



**UNITED
NATIONS**

EP

UNEP(DEPI)/MED BUR.83/6



**UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

23 September 2016
Original: English

83rd Meeting of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the
Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment
and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean and its Protocols

Tirana, Albania, 25-26 October 2016

Agenda Item 5: Specific Issues

Report by the Secretariat on specific issues

For environmental and cost-saving reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

UNEP/MAP
Athens, 2016

Table of contents

	Page
A. Governance and Organizational Matters.....	2
1 <i>Status of Ratification of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.....</i>	2
2 <i>Development of Host Country Agreements for RACs.....</i>	3
3 <i>Revision of the TOR of the Bureau.....</i>	4
4 <i>Shift to Thematic Focal Points.....</i>	4
5 <i>Reporting and Compliance.....</i>	5
6 <i>Participation of Palestine in the Barcelona Convention Conferences of Parties and meetings.....</i>	6
B. Assessment of MAP II.....	7
C. Cooperation and Partners.....	7
D. Outreach, Information and Communication.....	9
E. Istanbul Environment Friendly Cities Award.....	10
F. Preparations for COP 20.....	11
G. Planning for the Implementation of the PoW 2016-2017.....	12
Annexes	
Annex I - Status of Host Country Agreements of RACs.....	16
Annex II - Preliminary analysis of the current status and options and impacts for a shift to Thematic Focal Points.....	18
Annex III - TORs for the Assessment of MAP II.....	25
Annex IV - MAP Partner Applications Evaluation Table.....	30
Annex V - Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award - Nomination and Selection Process.....	33

A. Governance and Organizational Matters

1. Status of Ratification of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols

1. Based on the latest communication by Spain as Depositary Country, the current status of ratifications is described in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Summary of Status of Ratification

21 Contracting Parties have accepted the amendments to the Convention, 1995;
15 Contracting Parties have accepted the amendments to the Dumping Protocol, 1995;
17 Contracting Parties have accepted the amendments to the LBS Protocol, 1996;
7 Contracting Parties have ratified the Offshore Protocol, 1994;
17 Contracting Parties have ratified the SPA and Biodiversity Protocol, 1995;
7 Contracting Parties have ratified the Hazardous Waste Protocol, 1996;
15 Contracting Parties have ratified the new Prevention and Emergency Protocol, 2002;
10 Contracting Parties have ratified ICZM Protocol, 2008.

Table 2: Ratification of Barcelona Convention and Protocols by individual Contracting Parties

Contracting Parties																							
	Albania	Algeria	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Croatia	Cyprus	European Union	Egypt	France	Greece	Israel	Italy	Lebanon	Libya	Malta	Monaco	Montenegro	Morocco	Slovenia	Spain	Syria	Tunisia	Turkey	
Barcelona Convention																							
and Amendments																							
Dumping Protocol																							
and Amendments																							
Emergency Protocol																							
Prevention and Emergency Protocol																							
LBS Protocol																							
and Amendments																							
SPA Protocol																							
SPA and Biodiversity Protocol																							
Offshore Protocol																							
Hazardous Wastes Protocol																							
ICZM Protocol																							

2. Since the last meeting of the Bureau, the Depositary has communicated to the Secretariat the deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol by Italy, dated 30 June 2016. In accordance with Article 33 of the Barcelona Convention, the Prevention and Emergency Protocol entered into force for Italy on 30 July 2016. As already reported at the previous, 82nd Bureau Meeting, this is the 2nd ratification of the biennium, following the ratification of the ICZM Protocol by Israel on 1 February 2016.

3. The Depositary has communicated to the Secretariat that a letter was sent by Lebanon rectifying the mistake made when communicating the ratification of the amended text of the Convention. Table 2 reflects this updated information.

4. The Secretariat continued its efforts to achieve universal ratification of the amended Convention. Discussions continued with the one country whose ratification has not yet been received (Bosnia and Herzegovina). Follow-up will continue with Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to achieve the universal ratification of the amended Convention before the 20th Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP 20, December 2017).

5. The Bureau is also reminded that the Dumping Protocol still requires one additional ratification in order to enter into force. The support of the Bureau to facilitate the ratification of the Dumping Protocol in particular and of all other Protocols by the remaining Contracting Parties would be highly desirable.

