Sustainable
Development Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Corniche El Nile Street
Maspero
Cairo
Egypt
Tel: 202 5747847

Mr Ali Sirry

1st Secretary
Embassy of Egypt
Tunis
Tunisia
Tel: 216 1 800447
Fax: 216 1 794389

**ENVIRONNEMENT ET DEVELOPPEMENT
AU MAGHREB (ENDA)****Mr Magdi Ibrahim**

Coordinator
ENDA
196, Quartier OLM
Rabat Souissi
Maroc
Tel: 212 37 75641/14
Fax: 212 37 756413
Email: coord@enda.org.ma
Email: Magdi@enda.org.ma

FRANCE - FRANCE**M . Brice Dusuzeau**

Attaché de Coopération
Ambassade de France I.F.C
87 Avenue de la Liberte
1002 Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 783 355
Fax: 216 1 788 603

M. Serge Antoine

10, rue de la Fontaine
91570 Bièvres
France
Tel: 33 1 69412056 - 42848421
Fax: 33 1 42848420 - 69855233
Email: antoine@comite21.asso.fr

Mme Corinne Etaix

Chef de bureau de l'appui aux coopérations
Service des affaires Internationales
Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et
de l'environnement
Tel: 33 1 42191758
Fax: 33 1 42191719
Email: corinne.etaix@environnement.gouv.fr

M. Laurent Caplat

Chargé de mission Méditerranée
Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et
de l'environnement
Tel: 33 1 42191705
Fax: 33 1 42191719
Email: laurent.caplat@environnement.gouv.fr
20, avenue de Ségur

Marie-Claude Tabar-Nouval

Chargée de mission coopération internationale
Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à
l'aménagement du territoire (DATAR)
Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de
l'environnement
1, av. Charles Floquet
75343 Paris Cedex 07 SP
France
Tel: 33 1 40651103
Fax: 33 1 40651299
E-mail: marie-claude.tabar-nouval@datar.gouv.fr

GREECE - GRECE

H. E. Mr. Elias Efthimiopoulos

Deputy Minister for the Environment
Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning
and Public Works
17 Amaliados Street
115 23 Athens
Greece
Tel: 301 6447493-5

Mr Alexandros Lascaratos

MAP focal point
Email alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr

Ms Anneta Mantziafou

Consultant

University of Athens
Department of Applied physics
University campus bldg. Phys-V
157 84, Athens
Greece
Tel: 30 1 7276839
Fax: 30 1 7295281
Email amand@oc.phys.uoa.gr

INSTITUT MÉDITERRANÉEN DE L'EAU (IME)

Mme Selmin Burak

Point focal IME
Les Docks - Atrium 10.3
10, place de la Joiette
13002 Marseille
France
Tel: 34 91598777
Fax: 34 91598778
Email: info@ime-eau.org

M. Ridha Dhaoui

Trésorier Général
Point Focal Tunisie
Sonede
23, rue Jawaher lel Nehru
Tunis 1001

ITALY - ITALIE

Mr Matteo Baradá

Director General
General Directorate for Marine Protection
Ministry of Environment
Tel: 39 06 57223428-29-30/ 5758877
E-mail: difesamare@tiscalinet.it

Mr Giovanni Guerrieri

Expert
RI.BO.
Ministero dell'Ambiente
44, Via Cristoforo Colombo
00100 Roma
Italie
Tel: 39 06 57225250/393392907600
Fax: 39 06 57225195
Email: g.guerrieri@tin.it

LEBANON - LIBAN

H. E. Mr. Michel Moussa

Minister of Environment
Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 70-1091
Antelias
Lebanon
Tel: 961 4 522222
Fax: 961 4 418911 - 524555

LIBYA - LIBIE

Mr Abdul Fattah Boargob

Head of Cooperation Office
Environmental General Authority
El Gheran, P.O. Box 83618, Tripoli
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
Tel: 218 21 4839991
Fax: 218 21 3338098, 4839992
Email: ega@egalibya.org
Email: boargob@hotmail.com
www.egalibya.org

Mr Abdulrahman Sasi Zabila

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Tripoli
Libya

MALTA - MALTE**H. E. Mr Francis Zammit Dimech**

Minister of Environment
Ministry of Environment

H.E. Mr Mario Costa

Ambassador of Malta
Embassy of Malta
5, Rue Achart
Nord Hilton, 1082 Tunis
Tunisia
Tel: 216 9 324098
Fax: 216 841066
E-mail: ambassade.malte@planet.tn

Mr Andre= Vassalo Grant

Personal Assistant to the Minister
7 St Julians Hill St. Julians
Malta
Tel: 356 243306
Email: andre.vassallo-grant@magnet.mt

Mr Paul Mifsud

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

Mr Patrick R. Mifsud

Counsellor
Embassy of Malta
5, Rue Achart
Nord Hilton, 1082 Tunis
Tunisia
Tel: 216 1 847048
Fax: 216 1 841066
E-mail: ambassade.malte@planet.tn

**MEDCITES NETWORK
RESEAU MEDCITES****Mr Joan Parpal Marfà**

Secrétaire Général
MedCités
Mancomunitat de Municipis de l'Àrea
Metropolitana de Barcelona
C/ 62, Núm. 16/18 - Sector A, Zona Franca
08040 Barcelona
Spain
Tel: 34 93 2235151
Fax: 34 93 2234790
E-mail: desurb@amb.es

