



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.169/3
3 July 2000
ENGLISH
Original : French

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

4th Meeting of the Steering Committee of
the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

Corfu, 22-23 June 2000

**Report of the fourth meeting of the Steering Committee of the
Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)**

Table of Contents

Main body of the report

Annexes:

Annex I Agenda of the meeting

Annex II Summary of conclusions from the fourth meeting
 of the Steering Committee

Annex III Draft agenda for the 6th meeting of the MCSD in Tunis

Annex IV List of participants

Introduction

1. At their third meeting, held in Tunis from 20-21 January 2000, the members of the Steering Committee for the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD) decided to hold their fourth meeting in Corfu (Greece), at the invitation of the representative in the Commission of the Group of Chambers of Commerce for the Development of the Greek Islands (EOAEN).
2. The fourth meeting of the Steering Committee was thus held in Corfu, at the Ionian Cultural Centre, on 22nd and 23rd June 2000.
3. The following members of the Steering Committee, some of them accompanied by advisers, took part in the meeting: Group of chambers of commerce for the development of the Greek islands (EOAEN), Malta, Monaco, Tunisia, Turkey and the City of Rome. The UNEP/MAP Secretariat acted as secretariat to the meeting. The full list of participants is to be found in Annex IV to this report.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the Meeting

4. Mr. L. Chabason, MAP Coordinator, informed participants that, to her great regret, H.E. Mrs. F. Kefi, Tunisian Minister for the Environment and Land Planning and President of the MCSD's Steering Committee, was tied up with other commitments and therefore unable to attend the meeting. She had indicated that she was delegating the chairmanship of the meeting to H.E. Mr. M. B. Fautrier, Minister Plenipotentiary from Monaco. Mr. Guglielmi, WWF representative, also sent his apologies at being unable to attend for reasons beyond his control.
5. Mr. G. Giourgas, representative of the EOAEN, at whose suggestion the meeting was being held in Corfu, welcomed the members of the Committee. He gave a brief run-down of Corfu's history, stressing the lengthy Venetian influence, as well as that of the major figures who had left their mark on the island. Today, in hosting the Steering Committee of the MCSD, Corfu was honoured to be part of a new, entirely peaceful crusade towards sustainable development. Mr. Giourgas announced that his organisation would be presenting a medal to H. E. the Minister of Monaco, as well as to the Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator of MAP.
6. Mr. S. Dendias, President of the Corfu Chamber of Commerce, Mr. C. Skourtis, Deputy Prefect, and Mr. Y. Petsos, Director General- speaking on behalf of Mrs. A. Canellopoulos, Secretary for the Region of the Ionian Islands- welcomed participants in turn, wishing them a pleasant stay and a fruitful meeting. They all stressed the importance of the sustainable development concept to the local leaders and the inhabitants of Corfu, since for several decades the island had been one of the high spots of Mediterranean and international tourism. As such it had had to strike a balance between development and environmental protection at a very early stage.
7. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr. Chabason thanked the Corfu Chamber of Commerce and the local Greek authorities for their warm welcome. He added that for participants, being in Corfu where such obvious efforts had been made to control pressure on the environment would be a powerful symbol for their work.
8. H.E. Mr. Fautrier echoed these words of thanks on behalf of the Steering Committee, and also expressed his view that Corfu was a good example of the balance which could be struck around the Mediterranean basin to reconcile the contradictory demands of economic development and conserving our living environment. He added that a site as idyllic as that where the meeting was being held would help participants

decide on the final provisions to ensure the success of the 6th MCSD meeting in Tunis next November.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

9. Examining the draft agenda contained in document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 169/1, the Steering Committee decided that once it had discussed item 3 it would proceed directly to item 8 "Sixth Meeting in Tunis", which would thus become item 4, before then coming back to the remaining points in turn.