6. The Secretariat will continue using all possible opportunities to widen the level of ratification of the Barcelona Convention instruments. Further discussions have been held by the Coordinator with the President of the Bureau to explore possibilities of their joint work on this subject.

7. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau takes note of the current status of ratification of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols and urges the Contracting Parties which have not yet done so to ratify without further delay the relevant legal instruments.

(b) The Bureau congratulates Italy for the ratification of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol and Israel for the ratification of the ICZM Protocol.

(c) The Bureau encourages the President and the Secretariat to continue efforts to achieve the full ratification of the revised Barcelona Convention and the ratification of Protocols in a timely manner.

2. Development of Host Country Agreements for RACs

8. With Decision IG.20/13, entitled “Governance”, COP 17 (Paris, France, February 2012) decided to “urge countries hosting MAP Regional Activity Centers to finalize the new Host Country Agreements as soon as possible, in accordance with the draft prepared and submitted to them by the Secretariat and attached as Annex I to this decision, taking into account domestic laws, regulations and practices, while respecting the common interest of all parties in better coherence and coordination and in the financial implications for the MTF”. This call was repeated in Decision IG.21/13 of COP 18 (Istanbul, Turkey, December 2013) entitled “Governance”.

9. Since COP 17, the Secretariat has undertaken negotiations with the Parties hosting RACs in order to comply with these requirements. Such work has given uneven results and it has proven still difficult to achieve the harmonization of the texts of all these Agreements.

10. Following the recommendation of the previous, 82nd Bureau meeting, a brief report is presented in Annex I, describing the status of negotiation of each Agreement and the challenges encountered. In most of the cases the work is in progress, although at different stages, and the challenges encountered differ in nature.

11. Proposed Recommendations:

The Bureau takes note of the current status of development of the Host Country Agreements for RACs as reported by the Secretariat and encourages the Secretariat to continue its work with the concerned Contracting Parties and UNEP Headquarters and submit a report to its 84 Meeting describing the progress of negotiation for each Agreement since the 83rd Meeting, including a proposed timetable for the implementation of the respective COP Decisions, in order for the Bureau to advise on the way forward.

3. Revision of the TOR of the Bureau

12. With Decision IG.22/15 of COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016) entitled “Compliance Mechanisms and Procedures, Membership and Working Programme of the Compliance Committee for the Biennium 2016-2017”, the Parties adopted “the Recommendations of the Compliance Committee, as contained in Annex II to this Decision, addressing the implementation of Decision IG. 21/1, facilitation of Reporting and functioning of the Compliance Committee”. The Compliance Committee had recommended “to amend Article II, para. 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties, adding a compliance criteria in electing the members of the Bureau; in particular, adding after the words: “and regular attendance at the meeting of the contracting Parties” the following words: “and compliance with their reporting obligations under the Convention”.

13. The Bureau at its 82nd meeting requested the Secretariat to prepare the amended text of the Bureau TOR following the Compliance Committee recommendation, and to submit it to the 83rd Meeting of Bureau for review and further submission to COP 20.

14. The amended text of Article II, para. 3 of the Bureau TOR will read:

“3. In electing the members of the Bureau, the Contracting Parties shall seek to ensure rotation amongst the Contracting Parties, and will take into account regular payment of the contributions of the Contracting Parties to the MTF, regular attendance at the meetings of the Contracting Parties **and compliance with their reporting obligations under the Convention.**” (bold font added to highlight the amended text).

15. Proposed Recommendations:

The Bureau agrees with the amended text of the TORs and requests the Secretariat to prepare a draft Decision for submission to the MAP Focal Points Meeting in 2017 and to COP 20 for approval of the revised TOR.

4. Shift to Thematic Focal Points

16. With Decision IG.21/13 of COP 18 (Istanbul, Turkey, December 2013) entitled “Governance”, the Parties decided to “adopt the measures to strengthen the Barcelona Convention/MAP Governance and Management”. On this subject, the measures include the following text: “The current MAP Components Focal Points system will be refocused into Thematic Focal Points so as to promote an integrated and coherent approach in the implementation of the Convention, its Protocols and the Programme of Work, generate system-wide interest and optimize costs while avoiding fragmentation” and “The Secretariat with the support of the Bureau will prepare more concrete proposals for next biennium”.