MEDCOAST**Mr Erdal Ozhan**

Chairman
Middle East Technical University
Ankara 06531
Turkey
Tel: 90 312 2105429/30/35
Fax: 90 312 2101412
Email: medcoast@metu.edu.tr

**MEDITERRANEAN ASSOCIATION OF THE
NATIONAL AGENCIES FOR ENERGY
CONSERVATION
ASSOCIATION MEDITERRANEEENNE DES
AGENCES NATIONALES DE MAITRISE
DE L-ENERGIE (MEDENER)****Mme Marisa Olano**

Responsable des projets Méditerranéens
MEDENER/IDAE
95, Paseo de la Castellana (Planta21)
28043 Madrid
Spain
Tel: 34 914565025
Fax: 34 915551389
Email: molano@idaes.es

MED FORUM**M. Rafael Madueño**

Secrétaire Générale
Med Forum
Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 643, 3
08010 Barcelona
Espagne
Tel: 3493 4124309
Fax: 3493 4124622
Email: medforum@pangea.org

M. Paolo Bifani

Claraford 74270
Frangy
France
Tel: 33 450779746
Email: p.et.p.bifani@wanadoo.fr

MEDITERRANEAN WETLANDS (MEDWET)**Mme Lamia Mansour**

Regional Facilitator
MedWet Coast Project
Mr Thymios Papayannis
MEDWET Coordinator
23 Voucourestiou street
1067 Athens
Greece
Tel: 301 3600711/4

MONACO - MONACO

S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier

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

M. Patrick Van Klaveren

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

MOROCCO - MAROC

M. Abdelfetah Sahibi

Chef de Division Planification et Prospective
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire, de l'Urbanisme de
l'Habitat et de l'Environnement
36, avenue Al Abtal, Agdal
Rabat
Maroc
Tel: 212 37 681018
Fax: 212 37 68 0741
Email: dpp@minenv.gov.ma

M. Mourad Amil

Chef de division de l'observatoire national de
l'environnement
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire,
de l'Environnement, de l'Urbanisme
de l'Habitat et de l'Environnement
36, avenue Al Abtal, Agdal
Rabat
Maroc
Tel: 212 37 681001
Fax: 212 37 680741
Email: done@minenv.gov.ma

M. Bardach Hassan

Counsellor
Embassy of Morocco
39, rue 1er juin
Mutnelleille
Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 783801
Fax: 216 1 787103

NAPOLI MUNICIPALITY MUNICIPALITE DE NAPLE

Mr Armando Mauro

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

SLOVENIA - SLOVENIE

Mr Mitja Bricelj

Counsellor to the Government
Tel: 38614787384
Fax: 386 4787420
Email: mitja.bricelj@gov.si

Mr Slavko Mezek

Head of Koper Branch Office/Senior Adviser
National Office of Physical Planning
Ministry of Environment
Dunajska 48
1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
Tel: 386 61 1787021
Fax: 386 61 1787010
Email: slavko.mezek@gov.si

SPAIN - ESPAGNE

H. E. Mr Jaume Matas Palau

Minister of Environment

M. Javier Mato Veiga

Director de Gabinete
javier.mato@gabmin.mma.es

Mme Amparo Rambla Gil

Subdirectora General Adjunta
Email: amparo.rambla@sgnci.mma.es

Mr Adrian Vecino

Email: adrian.vecino@sgnci.mma.es

Javier Rubio de Urquia

Asesor Gabinete del Ministro
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Plaza San Juan de la Cruz
28071 Madrid, Espagne
Tel: 34 91 5976374/ 5976732
Fax: 34 91 5975980

SYRIA - SYRIE

H. E. Mr Farouk Adli

Minister of State for Environmental Affairs

Mr Yahia Awaidah

Director, Environment Directorate

Tel: 963 11 3321902

Email: env-eng@net.sy

Ms Nadejda Adli

Engineer

Mr Mohammed Nasir Bitar

Consultant

General Commission for Environmental Affairs (G.C.E.A.)

Ministry of Environment

P.O. Box 3773

Tolyani Street

Damascus

Syrian Arab Republic

Tel: 963 11 3310381

Fax: 963 11 4412577

Email: env-min@net.sy

TURKEY - TURQUIE

H. E. Mr Fevzi Aytakin

Minister of Environment

Ms Kumru Adanali

Acting Head

Foreign Relations Department

Ms Elvan Genç

Environmental Engineer

Ms Nelka Inanç

Deputy undersecretary

Ministry of Environment

Eskisehir Yolu 8 KM, Bilkent

06100 Ankara

Turkey

Tel: 90 312 2851705

Fax: 90 312 2853739

Email:

WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE INTERNATIONAL (WWF)

Mr Paolo Lombardi

Director

World Wide Fund for Nature International (WWF)

Via Po, 25/c

00198 Rome

Italy

Tel: 39 06 84497381

Fax: 39 06 84497366

email: plombardi@wwfnet.com

TUNISIA - TUNISIE

S. E. Mme. Faiza Kefi

Ministre de l'Environnement et de

l'Aménagement du Territoire

M. Khalil Attia

Directeur Général de l'Environnement

M. Belgacem Henchi

Chef de Cabinet

Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement
du Territoire

Centre Urbain Nord - Bâtiment I.C.F.