Agenda item 3: Strategic Review: preparatory activities, including a possible Declaration

10. Mr. A. Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator of MAP, introduced the Secretariat's report for the meeting (UNEP (OCA)/MED WG. 166/2), pointing out that most of the meeting would be taken up by an update on preparation of the Strategic Review. He recalled that the general outline for the Review had been approved by the Steering Committee at its January meeting in Tunis, along with the questionnaire and the other accompanying documents. Since January the Secretariat had been in a race against time to ensure that deadlines were met. The questionnaire was sent out to all MCSD members in February, and on several occasions a reminder had been sent to countries and other members to prompt the majority of them to send in answers and reports. For two countries where the answers were still outstanding, the Blue Plan's "Country Profiles" had been used, and in two further cases the reports of the OECD had been drawn on. The two consultants responsible for preparing the Review as such had thus had to work under difficult conditions as the reports trickled in- some only very recently. Moreover, it was the first time that this type of work had been undertaken without MAP's financial backing to the countries and other members. In fact, the quality of most of the answers and reports was exemplary, and apart from their summary which would be included in the Strategic Review, the data which they contained and the relevant analyses attached to them made them precious documents for the countries themselves. Thus, thanks to the work already put in at the Strategic Review's Steering Committee meeting in Monaco on May 11th, and the guidance which it had given, the Steering Committee now had before it the advanced version of the two main documents: Mr. Ennabli's report covering all chapters, with a basic outline for recommendations and proposals for action, and Mr. Cocossis' report which focused on policy performance and country responses, which were already partly included in Mr. Ennabli's report. On the understanding that other points may still need to be added or further reworking be requested, the other three consultants or teams of consultants had also completed their respective reports: Mr. A. Manos on "civil society", Mr. P. Bifani and Mr. M. Ibrahim on "regional cooperation", and Mr. A. Papasovic on "the Barcelona system/MAP". Basically these reports had also already been summarised and were included in Mr. Ennabli's report.
11. Mr. M. Ennabli, MAP consultant, introduced his draft Strategic Review for the Year 2000, recalling the method followed in its preparation, its aims and approaches, and picking out the general ideas in the main chapters on issues and sustainable development in the Mediterranean.
12. All the members of the Committee who took the floor following the presentation of the first draft of the Strategic Review in order to give their initial comments, congratulated Mr. Ennabli on the quality of the report before them: the wealth of information and the relevance of the analyses augured well for the final version, to be submitted to the Tunis meeting. Given the limited time and means with which this work had been done, it was fair to say that the wager had been well and truly won.

13. Mr. G. Giourgas, representing the EOAEN, pointed out that there was no mention in the report of islands. For some years, however, this had been one of the EU's major concerns, with islands included amongst the "least favoured and remote regions" receiving special treatment under the structural funds.
14. The Chairman, Mr. B. Fautrier, echoed this comment, recalling that islands were one of the region's main characteristics, that "insularity" gave rise to specific, sometimes very serious problems, and that it should perhaps be dealt with in a separate box in the report. He also felt that climate change should be dealt with separately. There was obviously a lack of political will on this front, and the importance of the subject needed to be stressed.
15. Mrs. K. Adanali, representing the Turkish Ministry of the Environment, pointed out that it would be jumping the gun to start thinking in depth about the text, and that any comments prompted by a careful reading of the report could be sent in writing. She felt, however, that more attention should be paid to inter-sectoral issues (such as the impact of transport, etc.).
16. Mr. L. Vella, representing the Maltese Department of the Environment, also stressed the need to tackle the islands and insularity, since the sustainable development issue was more serious there, and therefore stood out as an example for other regions.
17. Mr. F. la Torre, representing the City of Rome, felt that, generally speaking, it was the strategic vision which made up most of the Review and that, in order to be more effective, it should be made more concise and explicit. As far as the local authorities were concerned, they should not be put under the "civil society" heading, as that could give rise to confusion. They were constituent powers, usually elected, even if the degree of decentralisation varied from one country to another, and they should be seen as such, to ensure a better analysis of the state of urban development. Moreover, the report referred to the networks of NGOs, but not of the local authorities.
18. Three other members spoke in support of the comment made by the representative of the City of Rome on the need to disassociate the local authorities from civil society, even though for reasons of organisational ease they were associated in the three MCSD categories. One representative pointed out that the role of the local authorities was tending to increase.
19. As far as the Tunisian delegation was concerned, two further aspects deserved greater attention: the deterioration of the quality of life and the problem of water pollution- including clean-up- in order to protect surface and ground water.
20. Summing up the first round of comments, the Secretariat pointed out that he had taken note of these apt remarks, and that the report would be adjusted accordingly. For his part, Mr. L. Chabason felt that a description of the macro-economic trends and their impact in the region needed to be included, as well as a more specific analysis of the financial issues related to sustainable development, with international organisations being involved in certain projects such as the GEF and METAP.
21. Mr. B. Henchi, representing Tunisia, felt that the coordination and synergy between the different areas of work going on in the region needed to be improved, and that the main sources of funding should be concentrated on, as the latest SMAP meeting had shown.
22. In support of this idea, the representative of Turkey suggested that the Declaration should contain an appeal to riparian states and the organisations on the question of funding. The other members backed this proposal and stressed that the Review