17. Decision IG.22/1 of COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016) entitled “UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021” defines the following key output of the MTS: “1.1.3 Strengthen interlinkages between Core and Cross-cutting themes and facilitate Coordination at national level across the relevant sectors. In this context, examine the impacts of a transition to Thematic Focal Points within UNEP/MAP system for consideration at the COP 20.”

18. In order to comply with the above-mentioned decisions, and following the recommendation of the Bureau at its 82nd meeting, the Secretariat prepared a preliminary analysis of the current status and options and impacts for a shift to Thematic Focal Points, contained in Annex II of the present document.

19. The Bureau is invited to provide preliminary guidance and comments on this matter.

20. Proposed Recommendations:

The Bureau welcomes the preliminary analysis of the current status and the options for a shift to Thematic Focal Points presented by the Secretariat and ... (to be completed in accordance with the conclusions of the Bureau discussion).

5. Reporting and Compliance

Implementation of Decision IG.22/16 entitled “Reporting on the Implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols; and Operational Section of the Reporting Format for the Protocol on the Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean”

a) Reports received under Articles 26 and 27 of the Barcelona Convention and relevant articles of the Protocols

21. Under articles 26 and 27 of the Barcelona Convention as well as relevant articles of the Protocols to the Barcelona Convention, Contracting Parties have the obligation to submit their national reports on the legal and administrative measures taken to implement the provisions of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, including a summary of the effectiveness of such measures and any problems encountered in their application. National implementation reports should be submitted to the Secretariat every 2 years, using the online Reporting Format available at the BCRS infosystem, which is administered by INFO/RAC. COP 19 also adopted the operational reporting format for the ICZM Protocol, thus completing the reporting formats covering all legal instruments of MAP, i.e. the Barcelona Convention and its seven Protocols.

22. As at 31 August 2016, in addition to the 15 Contracting Parties that have submitted their reports by 29 February 2016 (Document UNEP(DEPI)MED BUR.83/6) three more Contracting Parties have submitted their reports as working drafts, namely Egypt, Spain and Tunisia. The Secretariat will follow up to ensure that official submission is finalized as soon as possible.

23. The Secretariat requested Contracting Parties who haven't done so to submit any pending reports, informing them also on the status of the report submission, through a letter sent on 17 June 2016 by the UNEP/MAP Coordinator to the MAP Focal Points.

24. Furthermore, with the same letter sent on 17 June 2016, the Secretariat invited Contracting Parties, at the request of COP 19, to report on measures taken to implement the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols for the biennium 2014-2015 by the end of October 2016 at the latest. As at 31 August 2016, 12 Contracting Parties have provided working drafts on their national implementation reports for the biennium 2014-2015.

25. With a view to facilitating reporting under the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, the Secretariat will continue to send reminders to Contracting Parties on their reporting obligations, by highlighting the benefits of reporting and the available assistance: legal, technical, administrative.

26. In this context, the Secretariat is working in close cooperation with INFO/RAC, to make sure that all the required logistic steps are taken to facilitate a smooth uploading of reports in the BCRS infosystem (bcrs@info-rac.org). This includes an ongoing update of the list of names of users with appropriate rights, according to their national role and expertise per each legal instrument. The BCRS infosystem has also created pre-filled reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, only for the Contracting Parties that have submitted officially the reports for the previous biennium (2012-2013).

27. The Secretariat will intensify direct engagement with Contracting Parties to explore the way and means of overcoming the difficulties which may be experienced in submitting their national implementation reports.

b) Update of the reporting format for the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols

28. COP 19 reiterated the request for a simplified reporting format for submission at COP 20. This process will be now expedited, since the recruitment of both the Governance

Programme Officer and the Legal Officer at the Coordinating Unit was recently completed (positions filled on 22 June 2016 and 26 August 2016 respectively).

29. Work to update the reporting format is ongoing, with the Secretariat working in close cooperation with relevant RACs, as appropriate. It is expected to have an updated format by the very beginning of 2017. A testing exercise of the updated report will be conducted immediately after. Based on the results of the testing exercise, the Secretariat will launch a written consultation with the Contracting Parties and submit the resulting format to the MAP Focal Point Meeting in 2017 and to COP 20 for adoption.