B.P. 52

2080 Ariana

Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 703161 - 704000

Fax: 216 1 702431 - 238411

Email: dgeqv@mineat.gov.tn

Mr Beshir Ben Mansour

Président, Directeur Général

Agence Nationale de Protection

de l'Environnement (ANPE)

M. Mohammed Said

Chef de departement

Tel: 841995, 840221

Fax: 848 069

Mme Fathia Mezhoud- Harmel

Directeur

Tel: 216 1 847 122

Fax: 216 1 848 069

12 rue du Cameroun-Belvedère

Tunis

Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 840221

Fax: 216 1 848069

Email: boc.meat@rdd.tn

Mme Amel Benzarti

Directrice

CITET

Centre International de Technologie

de l'Environnement de Tunis

Charguia, Blvd de l'Environnement

2080 Tunis

Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 770 285 / 772 014

Fax: 216 1 772 255

Email: dg@citet.nat.tn

M. Rachid Nafti

Coordinateur Projet METAP

CITET

Blv de l'environnement

1090 Tunis

Tel: 216 1 808650

Fax: 216 1 66 255

Email: citet.metap@citet.nat.tn

Mme Zeinab Belkheir

Directeur

MEAT

Tel: 216 1 703394

Fax: 216 1 704340

M. Noureddine Ben Aissa

Directeur

Tel: 216 1 704 258

Fax: 216 1 705 343

M. Tarek Mrabet

Attaché de Presse

Tel: 216 1 707 433

Mme Najet Trimeche

Chargé de Mission

Fax: 216 1 703286

M. Mohsen Khammari

Chargé de Mission

Tel: 216 1 238 389

M. Mohamed Ismail

Sous Directeur

M Ameer Jeridi

Attaché de Cabinet

Tel: 216 9 305 586

Email: boc.meat@rdd.tn

M. Choukri Necib

Attaché de Cabinet

M. Naji Halloul

Sous Directeur

M. Salem Ben Massaoud

Directeur

Tel: 216 706960

Fax: 216 1 704340

M. Najeh Dali

Directeur Coopération Internationale

Tel: 216 1 708490

Fax: 216 1 702431

Mme Sabria Bnoui

Chef de Service

de la Coopération Internationale

Mme Hédia Baccar

Directeur

Ministère de l'environnement et de l'aménagement du territ

Immeuble ICF, Centre Urbain Nord

Tunis 2190

Tunisie

M. Karim Akrouf

Président

Association des Amis du Belvédère

Représentant de MIO

12 av. Habib Bourgiba

2090 Mornag

Tunis

Tel: 216 1 360 310/ 890 386/ 09350189

Fax: 216 1 360 310/ 890 386

OBSERVERS - OBSERVATEURS

**UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND SECRETARIATS
SECRETARIAT DES NATIONS UNIES**

**MEDITERRANEAN ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME (METAP)**

Mr Sherif Arif

Regional Environmental Coordinator
METAP Coordinator
Rural Development Water & Environment Department

Middle East and North Africa Region
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
United States of America

Tel: 1 202 4737315
Fax: 1 202 4771374
Email: sarif@worldbank.org

UNIDO/ICS

Mr Gennaro Longo

Director,
Area of Earth, Environmental & Marine
Sciences & Technologies
UNIDO/ICS

Padriciano 99
Palazzina L2
340 12 Trieste
Italy
Tel: 39 040 9228104
Fax: 39 040 9228136
Email: gennaro.longo@ics.trieste.it

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

Mr George Kamizoulis

Senior Scientist
WHO/EURO Project Office
Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan
46, Vassileos Konstantinou
116 36 Athens
Greece
Tel: 7273105
Fax: 7253196 - 7
Email: gkamiz@unepmap.gr

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS, AND OTHER OBSERVERS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES, ET AUTRES OBSERVATEURS**

CITY OF ROME/ECOMED

Mr Franco la Torre

Resp.Med.Act
26, Via di Porta Lavernale
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39 06 5783564
Fax: 39 065781448
Email: ecomed@romacivica.net

LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES (LAS)

M. Saher Sadj Aissa

Director LAS, Tunisia

M. Ahmed Bazara

93 Av. Louis Braill, Cité el Khadra
Tunis 1003
Tunisia
Tel: 216 1 770 100
Fax: 216 1 772 801

**ARAB NGO NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENT &
DEVELOPMENT (RAED) RESEAU ARABE DES
ONG POUR L-ENVIRONNEMENT ET LE
DEVELOPPEMENT(RAED)**

Mr Youssef Nouri

Lycée Abou Sofiene
Ksar Said II
2009 Tunis, Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 515 307
Fax: 216 1 508 361
Email: youssef.nouri@fls.rnu.tn

Mme Rafika Blili

Cité el Andalous,rue el Hijez, BE 13
Menzah 8e.
Tunis, Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 700183
Tel: 216 9315109