- provided the opportunity to bring out the importance of funding sustainable development activities, with the various available options, the role of the mechanisms, sponsors, and bilateral cooperation (with Japan, for example) being dealt with in more detail.
23. One representative drew participants' attention to the vocabulary used to describe the organisations and their structures, which was sometimes rather daunting. Since the Review was intended for a wide audience, more familiar terminology should be used, without too many acronyms. Another representative felt that this boiled down to a problem of image and that a lively message should be put across which everyone could pick up; having said that, it was difficult to avoid using most of the abbreviations in describing international organisations.
 24. The meeting also considered other matters related more to the report's presentation than its actual content. Some of the experts' analyses were highly critical, and rightly so, for example as far as the MAP system, the MCSD and its composition, the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and the North-South divide were concerned. Should the experts' "regional" reports be published and circulated separately, or should they simply be summarised and included in the Review, maybe with a slightly different message since certain sensitivities had to be taken into account. More space should also be given to the national CSDs, and the importance of involving them in the MCSD's work. The current chapter III sometimes gave the impression of being a catch-all to the detriment of chapters III and IV, whose significance and substance were thus undermined: a better balance needed to be struck overall, if needs be by transferring to chapters IV and V those elements from chapter III which would more logically fit in there, and thus avoiding repetition. It was good that the interest of the "network" approach to sustainable development had already been stressed in the report, but the networks did not stop at the NGOs. There were also networks of towns, chambers of commerce and universities.
 25. Summing up the spirit and the various points of discussion, the Secretariat pointed out that all the comments made regarding both presentation and content would be taken into account when the reworked version of the report was drawn up. But the Review provided the opportunity of raising the issue of restructuring MAP vis a vis the Contracting Parties, an opportunity which should not be missed. Originally, MAP was structured around the protection of the marine environment and assessment, but it had gradually been refocused on coastal management and the concept of sustainable development. This refocusing had been made possible partly because two regional centres, the PAP and the BP, were already working on these issues, and because MED POL had begun to open up to them through the SAP. It had thus been possible to build upon integrated coastal area management (ICAM) and scenarios, and avoid any shake-up of structures. It would appear, however, that a limit had now been reached, as the work on "industry" and "free trade" had shown. So there was a clear option to be put to the Contracting Parties: either work continued under the current system, with a real risk of reaching dead-lock in the long term, or the RACs, MED POL and the CAMPs would have to be restructured by revising the working method and introducing new players such as international organisations for matters where MAP did not have the requisite expertise.
 26. The members of the Steering Committee rallied behind this point of view in the belief that a process was already underway, which could no longer be halted, and that the Review, even in its present preliminary form, provided sufficient relevant elements to be able to redirect the strategy.
 27. Mr. H. Cocossis, MAP consultant, introduced the main outline of his report on the analysis of the countries answers and reports, which included three summary tables

and focused on the performance of policies already implemented, the shortcomings and weaknesses of current policies, and the main measures adopted by each country towards sustainable development.