Follow-up on Decision IG.22/15 on Compliance Mechanisms and Procedures, Membership and Working Programme of the Compliance Committee for the Biennium 2016-2017

Composition of the Compliance Committee

30. Pursuant to Decision IG 17/2, COP 19 adopted decision IG 22/17 on the composition of the Compliance Committee. As a result the Committee composition was renewed with five new members from Albania, France, Israel, Spain and Turkey.

31. COP 19 also decided that Egypt, Algeria and Monaco should nominate experts for election by the 82nd Meeting of the Bureau. The Bureau at its 83rd Meeting urged the relevant Contracting Parties, namely Algeria, Egypt and Monaco to submit the details of their nominated candidates by 15 May 2016 at the latest to sit as Members and Alternate Members of the Compliance Committee for a term of four years until COP 21 and agreed to their being elected by correspondence.

32. In this respect the Secretariat has followed up on the letters sent to the concerned Contracting Parties (namely Algeria, Egypt and Monaco). As of 2 September 2016, only Egypt has nominated an expert, Dr. Joseph Edward Zaki.

33. The Secretariat will engage with Algeria and Monaco in order to complete the composition of the Compliance Committee as soon as possible.

34. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau urges the remaining Contracting Parties who have not yet done so, to submit their 2012-2013 report without further delay.

(b) The Bureau urges all Contracting Parties to expedite efforts to submit their 2014-2015 reports, in order to comply fully with the deadline set by the COP 19 Decision IG.22/16.

(c) The Bureau takes note of the proposal by the Secretariat with regard to the implementation of the decision IG.22/16.

(d) The Bureau elects the following nominated candidates to sit as Members and Alternate Members of the Compliance Committee for a term of four years until COP 21:
- Dr. Joseph Edward Zaki, national of Egypt, elected for a term of four years.
(to be completed once the remaining two nominations are received).

6. Participation of Palestine in the Barcelona Convention Conferences of Parties and meetings

35. The Bureau, at its 82nd Meeting, requested the Secretariat to be updated on the issue regarding “support to the participation of Palestine in the Barcelona Convention conferences of parties and meetings”. Following the Bureau’s request the Secretariat has prepared document UNEP(DEPI)/MED BUR.83/Inf.6. Furthermore, the Secretariat calls the attention of the Bureau to Rule 6 of the “Rules of Procedure for meetings and conferences of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its related Protocols”, regarding the participation of observers.

B. Assessment of MAP II

36. At COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016), the Parties decided in favor of the option ii contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/23 on the implementation of decision IG.21/16 on Assessment of the Mediterranean Action Plan. Accordingly, the Mediterranean Action Plan Phase II document would be adjusted to reflect the key developments made in the Mediterranean Action Plan system with regard to thematic issues. The Contracting Parties agreed to proceed as proposed in option ii and that an open-ended working group of the MAP Focal Points, under the guidance of the Bureau, should be assigned to update the document for submission to the Contracting Parties at COP 20. The Group would require at least one meeting during 2016-2017. This process will be supported by resources budgeted to the amount of EUR 95,000, of which 25,000 are already approved from MTF in the biennium 2016-2017.

37. The Secretariat prepared draft TORs for the assignment, contained in Annex III of the present document.

38. The Secretariat re-iterates its proposal on the course of action: (i) the Secretariat to send invitations to the Focal Points to appoint their representatives on the open-ended Working Group; (ii) the Bureau to nominate the President or one of the Vice-Presidents to lead the work of the Working Group with Secretariat's support; (iii) the Working Group to hold its meeting in the first quarter of 2017; (iv) the Working Group to prepare its conclusions in time for submission to the 84th Meeting of the Bureau; and (v) the Bureau to provide its recommendations to the Meeting of MAP Focal Point in 2017.

39. It has to be noted that the external resources of EUR 70,000 are not yet secured. The Secretariat will work to this end and will inform the Bureau accordingly. It is recommended that the Contracting Party of one of the Members of the Bureau considers supporting this process with the necessary resources.

40. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau approves the TORs for the assignment prepared by the Secretariat

(b) The Bureau assigns Mr/Ms ... to lead the Open-ended Working Group (*to be completed in accordance with the conclusions of the Bureau discussion*).

(c) The Bureau requests the Secretariat to continue undertaking the course of action for the implementation of the COP 19 conclusions on this matter, as decided at the 82nd Bureau Meeting (paragraph 34 of document UNEP(DEPI)/MED BUR.82/7).

(d) The Bureau calls upon the Contracting Parties to provide the necessary additional resources to ensure the full implementation of the process and their involvement.

C. Cooperation and Partners

41. The Secretariats of UNEP/MAP, through SPA/RAC, ACCOBAMS, GFCM, IUCN-Med, in collaboration with MedPAN (the Partners) prepared a draft "Joint Cooperation Strategy on Spatial-based Protection and Management Measures for Marine Biodiversity among the Secretariats of ACCOBAMS, GFCM, IUCN-Med, UNEP/MAP through SPA/RAC and in collaboration with MedPAN" (the draft Joint Strategy). The draft Joint Strategy builds on the common mandates of the Partners and the foreseen cooperation outlined in the Strategy aims to ensure that the activities undertaken by the concerned Partners in relation to the spatial-based management and conservation in the open sea in the Mediterranean are harmonized and complement each other within the existing mandates of the respective Secretariats. Following the discussion of this draft Joint Strategy at the 40th GFCM Steering Committee meeting in May 2016, the draft has been further refined by the Secretariat, to highlight that the foreseen cooperation among the Secretariats is fully in line with their existing mandates. Noting that the

aim of the Secretariats is to finalize and sign the draft Joint Strategy at the 2nd Forum MPAP, to be held in Morocco from 28 November to 1 December 2016, the draft Joint Strategy is presented as an Information Document to the Bureau.

42. The European Commission (DG Mare) has launched the process for the preparation of a Maritime Strategy in the Western Mediterranean sub-sea basin. The intention is to avoid overlapping, building on complementarity, enhancing ocean governance and strengthening collaboration with MAP and GFCM and focusing on emerging priorities. Flagship actions to focus on, such as safety and security, ocean governance, ICZM, marine research and blue technology as well as marine protected areas, were highlighted as important for the region. The timeline for the preparation of this strategy is July 2016-May 2017. Such a Strategy may offer opportunities to reflect the MSSD objectives at sub regional level and support compliance with the Barcelona Convention in achieving GES. Of importance is also the need to rely and build on existing regional or sub regional governance mechanisms to avoid unnecessary proliferation. In particular, the MCSD is a regional forum where sub regional initiatives related to blue growth and actions promoting sustainable development in the Mediterranean can share lessons learnt and be inspired for better performance.

43. The Secretariat prepared the proposal for the GEF Mediterranean Sea Programme (MedProgramme). The Programme's objective is to kick-start the implementation of actions aimed at strengthening climate resilience and water security, and improving the health and livelihoods of coastal populations. The Programme builds on four components which fully reflect the priorities adopted by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention in the MTS and other instruments such as the MSSD, the RCCAF, etc. The MedProgramme was submitted to the GEF Secretariat the 25 July 2016 for consideration of its inclusion in the October work programme of the GEF Council. The proposed size of the MedProgramme is about US\$ 47 million from GEF International Waters, Chemical and Waste, and Biodiversity focal areas. If approved by the GEF Council in October 2016, these funds will be used to implement activities in the GEF eligible Countries that endorsed the Programme (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Morocco and Tunisia). Moreover, the MedProgramme will strategically contribute to the sustainable development efforts in the Mediterranean basin and to the dialogue, cooperation, and therefore peace and security in the region.

44. The Secretariat has received the application of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) through the Università di Siena (UNISI), for accreditation as UNEP/MAP Partner.

45. The Secretariat has reviewed the documentation submitted in line with Decision 19/6 on "MAP/Civil society cooperation and partnership" and found that SDSN/UNISI meets the criteria for such accreditation. The results of the evaluation of the application are presented in Annex IV to the present report for the Bureau's consideration.