RAED

Magles El Shaab
P. O. Box 2
Cairo, Egypt

Tel: 20 2 304163
Fax: 20 2 3041635
Email: aoye@ritsec1.com.eg

RAMOGE

Mr Guliano Fierro

University of Genoa
DIPTERIS
Corso Europa 26
16132 Genoa
Italy

Tel: 39 010 3538270
Fax: 39 010 500794
Email: comett@dipteris.unige.it

PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

H. E. M. Mounir Ghannam

Ambassador

Mr Bassel Torjeman

Embassy of Palestinian Authority
17 rue Ernest Conseill
Place Pasteur 1002
Tunis, Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 784725/ 790883

**ASSOCIATION TUNISIE MEDITERRANEE POUR LE
DEVELOPPMENT DURABLE (ATUMED)**

M. Mohamad Fakhakh

Président
6, Impass 1 rue Mosbeh Jerbou
Manar 2 , 2092
Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 886 591
Fax: 216 1 886 488
Email: mistral@genet.tn

ASSOCIATION LES AMIS DES OISEAUX

M. Ali El Hilly

President
Faculte de Science 1060 Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 872600
Fax: 216 1885073
Email: aao.bird@planet.tn

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

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

M. Guillaume Benoit
Directeur

Mr Cistulli Vito
Environmental Economist

Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC)
15 Avenue Beethoven
Sophia Antipolis
06560 Valbonne
France
Tel: 33 492387130
Fax: 33 492387131
Email: planbleu@planbleu.org

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

Mr Ivica Trumbic
Director
email: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr

Mr Marko Prem
Deputy Director
email:marko.prem@ppa.tel.hr
Priority Actions Programme/Regional Activity
Centre (PAP/RAC)
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana P.O Box 74
21000 Split
Croatia
Tel: 385 21 343499
Fax: 385 21 361677

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

M. Adel Hentati
Directeur
Centre des activités régionales pour les
Aires spécialement protégées (CAR/ASP)
Boulevard de l'Environnement
1080 Tunis La Charguia
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 795760
Fax: 216 1 797349

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

Mr Michele Raimondi
Managing Director
Regional Activity Centre for Environment
Remote Sensing
2 Via G. Giusti
90144 Palermo
Italy
Tel: 39 091 342368
Fax: 39 091 308512
E-mail: ctmrac@tin.it

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

Mr Victor Macià
Director
Cleaner Production/Regional Activity Centre
Paris 184
08036 Barcelona
Espagne
Tel: 34 93 4151112
Fax: 34 93 2370286
Email: prodneta@cipn.es
Email: vmacia@cipn.es

**SECRETARIAT FOR 100 MEDITERRANEAN
HISTORIC SITES
SECRETARIAT DES 100 SITES HISTORIQUES
MEDITERRANEENS**

M. Daniel Drocourt
Coordonnateur
"100 Sites historiques méditerranéens"
du Plan d'action pour la Méditerranée
Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville de Marseille
10 Ter Square Belsunce
13001 Marseille
France
Tel: 33 491907874
Fax: 33 491561461
Email: ddrocourt@mairie-marseille.fr

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

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
(UNEP)
COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN
ACTION PLAN
SECRETARIAT OF THE MCSD**

Mr Lucien Chabason

Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273101

Fax: 30 1 7253196-7

E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Mr Arab Hoballah

Deputy Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273126

Fax: 30 1 7253196-7

E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

Francesco-Saverio Civili

MEDPOL Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273106

Fax: 30 1 7253196-7

E-mail: fscivili@unepmap.gr

M. Mohamed Ennabli

MAP Consultant

1, rue Malchus, La Marsa 2070

Tunis, Tunisia

216 1 774169

Email: ennabli.mohamed@gnt

Mr Harry Coccossis

MAP Consultant

Nikis 44, Marousi

Athens, Greece

Tel: 301 6800051

Fax: 301 6800053

Email: hkok@aegean.gr

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

Tel: 301 7273100

Fax: 301 7253196-7

Email : unepmedu@unepmap.gr

ANNEX II

STRATEGIC REVIEW FOR THE YEAR 2000 RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

The regional review clearly shows the progress which has been made towards sustainable development and environmental protection as well as the flaws which continue to exist, since the Mediterranean Action Plan and Barcelona Convention and its Protocols were revised in 1995.

New types of growth and development which take greater account of the social well-being of the entire population and of environmental concerns need to be sought.

The environmental, economic and social cost to be borne in the short term by certain countries within a context of integration and liberalization which favors market mechanisms can only be acceptable if serious accompanying measures are adopted in order to cushion the impact on the least privileged sectors of society, and which will guarantee more long-term sustainability.

At national level, the difficulty of giving concrete expression to measures towards sustainable development decided upon by the Mediterranean community shows, on the one hand, that the new concept has not as yet managed to mobilize all spheres of Society and, on the other, that States have been slow in implementing some of the decisions taken.

Although it is highly active, co-operation in the Mediterranean is, on the one hand, affected by a lack of common vision and inadequate co-ordination between the main partners currently or potentially involved and, on the other, by a mismatch between resources available for development and investments, given the scale of the tasks to be accomplished. This is exacerbated by the fact that the short-term effects of the Uruguay Round's decisions have not produced the expected results for the developing Mediterranean countries, judging by the worsening foreign trade deficit faced by most countries.