28. During the ensuing exchange of views, the members of the Steering Committee, having praised the soundness and relevance of the work, recognised that there had been a highly satisfactory rate of response from the countries, and requested more details on some of the aspects dealt with.
29. In answer, the consultants and the Secretariat pointed out that the empty boxes in the tables did not necessarily indicate any shortcomings on the part of countries, but could simply be omissions or lacking information. In any case, countries would have the opportunity to correct and complete.
30. Generally speaking, and given the officially validated nature of the information sent in, participants agreed that countries should be mentioned by name, as was the case with the current version, with the proviso that they would have the possibility of rechecking and perhaps correcting the information when they were sent the reworked report. The part on the countries did not include indicators with figures attached, particularly as far as the setting up and building of capacity was concerned (inspectories, training systems, etc.), and when the reworked document was sent out it would also be an opportunity to request additional information on these matters.
31. Mr. M. Ennabli read out the first set of around thirty "recommendations and proposals for action" which were set out under chapter VI of the report in its current form.
32. The members of the Steering Committee felt that there was a mismatch between the "drive towards sustainable development" referred to in the title and the often highly technical nature of the recommendations. Criticism was sometimes leveled at shortcomings which some countries had already sorted out, and there was a tendency to home in on organisational matters. To put it in a nutshell, more account should be taken of policy- the priority- and technical aspects- accessory- particularly as they would provide the basis for the Declaration to be adopted by the ministerial segment in Tunis.
33. The consultants and the Secretariat answered that this first set was basically a test run, to see whether there were ideas which needed to be left out, taken on board or further developed. Given the importance of the recommendations in the Review, and their links to the Declaration for which they would provide the basis, there was no doubt that some restricted sort of working structure would have to be set up to work specifically on drafting.
34. Following a brief discussion the Steering Committee decided on the following modus operandi for the recommendations: the Secretariat and the two experts from the Review's drafting team would prepare the draft recommendations, which would be sent out to the members of the Commission around 15th July 2000; on the basis of members' comments the Secretariat, the two experts and other possible members would then meet around 20th September, at the invitation of Tunisia, to draft the final version of the recommendations as well as the outlines of the Declaration.

Agenda item 4: 6th meeting of the MCSD and its agenda

35. Having noted that countries had a problem with the initial date of 20-23 November 2000, since it would clash with the ministerial segment of the meeting of the framework convention on climate change in The Hague, consensus was quickly

reached on Tuesday 14- Friday 17 November 2000, as proposed by the Secretariat and Tunisia, the host country.

36. The Secretariat also pointed out that when the draft agenda annexed to its report to the meeting was drawn up, there was still no talk of a possible Declaration being adopted at the close of the ministerial segment. This new element meant that the agenda would have to be revised, switching the ministerial segment from the first to the third day, so that the Strategic Review with its recommendations, and the draft Declaration could be discussed and finalised beforehand by the ad hoc working groups and the plenary. The fourth and final day would thus be given over to the remaining agenda items and the adoption of the summary of conclusions and decisions, with the majority of members who had been consulted by mail going along with this solution rather than the adoption of the usual in extenso report (which would be drawn up in any case but sent out to all members for approval a few days after the meeting).
37. The members of the Steering Committee approved this new general format for the agenda, on the understanding that within the next few days the Secretariat would send them a detailed version of the revised timetable, which planned for an opening plenary on the first day, a closing plenary for the work of the ad hoc groups at the end of the second day, and then a further plenary after the ministerial segment. They also agreed that the ministerial segment should concentrate on the strategic vision and on specific action, and that for this purpose the Secretariat would send national focal points an indicative list which could serve as a basis for the statements of their respective ministers.

Agenda item 5: Thematic working groups: progress report

38. The Secretariat gave the Steering Committee a progress report on the work of the three thematic groups still active: "Industry and sustainable development", "Free trade and the environment within the context of sustainable development", and "Urban management and sustainable development", detailing their meetings, parallel studies, and respective input. The Steering Committee took note and requested and encouraged dynamic involvement in the preparatory activities on these themes, in order to produce realistic and effective recommendations.