46. The Secretariat recommends that the Bureau approves SDSN/UNISI to be admitted as MAP partner.

47. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau welcomes the progress achieved on issues related to Cooperation and Partners and encourages the Secretariat to continue its work on these issues;

(b) The Bureau takes note of the draft "Joint Cooperation Strategy on Spatial-based Protection and Management Measures for Marine Biodiversity among the Secretariats of ACCOBAMS, GFCM, IUCN-Med, UNEP/MAP through SPA/RAC and in collaboration with MedPAN" (the draft Joint Strategy) and encourages the Secretariat to engage in further efforts for enhancing collaboration with the Secretariats of ACCOBAMS, GFCM, IUCN-Med, in collaboration with MedPAN, in relation to the spatial-based management and conservation in the open sea in the Mediterranean, within the existing mandates of the respective Secretariats;

(c) The Bureau welcomes the preparation of the MedProgramme and encourages the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention to raise awareness to their delegations at the GEF Council in order to support the endorsement of the Programme;

(d) The Bureau invites the Contracting Parties to support the sub regional initiative of the Western Mediterranean sub-sea basin and use it as an opportunity to reflect the MSSD objectives at sub regional level as appropriate;

(e) The Bureau endorses the results of the evaluation conducted by the Secretariat of the application submitted by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) through the Università di Siena (UNISI) for accreditation as UNEP/MAP Partner and requests that the Secretariat submits it to the MAP Focal Points and to COP 20 for consideration and endorsement.

D. Outreach, Information and Communication

48. The Secretariat has published in hardcopy form (a) the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development 2016-2025 (in English and French), (b) the Memorandum of Understanding between UNEP/MAP and GFCM (in English), (c) the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Mediterranean Sea and Coast and related Assessment Criteria – IMA (in English), and (d) the Marine Litter Assessment in the Mediterranean (in English and French). The Secretariat is planning to widely distribute these publications, in upcoming UNEP/MAP meetings as well as in country trainings, meetings of relevant other projects, etc, as appropriate.

49. In order to progress towards key output 3.7.1 “Coordination with the ongoing process towards the adoption of an implementing agreement on BBNJ” and strengthen the visibility of the Mediterranean in the international BBNJ process, the Secretariat co-organized and held, together with GFCM a side-event on 31 August, entitled “Regional Ocean Governance in Practice: the Mediterranean experience”, at the 2nd Preparatory Committee on the Development of an international legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, New York (USA), 26 August - 9 September 2016. The UNEP/MAP Coordinator participated in this side event.

50. The Secretariat is planning to participate in the meeting organized by the CBD Secretariat on “Sustainable Ocean Initiative Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fisheries Bodies on Accelerating Progress Towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”, (26 - 29 September 2016, Seoul, Republic of Korea) with a joint presentation together with GFCM in the Plenary. CBD will cover the costs of this mission. The presentation will be on the Mediterranean experience in the session “Sharing lessons on regional-scale cooperation and scientific mechanisms of regional organizations/bodies for effective implementation towards achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals”.

51. It is very important to invest and build on the increased visibility of the MAP system and its work achieved in COP 19. In the absence of specific capacity at the Coordinating Unit, it is proposed to use the resources allocated in the 2016-2017 budget for the identification and engagement of external capacity to develop a plan of action for the biennium in line with the Communication Strategy 2012-2017 adopted by the Contracting Parties with Decision IG.20/13 entitled “Governance” (COP 17, Paris, France, January 2012).

52. In the meantime, the Secretariat has finalized the development of the revamped website of UNEP/MAP in English, French and Arabic, and its data base, in collaboration with the Division of Communication and Public Information of UNEP. Launching, full operation and training is expected by October 2016.

53. UNEP/MAP was the pilot Regional Seas Convention to join (May 2016) the InforMEA database established by UNEP. All data and information was shared as requested.

54. The Secretariat will propose to the Bureau in due course the establishment of a full-time position within the Coordinating Unit to deal with Information and Communications functions for the MAP system, to be considered by COP 20 (December 2017) for the biennium 2018-2019. Meanwhile, the Secretariat proposes to the Bureau to jointly mobilize human resources from the Contracting Parties that can avail them to the Coordinating Unit in the form of seconded staff or Junior Professional Officers.

55. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau expresses appreciation for the very good results of the information and communication work following COP 19;

(b) The Bureau takes note of the status of recruitment at the Coordinating Unit and in addition, it encourages the Contracting Parties who may be able to do so to contribute human resources to the Secretariat in the areas that are mostly needed such as information and communication, and resource mobilization, through JPO and other similar schemes and to consider an increase in the allocation of funds to the required human resources for the effective and consistent delivery of the Programme of Work.

E. Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award

56. With Decision IG.22/19 of COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016) entitled "Environment Friendly City Award" the Contracting Parties decided "to establish the Environment Friendly City Award to be conferred to Mediterranean coastal cities, and name it the "Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award" and requested "the Secretariat, using extra budgetary resources, to finalize the procedure for the nomination and selection criteria, on the basis of the elements described in the Annex, and mechanisms for visibility, for consideration of the 2016-2017 Bureau for its approval, and grant the first award at COP 20".

57. The regular process and timeline for granting the award as described in the above-mentioned decision will apply to the biennia from 2018 onwards. This year, work still needs to be done to develop and finalize the nomination and selection criteria and process and to grant the first award at COP 20. For this purpose, and following the consultations between Turkey and the Secretariat in order to implement the decision, Turkey confirmed the provision of the necessary resources to launch the first edition of the Award at COP 20 in December 2017, amounting to EUR 44,000 as per the POW and Budget 2016-2017.

58. The Secretariat proceeded with work to finalize the selection criteria and process. The following actions were taken in this respect: (i) a Task Force was created (as per Annex of Decision IG. 22/19) composed of representatives from the Coordinating Unit and MAP Components, (ii) a document describing the nomination and selection process was drafted, together with an Application Form, (iii) the two above mentioned documents were revised by the Task Force and are presented in Annex V of this document, for the approval of the Bureau.

59. Based on the experience and the lessons learnt from this first edition the Secretariat, through the Task Force, will revise as appropriate the relevant process and criteria.

60. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau welcomes the work done by the Secretariat and the Task Force on the Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award, approves the nomination and selection process and the Application Form and, to this end, requests the Secretariat to proceed with launching the award in accordance to this process, so that the first edition of the Award is granted at COP 20;

(b) The Bureau expresses appreciation for the support of Turkey to this process.

F. Preparations for COP 20

Dates of COP 20

61. COP 19 decided that COP 20 would take place in Tirana, Albania, on 5-8 December 2017. However, in June 2016 the Member States of the United Nations Environment Assembly of UNEP announced that the third session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-3) will take place in Nairobi, Kenya, on 4-6 December 2017. Due to the overlap of the two events, and in order to ensure the highest possible participation in COP 20, the Bureau may wish to reconsider the dates of COP 20. The Secretariat proposes as alternative dates, either 21-24 November 2017 or 12-15 December 2017.

Theme of COP 20

62. The Secretariat, after consultations between the Coordinating Unit and the MAP Components, suggests the following as possible main themes of COP 20:

(a) *Tourism and its growing impacts on the marine and coastal environment of the Mediterranean Sea*

63. Tourism is a major pillar of Mediterranean economies, offering consistent employment (11.5% of total employment in 2014) and economic growth (11.3% of regional GDP). In the Mediterranean basin, tourism is vital for many countries. Furthermore, maritime transports are closely linked to tourism development in the Mediterranean. Over time, Mediterranean destinations have developed a unique blend of tourism products covering leisure, health, sports, nature, business, as well as cruise and culture. However, the economic growth related with the tourism sector has often been to the detriment of environmental integrity and social equity. This issue has not been discussed for some time within UNEP/MAP – Barcelona Convention and it is now addressed in the MSSD 2016-2025 (Annex to Decision IG.22/2, especially under Objective 2) and in the Regional Action Plan on Sustainable Consumption and Production in the Mediterranean, as one of its four priority areas (Annex to Decision IG.22/2).