Apart from a clear political impetus, any shift towards sustainable development also requires reference models which identify and put across a shared vision, which takes account of the Mediterranean peculiarities, as well as a coherent strategy capable of guiding the various stages of its implementation.

To this end the MCSD proposes the following steps:

A common vision and a regional strategy

1. The Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention are invited to define a common vision of the region's future along with all of the partners concerned. For this purpose, they are invited within the framework of MAP and with all the partners concerned, to prepare a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, if possible for adoption at their Thirteenth Ordinary Meeting (2003). This Strategy should reflect a responsible acceptance of the medium and long-term stakes and clear commitment and solidarity at all levels (regional, national, local) and in all sectors (economic, social, environmental); this strategy should:
 - Take account of the diversity of existing political, social, economic, cultural and environmental systems;
 - Allow States and Local Authorities to play their full role
 - Respect the multiple values of Mediterranean societies;

- Draw on all elements of Society;
 - Promote social equity;
 - Ensure respect for the integrity of eco-systems;
 - Apply a participatory approach;
 - Identify and promote adequate methodologies and tools;
 - Promote the transfer and mastery of cleaner technologies;
 - Promote bilateral and regional cooperation;
 - Take due account of the principle of common but differentiated responsibility;
 - Encourage complementarity and synergies with other relevant programmes;
 - Express at the Mediterranean level the aims and proposals for action laid down by major global conventions, particularly on climate change, biodiversity, desertification etc., as well as the UN-CSD's recommendations;
 - Facilitate implementation of the Barcelona Convention, its protocols and MAP recommendations;
 - Build the required capacities to meet the above-mentioned objectives effectively.
2. The Regional Strategy should pay particular attention to the implementation of recommendations and proposals for action adopted or to be adopted within the MCSD framework, establishing clear objectives and adequate means, inter alia in the following areas: water demand management, tourism, industry, agriculture, energy, transport, waste, free trade and the environment, information and awareness raising, indicators for sustainable development, land use planning, coastal management and urban development.

National Strategies towards impetus and implementation

The Contracting Parties are invited to draw up or revise as soon as possible depending on their circumstances national sustainable development strategies.

3. National sustainable development strategies should be drawn up or revised in accordance with national specificities and priorities depending on the circumstances, in order to take account of evolutions towards globalization in the Mediterranean region. The preparation/revision of national strategies and their implementation should be conducted according to a participatory approach, involving all actors and at all levels of responsibility concerned and should be coherent with other similar exercises.
4. National sustainable development strategies should be elaborated within the framework of their respective national Agenda 21 and should define ambitious objectives regarding the uncoupling of production on the one hand from energy consumption and the use of resources and natural areas on the other. International commitments on cleaner production as well as the internationally accepted aims for limiting polluting emissions should find their expression in national strategies. National objectives should be established for sustainable consumption aimed at controlling the impact of structural changes on consumption patterns (private transport, renewable energy, solid waste and packaging, etc.).
5. National strategies should endeavour to translate the recommendations and proposals for action adopted or to be adopted within the MCSD context into concrete objectives and means. In this respect, the MCSD could prepare guidelines for drawing up national strategies.

6. The Contracting Parties are invited to set up as soon as possible National Commissions on Sustainable Development or other types of participation structures which should be representative of the forces active within the country, in order to strengthen coherence and convergence in action.
7. The Contracting Parties are invited to carry out any necessary legislative, fiscal, financial, trade or economic reforms likely to assist in implementing national sustainable development strategies including the following elements:
 - Rationalization of economic activity by integrating the environmental dimension;
 - Ensuring social equity;
 - Preserving and managing natural resources on a sustainable basis.
8. As regards the legal framework for sustainable development, the Contracting Parties are invited to:
 - Update and implement their national legal framework in line with environment-related international agreements they have ratified;
 - Complete the organization of the national and local institutional structures concerned;
 - Ensure and render the rules on governance as flexible as possible by promoting the principle of subsidiarity, transparency and the participatory approach;
 - Facilitate access to justice at a national level in order to ensure that environmental law is respected.
9. Since the rapid urbanization of the coastal areas in particular, as well as regional imbalances, are both crucial sustainable development issues, the Contracting Parties are invited to entrust to the extent possible the Local Authorities with greater responsibility for decentralized environmental management as well as for urban and rural development, particularly within the framework of local Agendas 21, guaranteeing good governance and the involvement of the main groups in Society.
10. Given the strategic importance of the coasts, and the necessary implementation of the principles of integrated coastal management, regional policy guidance and methodological tools for the integration and continuous observation of coastal areas should be further studied and promoted within MAP, in order to facilitate implementation, including guidance for the development of national legislation.

Effective Regional Coordination

11. In appointing/selecting their representatives to MCSD, the Contracting Parties, local authorities, NGOs and socio-economic actors should take full account of the necessity to maintain the open, autonomous, advisory, and representative nature of this body. Through appropriate networking, they should draw on the experience of past members and ensure input from the wider groups they represent. Members from local authorities, NGOs and socio-economic actors should represent as wide a spectrum as possible of major groups of the society and should participate more actively in the work of the MCSD.

12. In order to strengthen the exemplary nature of State mobilization, and to support the unique character of the Mediterranean eco-region, the Contracting Parties and the other members of the MCSD are invited to improve their communications in order to guarantee an effective circulation of information between the MAP structures and national focal structures in particular, making MAP activities and output more visible to Mediterranean public opinion and to the interested international community.