Agenda item 6: Follow-up of MCSD recommendations

39. Introducing this agenda item, the Secretariat pointed out that on many occasions the implementation and follow-up of recommendations had been discussed at recent ordinary meetings of the Contracting Parties, and at MCSD meetings, without any clear-cut, formal decision having been reached, however: although it had been made clear on each occasion that the Contracting Parties should apply the MCSD's recommendations, it had never been stipulated how they should do so.
40. With one participant having recalled that at the Eleventh meeting in Malta the Contracting Parties had invited the Secretariat to prepare a follow-up strategy which would thus make it possible to assess the effectiveness of actions undertaken, the Deputy Coordinator pointed out that this would be done by the next focal points meeting, but that in the meantime there had been a drive for visibility, with the recommendations being put on the website, and with widely circulated off-prints; moreover, the pilot project-based approach followed in some countries, particularly for information and tourism, had made for some excellent reports, and proved that particularly if they were twinned these projects could be used to test the practical provisions for implementing recommendations. The meeting agreed that it was an interesting approach to follow.

Agenda item 7: Possible new themes: preparatory activities

41. The Secretariat recalled that thus far the themes tackled by the MCSD had been selected in the absence of any specific criteria, and without wondering what added value they offered compared with work already undertaken in the region. As long as the themes had made it possible to bank on MAP's experience and expertise- as with tourism and coastal management- everything had run smoothly, but with the remaining three themes still underway things looked very different. That was why the idea of needing a "maturing period" had proved essential for the selection of new themes, and that feasibility studies based on 4 criteria would enable an initial "sorting" to take place at the 6th meeting in Tunis, with the final selection being made at the 7th meeting, planned for Turkey.
42. The Steering Committee confirmed its total support for the selection method adopted for new themes, also approving the Secretariat's idea of taking as a basis elements which would stem from the Strategic Review and the Declaration to be adopted next November in Tunis.

Agenda item 8: Cooperation with the UN-CSD and other partners

43. The Deputy Coordinator retraced the events leading up to the UN-CSD's backing out of participating in the organisation and running of the forthcoming meeting in Tunis. The move was open to various interpretations, with the most likely one being an internal hiccup within the UN-CSD during preparations for the 8th meeting of the CSD, as well as a financial problem.
44. Having noted this back-down with regret, the members of the Steering Committee felt that they should look to the future and the many opportunities the MCSD would have of taking part in critical processes and promoting within them its achievements and its Strategic Review, starting with the preparation for RIO +10 or the 2nd Earth Summit. Collaboration with the UN-CSD should therefore be pursued, and Tunisia had sent its President an invitation to the 6th meeting. For his part, the chairman of the meeting suggested setting up cooperation with other bodies, such as the regional economic commissions. In general terms, all the members of the MCSD should be reminded to adopt a strategy of being present at and actively participating in every relevant international forum or process, vaunting the success of Mediterranean cooperation. The meeting asked the Secretariat to extend an invitation to the 6th meeting to all those actors and organisations who were active on the environment-development front in the Mediterranean and elsewhere in the world.

Agenda item 9: Any other business

45. Under this agenda item, Mr. L. Chabason reported to the Steering Committee on two decisions taken at the last meeting of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Malta, 9 and 10 May 2000) which directly affected the MCSD: the nomination of the Federation of Egyptian Industries as the fifth member of the "socio-economic actors" category, and the association of the Palestinian Authority in the Commission's activities, financially supported by MAP whenever possible. The Palestinian Authority would be invited to attend the 6th meeting in Tunisia, represented by its minister for the environment, and provisionally would enjoy the status of associate in the MCSD's work and activities.

Agenda item 10: Closure of the meeting

46. Under the chairmanship of Mrs. K. Adanali, replacing Mr. B. Fautrier, the Secretariat submitted a “Summary of conclusions of the fourth meeting of the Steering Committee” to participants. Having made several necessary amendments, the Steering Committee adopted the summary as included in Annex II to this report. The Secretariat recalled that a meeting report would be sent out to all members of the Committee for comment.
47. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 13 h 15 on Friday, 22nd June.
48. Immediately after the closure a press conference was held for the local media, during which the representatives of the EOAEN and the Deputy Coordinator presented the meeting’s conclusions. A press communiqué had been circulated to them at the opening of the meeting, to which the media had been invited.