Monitoring and Assessment Tools

13. Since the preparation of prospective analyses at the Mediterranean level as well as the production of useful information for public decision-taking and sectoral policies require updated data on all areas of human activity, it is proposed that the Contracting Parties develop and network the national environment and development observing systems or other similar appropriate functions.
14. Since sustainable development and environmental protection are medium to long-term processes, it is proposed that the Contracting Parties:
 - Utilize appropriate measurement tools, as well as performance and response indicators which can assess progress;
 - Adopt measures to enable the regular follow-up and assessment of the state of the Mediterranean environment (inter alia, land, marine and coastal).

Follow-up of Proposals for Action

15. Since the revised Barcelona Convention lays down the requirement to take full account of MCSD/MAP recommendations and to take the necessary measures to adopt them during their ordinary meetings, it is proposed that the Contracting Parties:
 - Make concrete provisions to ensure that proposals are disseminated to concerned institutional structures, authorities and other actors;
 - To report on them in the national reports for submission to MAP.
16. In order to give concrete expression to the MCSD's and MAP's proposals for action through effective implementing activities, within the MAP context and in interaction with the countries, the Contracting Parties are invited to agree on the preparation of projects for submission to financing institutions. In this respect, the MAP components should strengthen their capacity for preparing and managing projects related to MAP priorities.
17. The Contracting Parties are invited to promote the emergence of regional strategic action programmes or projects within the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on priority issues dealt with by MAP/MCSD in application of decisions taken by the Contracting Parties, and to assist fully in their implementation at the national level with the participation of all the actors concerned.

Broader Regional Cooperation.

18. Given that the Mediterranean eco-region is the appropriate framework for dialogue and interdependence, the Euro-Mediterranean partners and other cooperation programmes in the region are invited to set the aim of Sustainable Development at the very heart of the implementation of their activities at regional and national level based on equity, shared responsibility and solidarity.

19. With the aim of rationalizing means and increasing synergy the Contracting Parties are invited to:
- Promote greater cooperation between MAP, the United Nations agencies, the World Bank and other concerned institutions in the region and encourage them to take account of the priorities defined by the Contracting Parties;
 - Encourage official collaboration between MAP and their respective regional programmes;
 - Take account of, exchange information on and promote cohesion and complementarity of the objectives of their respective programmes of activities;
 - Better involve or even entrust competent, ad hoc, intergovernmental actors with the management of certain thematic activities;
 - Strengthen, or even institutionalize cooperation with the UN-CSD.
20. The Contracting Parties are invited to promote a closer North-South partnership by strengthening the voluntary contributions made by countries at the regional and bilateral level in order to better support MAP activities to promote sustainable development, particularly pilot projects and capacity building at the country and regional levels.
21. The Contracting Parties, regional networks of NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors as well as the MAP Secretariat are invited to contribute actively to preparations for Earth Summit II. For this purpose, at its next meeting the MCSD Steering Committee should adopt a work programme for the period 2001-2002.

ANNEX III
Draft A Tunis Declaration of the Mediterranean Commission
on Sustainable Development for consideration by the Contracting Parties

The members of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD), meeting in Tunis from 14-17 November 2000, having examined the Strategic Review of sustainable development policies in the Mediterranean;

Recalling the importance of the Agenda 21 and the Agenda Med 21 framework resulting from the Tunis Conference (November 1994), the resolution adopted in Barcelona in June 1995 by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, and the Barcelona Declaration on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (November 1995), as well as its environmental component adopted by the Helsinki Conference (November 1997);

Recalling the importance of the three pillars of sustainable development - economic, social and environmental - and the need for an integrated approach;

Noting the progress accomplished towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean since the Rio Conference, and particularly the renewal of MAP, the revision of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, as well as the adoption of new protocols and the setting up of the MCSD, and the development of its work since the First Meeting at Rabat in 1996;

Stressing the importance and exemplary nature of the Mediterranean as an eco-region and an arena for solidarity, as well as its vocation for bringing civilizations closer to one another;

Expressing its appreciation of the progress made in the various countries of the region towards building capacity at both the public and professional levels and within the associations, to draw up and implement sustainable development policies;

Noting the progress made within the framework of the Barcelona Convention towards abating pollution from land- and sea-based sources and protecting biodiversity, and welcoming in particular the adoption and initiation of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) to combat pollution from land-based sources ;

Stressing the increasing role of the Mediterranean NGOs having an environmental vocation, and of regional networks of socio-economic groups and local authorities as actors and partners in sustainable development;

Stressing the role played by the scientific and educational community and the media in raising public awareness of the sustainable development stakes;

Noting, however, the pressures on the environment and the persistence of practices which are not sustainable in the long term, such as littoralization, the excessive exploitation of vulnerable natural resources, the concentration of tourist activities, the increased production of solid domestic and industrial waste, the growing consumption of fossil fuels, and the spread of non-sustainable production and consumption patterns;

Concerned by the possible consequences of climate changes for the Mediterranean environment and for natural resources that are already limited and vulnerable, particularly in respect of water resources, desertification, coastal erosion and the impact on deltas;