**4th Meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD
Corfu, 22-23 June 2000**

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

- I. Opening of the meeting
- II. Adoption of the Agenda
- III. Strategic Review: preparatory activities, including a possible "Declaration"
- IV. Sixth Meeting of the MCSD and agenda
- V. Thematic Working Groups: progress
- VI. Follow-up of MCSD recommendations
- VII. Possible New Themes: preparatory activities
- VIII. Cooperation with UN-CSD and other partners
- IX. Any other matters
- X. Summary of decisions and closure of the meeting

Annex II

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE MCSD STEERING COMMITTEE, 22-23 JUNE 2000, CORFU.

The Steering Committee noted with interest the importance and content of the meeting's working documents, which were prepared with very limited time and means and which, independent of their being summarised for the Strategic Review, provide an important source of information for all Mediterranean partners.

Following the presentation of the documents by the Secretariat and relevant experts, as well as a discussion of the most salient aspects, the Steering Committee adopted the following conclusions and decisions:

I. PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES FOR THE STRATEGIC REVIEW FOR THE YEAR 2000, INCLUDING A DRAFT DECLARATION

a) for the continued preparation of the Review, the following points should be borne in mind:

1. The strategic vision and approach should be better presented to make them entirely visible and useable.
2. Insularity and its specific related issues should be dealt with, possibly within a special inset in the report.
3. As far as possible the local authorities should be disassociated from civil society with which they are all too often associated under the same heading in the report. For this purpose the necessary adjustments should be made to the text on civil society
4. Greater emphasis should be placed on climate change and the need for clearer political will in this field;
5. More account should be taken of the issues concerning the "deterioration of the quality of life" and "water pollution problems", particularly within the framework of sustainable urban development;
6. In the chapter on development issues, macro-economic trends and their consequences in the region need to be introduced;
7. Chapter III is to be restructured in four chapters in the interests of legibility and coherence; some elements in chapter III pre-empt the content of chapters IV and V, and should be switched into the latter;
8. In its current form the report provides scant information on capacity creation and building for the purposes of environmental management and sustainable development in the Mediterranean region; when the reworked Review is sent to the members of the MCSD attention should be drawn to this shortcoming by requesting additional data;
9. For the "recommendations" section, policy and technique should be clearly taken into account, with the emphasis on the former and the drive towards sustainable development;
10. The matter of funding sustainable development activities should be highlighted, with the various options available in the region, the role of sponsors and bilateral cooperation;
11. Wherever possible straightforward terminology should be used to describe structures and mechanisms; the final message should be forceful and accessible to a wide audience;

b) As far as the practical details of consultation, cooperation and circulation related to the Strategic Review are concerned, the Steering Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. The question of visibility, particularly through a more dynamic information and communication policy is as essential to the MCSD as it is for MAP as a whole; no effort should be spared in making this aspect a priority, particularly when the Strategic Review is circulated, and then at all subsequent stages of Mediterranean cooperation towards sustainable development;
2. In the summary of information provided by the members of the MCSD, countries should be mentioned by name in the descriptive part, as is the case in the current version, pending verification on their part when the reworked report is sent to them, asking them to provide figures for actions undertaken and concerning the staff working in the environment and sustainable development field, if needs be;
3. Sustainable development is an issue which should prompt MAP and the MCSD to question their role and competences, and those of the Regional Activity Centres and programmes, and possibly to envisage restructuring to open the door to other partners and outside sources of expertise;
4. Priority should be given to the "network" approach for the three MCSD categories (local authorities, socio-economic actors and NGOs);
5. Close collaboration and follow-up should be encouraged between the national CSDs and the MCSD, as well as between the UN-CSD and the MCSD, particularly after analysis of the type of link to be developed and the useful and necessary ways and means for setting up a cooperation strategy;
6. The Review should be used as an opportunity to question the Contracting Parties about the MCSD's working method: either to continue with the current system, or to bring in new players such as international organisations on questions where MAP does not have the requisite expertise;
7. The modus operandi chosen for drafting recommendations is as follows: the Secretariat and two experts from the Review preparation team shall prepare draft recommendations which will be sent out to the members of the Commission around July 15th 2000; on the basis of members' comments, the Secretariat and relevant experts as well as other possible members shall meet as soon as possible around September 20th at the invitation of Tunisia, in order to prepare the final version of the recommendations as well as an outline for the Declaration.