Stressing the growing imbalance largely due to the mismatch between human and financial resources and the challenges to be faced;

Concerned by the drop in levels of public assistance to the developing countries over the last decade, the low levels of direct investment, the inadequate domestic resources allocated to services and to building the national infrastructure and capacity needed for sustainable development;

Stressing, on the one hand, the impact of globalization and the gradual integration of the region into the global economy, and the intensification of economic, cultural and tourist exchanges in particular, and, on the other, the risks to which the natural and cultural heritage and Mediterranean specificities are exposed;

Anxious to see the regional and Euro-Mediterranean partnership consolidated, and in particular the project on the free trade area becoming part of a sustainable development based approach;

Propose that:

Cooperation and financing

Sustainable development should become the priority of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and of other regional cooperation programmes, thus reflecting the needs of the region;

Multilateral and bilateral international or regional funding available under public development aid should be considerably increased and better adapted to the programmes for the protection of the environment and sustainable development in the Mediterranean and the use of the existing mechanisms for the promotion of sustainable development should be intensified and their accessibility improved;

Innovative financial mechanisms that are better adapted to the sustainable development stakes, such as a solidarity fund, should be studied and applied at the international and regional levels as well as at the national and local levels;

National and local financing of environmental protection and sustainable development policies should be considerably increased in the Mediterranean;

The human resources dedicated to the implementation of environmental protection and sustainable development policies should be mobilized more effectively at the regional, national and local levels and, at the same time, a particular effort should be made in the region to encourage the transfer of technology;

Legal Framework

Ratification of the amendments to the Barcelona Convention and the new protocols continues to be an urgent priority if the appropriate legal framework is to be provided for the protection of the coastal and marine environment, and for MAP-s activities;

The sustainable and integrated management of the coastal areas should be based on appropriate legal frameworks, using adequate legal instruments;

An information mechanism to report on the monitoring and implementation of the instruments of the Barcelona Convention should be developed in accordance with the commitments contained in the Convention, as amended in 1995;

Decentralization and Participation:

The process for implementing environmental protection and sustainable development programmes requires the strong involvement and a better participation of local authorities, socio-economic actors and NGOs, so that they can take greater initiatives;

Partners from these three major groups should be encouraged to organize themselves in networks in order to strengthen further their role in the MCS and to enhance their contribution to the protection of the environment and sustainable development;

In view of their importance for sustainable development, initiatives should be taken towards the local authorities and socio-economic actors to encourage them to participate more effectively in the work of the MCSD;

To this end, MCSD proposed to the Contracting Parties that they:

- draw up or revise their own sustainable development strategies in the light of the results of the Strategic Review;
- implement appropriate institutional, fiscal and legal reforms to move towards sustainable development, and devote the necessary means to capacity-building;
- with the support of the MAP Secretariat, provide the link between the work of the MCSD and the bodies responsible for preparing the Earth Summit II, with a view to emphasizing in that forum the value of the Strategic Review and other MCSD activities as well as the sustainable development prospects of the Mediterranean;
- take the necessary steps to implement the objectives of and the commitments entered into under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol and instruct MAP to become involved in that process in the perspective of the Seventh Conference of the Parties (Marrakesh 2001);

and also proposes to the Contracting Parties that they invite:

The concerned partners to ensure a better monitoring and an effective implementation of the recommendations adopted by MAP and notably those of the MCSD, backed up by regular reports;

The countries concerned to strengthen bilateral cooperation further and to encourage direct investment and the transfer of clean technologies;

The European Commission and the international organizations concerned to improve allocated resources and means, increase synergies and mutual support between their programmes of intervention in the Mediterranean, so as to meet more effectively the needs of the region;

The MAP Secretariat

- to work in the framework of its information strategy on tools for monitoring and evaluating the state of the environment and sustainable development and to implement with the concerned partners an information programme on environment and sustainable development in the Mediterranean;
- to include an item on inter-institutional cooperation in the Mediterranean in the agenda for the next ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties.

ANNEX IV

Summary of conclusions of the Sixth Meeting of the MCSD

1. Election of the new Steering Committee

After the usual consultations among the members of the Commission, the Meeting elected a new Steering Committee, including the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Malta) as an ex officio member. The new Steering Committee is composed as follows:

President:	H.E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier	(Monaco)
Vice-Presidents:	H.E. Mrs. Falza Kefi	(Tunisia)
	H.E. Mr. Francis Zammit Dimech	(Malta)
	Mr. Alex Lascaratou	(Greece)
	Mr. Georges Giourgas	(EOAN)
	Mr. Magdi Ibrahim	(ENDA)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Armando Mauro	(City of Naples)

2. Consideration of the Strategic Review

- (a) The members of the Commission expressed their satisfaction with the contents of the Strategic Review stressing the relevance of its analyses, the wealth of information it contained and the significant improvements made to the first version distributed;
- (b) The Secretariat is invited to enhance the present version, without changing its substance, on the basis of the comments to be sent in writing by the countries and other members of the Commission not later than 31 December 2000;
- (c) In preparing this final version, the following points will, as far as possible, be taken into account:
 - the environmental dimension of sustainable development should not be overly emphasized to the detriment of the economic dimension which, for many countries, was still a vital stake;
 - the concept of shared but differentiated responsibilities;
 - more reference to the importance of indicators and to the work carried out in the region by organizations other than those already mentioned in the Review;
 - the question of climate change and its possible repercussions in the Mediterranean; and
 - updated data communicated by members to complete the tables in the annexes.
- (d) All the participants agreed on the need to make optimum use of the important work carried out during the preparation of the Review; every opportunity should be taken to give it the widest possible circulation in order to reach all sectors in civil society;

To that end:

- The Secretariat will prepare a synthesis of the Review and will publish it in the form of a pamphlet;
- The Review and its synthesis will serve as a basis for the contribution of MAP and of the MCSD to the forthcoming important events: the Governing Council of UNEP; the meetings of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development; Earth Summit II and other international conferences;
- The Meeting welcomed the proposal that the Strategic Review should serve to prepare a strategy for sustainable development in the Mediterranean; a draft strategic framework document would be submitted to the forthcoming meetings of the MCSD and of the Contracting Parties in 2001, and the text would be finalized and submitted for approval at a meeting of experts from the Contracting Parties to be held in 2002 and presented for approval to the Bureau, before Rio + 10. Spain had generously proposed to host this meeting;
- The Secretariat of the MCSD will draw up a detailed work programme with a view to contributing to the preparations for Earth Summit II (2002). This programme will be circulated for comments to all members before its finalization and implementation;
- Moreover, in view of the quality and wealth of information contained in the regional reports and of many national reports, better use should be made of them, particularly through the preparation of country profiles and a series of success stories to promote exchanges of information and experience;
- The dynamism created through the preparation of this Review by the excellent cooperation and interaction between the consultants, experts, members of the MCSD and Secretariat should also use the valuable information gathered to strengthen the MAP strategy.

3. Recommendations and proposals for action

After a thorough discussion in the ad hoc and plenary meetings, the Meeting adopted, as amended, the set of recommendations taken from the Strategic Review for submission to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties in Monaco.

4. The Tunis Declaration

After a fruitful discussion in the ad hoc and plenary meetings, the MCSD, at its high-level segment, adopted the Tunis Declaration for consideration by the Contracting Parties.

The Meeting further requested that that, following its adoption by the Contracting Parties, the Tunis Declaration would be submitted, together with the Strategic Review, to all the major international forums, and particularly to Earth Summit II.

5. Role and Mode of Operation of the MCSD

Considerable time was devoted to an open, frank and critical discussion of the role and mode of operation of the MCSD. It was agreed that this discussion would be fully reflected in the detailed final report of the Meeting.

The MCSD requested the Secretariat to include an item on the Agenda of the next Meeting on tangible ways to harness synergies and cooperation within other groups in the region.

6. Participation of the groups

The Meeting urged NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors to participate actively and effectively in the work of the MCSD and to establish networks with former members in order to benefit from their experience.

The proposal to organize a forum of civil society partners within the framework of the MCSD was endorsed.

7. Consideration of ongoing activities

Industry and sustainable development

The Meeting took note with interest of the progress report of the thematic group "Industry and sustainable development" and of the announcement by the group that a large workshop would be organized by CP/RAC in March/April 2002 to introduce and discuss the tools prepared and the studies carried out by MED POL, ICS/UNIDO and CP/RAC in cooperation with the other members prior to their formal presentation to the meeting of the MCSD. It was decided that other institutions such as CITET should be associated with the exercise.

Free trade and environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context

The Meeting took note with interest of the report on the activities and outcome of the workshop held in September 2000. It emphasized that the work on this theme should be continued, not only in relation to the past experience of other free-trade areas but also with due regard for a specific Mediterranean character which was evolving rapidly in view of the fact that four riparian countries were already involved in association agreements. While focusing on the impact of free trade on the environment, it was necessary to take into account the overall context of sustainable development and the impact of environmental measures on free trade. Moreover, it would be useful to consider policy measures capable of mitigating potential negative effects. The ongoing work in that area by other organizations including METAP should be taken into account for the sake of complementarity and synergy. The assistance of the socio-economic actors should be actively sought.

Urban management and sustainable development

Having taken note with interest of the report on the group's work, the Meeting invited it to continue the regional studies and analysis that had been initiated on the basis of the replies to questionnaires, whose addressees would have to be approached again, but also with the more active assistance of the MAP Focal Points and the MCSD. Other available work and sources of information must also be taken into account. The participants noted that a workshop was to be held in April 2001 and expressed the view that, in dealing with the theme, the importance should be borne in mind of urban development established in consultation with the local population whose quality of life must remain the basic objective.

8. Consideration of possible new issues:

The Commission went through an exchange of views on the questions that have been the subject of feasibility case studies, bearing in mind the further preparation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development as well as the need for practical action, an integrated approach and the mobilization of concerned partners.

At the present stage, particular attention was focused on the following issues:

- agriculture and rural development,
- urban waste management and consumption patterns, and
- international cooperation: mobilization of resources and partnerships.

on which the Secretariat would prepare an additional report covering in particular the work programme and an assessment of expected value added in the context of the MCSD for consideration and approval at the Seventh Meeting (Antalya), taking due account of other ongoing work.

However, work on other issues will progress through the impetus given by the Secretariat, backed by available expertise.