II. 6TH MEETING IN TUNIS AND ITS AGENDA

- a. The dates chosen are Tuesday 14th – Friday 17th November 2000;
- b. The agenda initially proposed has been revised as follows to take account of the possible adoption of a Declaration by the ministerial segment:
 1. The first two days, largely taken up by the Strategic Review, will comprise a plenary followed by ad hoc working sessions on performance, regional cooperation, recommendations and the Declaration; they will be rounded off by a further plenary;
 2. The ministerial segment will meet on Thursday 16th with the aim of adopting the Declaration, once Ministers have presented their vision for the Mediterranean and a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, based on guidelines to be provided by the Secretariat;
 3. Following the ministerial segment, the MCSD will meet again in plenary to deal with the remaining agenda items until the closure of the meeting on Friday, 17th November 2000.

III. WORK PROGRESS IN THE THEMATIC GROUPS

The Steering Committee noted the progress made in the groups dealing with the three continuing themes: "industry and sustainable development", "free trade and the environment", and "urban management". It requests and encourages dynamic participation in the preparatory activities for these themes in order to produce realistic and practical recommendations.

IV. FOLLOW-UP TO MCSD RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. The Steering Committee approves and encourages the conducting of pilot studies, particularly twinned ones, for the implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations;
- b. These pilot studies should also assist in the preparation of guidelines to be submitted to the next MAP focal points meeting, on the implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations in accordance with a decision taken by the Eleventh ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties.

V. PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES FOR THE NEW THEMES

- a. The Steering Committee confirms the method chosen for the choice of possible new themes: pre-feasibility studies according to the four criteria previously established, allowing an initial list of priorities to be drawn up at the 6th meeting in Tunis, and a final one at the 7th meeting planned for Turkey;
- b. In choosing themes, the recommendations from the Strategic Review and the Declaration to be adopted in Tunis will also be taken into account.

VI. COOPERATION WITH THE UN-CSD

- a. The Steering Committee noted that the UN-CSD had backed out of jointly organising the 6th MCSD and participating in the Tunis meeting;
- b. The opportunity offered by the preparation of Rio + 10 (Earth Summit II) should be grasped for continued cooperation with the UN-CSD, particularly with the results of the Strategic Review, and possibly to set up cooperation with other bodies such as the regional economic commissions.
- c. The 6th meeting in Tunis should provide the opportunity to remind all members of the MCSD that they should generally adopt a strategy of the Commission being present and actively participating in all relevant international forums and processes.
- d. The Steering Committee requests that the Secretariat invite all actors and organisations active in the environment-development field in the Mediterranean and elsewhere in the world to the Tunis meeting from 14-17 November 2000.

Annex III
Sixth meeting of the MCSD, 14-17 Novembre 2000, Tunis
Provisional Draft Agenda

	14 November	15 November	16 November	17 November
9h-11h	<u>S1 Plenary:</u> <Opening <Adoption of the agenda <Examination of the Strategic Review and general discussion	<u>S5 Ad hoc working sessions</u> (continued)	<u>S9 Plenary</u> <Ministerial segment on sustainable development in the Mediterranean, vision for the region and role of the MCSD/MAP. Presentations by Ministers and Heads of Delegations	<u>S13 Plenary:*</u> <Pre-feasibility studies for new themes: selection and fixing of priorities
11h-11h30	Coffee Break			
11h30-13h	<u>S2 Plenary:</u> <continued discussion of Strategic Review; <organisation of ad hoc working sessions	<u>S6 Ad hoc working sessions:</u> (continuation and end)	<u>S10 Plenary:</u> <Continuation of ministerial segment <u>Presentations and discussions</u>	<u>S14 Plenary: *</u> < Implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations
13h-14h30	Lunch Break			
14h30-16h30	<u>S3 Ad hoc working sessions (4) :</u> <Capacity building for environmental management and sustainable development; < Regional and international cooperation; < Recommendations and proposals for action; < Ministerial Declaration	<u>S7 Plenary :</u> <Outcome of discussions in ad hoc working sessions.	<u>S11 Plenary</u> < Ministerial Declaration, Adoption	<u>S15 Free*</u> (preparation of the summary of conclusions by the Secretariat)
16h30-17h	Coffee Break			
17h-18h30	<u>S4 Ad hoc working sessions :</u> (continued)	<u>S8 Plenary :</u> < Examination and adoption of the recommendations and proposed actions for a framework strategy on sustainable development in the Mediterranean.	<u>S12 Plenary: *</u> Presentation of the activities of the thematic working groups: <Free trade; <Industry; <Urban development.	<u>S16</u> Adoption of summary of conclusions and decisions

* **Options:** Ad hoc working sessions in 3 groups on thematic activities in S12 then ad hoc working sessions in 3 groups on the pre-feasibility studies in S13; finally results of S12 and S13 in S14. S15 would consequently deal with the implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations.

Annex IV
LIST of PARTICIPANTS

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

M. Georges Giourgas
Conseiller Affaires Européennes
Chambers Group for the Development
of Greek Islands (EOAEN)
17, Av. des Phalenes
Bruxelles 1000 Belgique

Tel: 322 6485726
Fax: 322 6485725
E-mail: g.giourgas@freebel.net

**CITY OF ROME
VILL E DE ROME**

Mr Franco la Torre
ECOMED
26, Via di Porta Lavernale
00100 Rome
Italy

Tel: 39 06 5783564
Fax: 39 065781448
Email: ecomed@romacivica.net

MONACO - MONACO

S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier
Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Chargé du suivi des questions
d'environnement
Direction des relations extérieures
Coopération internationale
Tel: 377 93158333
Fax: 377 93158888/93154208
E-mail: bfautrier@gouv.mc

M. Patrick Van Klaveren
Conseiller Technique
Direction des relations extérieures
Coopération internationale
16 Boulevard de Suisse
MC-98000 Monaco
Principauté de Monaco

Tel: 377 93158148
Fax: 377 93509591
Email: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

MALTA-MALTE

Mr Louis Vella
Principal Environmental Expert
Environment Protection Department
Floriana CMR02
Malta

Tel: 356 232022
Fax: 356 241378
Email: lovella@waldonet.net.mt

TUNISIA - TUNISIE

M. Belgasem Henchi
Chef du Cabinet

M. Khalil Attia
Directeur Général de l'Environnement
Tel: 216 1 704000, 702779
Fax: 216 1 238411
Email: partenaires@rdd.tn

Ministère de l'Environnement et
de l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord
B.P. 52
2080 Ariana
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 704000

Mr Beshir Ben Mansour

Président, Directeur Général
Agence Nationale de Protection
de l'Environnement (ANPE)
rue du Cameroun-Belvédère
Tunis
Tunisie
Tel: 216 1 840221
Fax: 216 1 848069

TURKEY - TURQUIE

Ms Kumru Adanali
Division Chief
Foreign Relations Department
Ministry of Environment
Eskisehir Yolu 8 KM, Bilkent
06100 Ankara, Turkey
Tel: 90 312 2851705
Fax: 90 312 2853739
Email: kumrua@hotmail.com

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

Mr Lucien Chabason

Coordinator
Tel: 30 1 7273101
E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Mr Arab Hoballah

Deputy Coordinator
Tel : 301 72573 126
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

Coordinating Unit for the
Mediterranean Action Plan
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 10 Athens
Greece
Tel: 30 1 7273100
Fax: 30 1 7253197
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr

M. Mohamed Ennabli

Consultant
1, rue Malchus 2070
La Marsa
Tunisia
Tel: 216-9336910
E-mail: mohamed.ennabli@gnet.tn

M. Harry Coccossis

Consultant
Nikis 44
15123 Marousi
Athens
Greece
Tel: 301 6800052
Fax: 301 6800053
E-mail: hkok@aegean.gr