(b) *Regional Framework for ICZM: Boosting integration to reach good environmental status and sustainability*

64. The adoption (2008) and entry into force (2011) of the Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean recognized the importance of an integrated management approach for the sustainable development of coastal zones. Furthermore, ICZM constitutes Cross-Cutting Theme 1 of the UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021, (Decision IG. 22/1), while it is included in the general objectives of the MSSD 2016-2025 (Decision IG. 22/2). COP 19 also invited the Secretariat to define a common regional framework for ICZM, for consideration at COP 20. Therefore, the proposed theme can focus on how a holistic ICZM approach can best contribute to reaching the objectives of all the other legal and policy documents of UNEP/MAP – Barcelona Convention.

65. The Bureau is invited to reflect on these possible themes. The Bureau member from Albania, host country of COP 20, or other Bureau members may wish to propose and examine other themes for COP 20.

COP 20 Decisions

The proposal of the Secretariat is to focus, to the extent possible, on a limited number of forward-looking and substantive Decisions, guided by the UNEP/MAP Mid Term Strategy 2016-2021, in addition to the issues emanating from COP 19. The members of the Bureau are expected to discuss on the approach to be followed for the preparation of potential COP 20 decisions and provide their guidance and advice to the Secretariat.

66. Proposed Recommendations:

(a) The Bureau decides to change the dates of COP 20 to..., to avoid overlap with UNEA-3 (to be completed in accordance with the conclusions of the Bureau discussion).

(b) The Bureau takes note of the possible themes of COP 20 and ... (to be completed in accordance with the conclusions of the Bureau discussion).

(c) The Bureau agrees with the proposal of the Secretariat to focus on a limited number of forward-looking Decisions, guided by the UNEP/MAP Mid Term Strategy 2016-2021 and Programme of Work 2016-2017.

G. Progress in implementation of the PoW 2016-2017

a) Preparation of the 2017 Quality Status Report

67. The draft concept table of contents and timeline for the preparation of the 2017 Quality Status Report (2017 QSR) based on MAP EcAp-based EO and related common indicators has been developed in detail, following internal discussion and agreement, including during the last EcAp Task Force meeting in June 2016, in Athens, Greece. This concept will also be discussed at the CORMON Pollution meeting on 19-21 October, in Marseilles, France. Since the adoption of the IMAP decision at COP 19, and given the IMAP implementation is still at an early phase, it is important to develop an approach which is in line with other Regional Seas (such as OSPAR and HELCOM) and accommodates the short time available for its preparation (looking also at data gaps on some of the IMAP indicators). As countries are still in the process of revising their national monitoring programmes, it will not be possible to compile a full set of data for all IMAP indicators for the 2017 QSR. Therefore, the most practical approach for the 2017 QSR is to use all indicator data available and to complement and address gaps with inputs from additional sources, identified and mapped from other partners, the NAP reports, etc.

68. Several steps are needed before a fully indicator-based regional assessment can be undertaken. These steps include:

- 1) Development of Indicator Guidance Factsheets for each of the IMAP Common indicators (by October 2016)
- 2) Countries to develop or revise their monitoring programmes in relation to IMAP (2016-2017)
- 3) Development of an IMAP data reporting system, linked to INFO/RAC's InfoMap platform (2016)
- 4) Agreement on the template for countries to report on data and metadata for each indicator as well as on the indicator assessment template for reporting. These templates, which will be in line with the latest MSFD reporting template and comparable with OSPAR and HELCOM, will be discussed at the CORMON meetings with the view for countries to pilot for certain indicators. The results of these tests will be included in the 2017 QSR and the final templates will be presented to MAP Focal Points and COP 20 in 2017 for review and adoption.

69. Given the above, this report should be a combination of quantitative data with qualitative information and should define the process for the next QSR report to be completely based on national data and assessments. It is expected that the assessment templates will be piloted by a number of countries, for indicators where data is available, and will be included as case studies in the 2017 QSR report.

70. It is suggested to prepare the 2017 QSR report as an online interactive report, that can be made widely available online, be visually appealing, include graphics and animations (such as time series maps of concentrations) and can include links to case studies (from Contracting Parties and also partners) or links to other databases and information sources. A Summary Report would also need to be prepared and published.

71. The 2017 QSR Table of Contents is currently structured to link the IMAP Ecological Objectives and indicators with the three Core Themes of the UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021. A QSR Working Group (WG) will ensure the technical coordination to include all MAP Components and the EcAp Task Force. This WG will define partners, experts and sources of additional information and will provide the core content of the 2017 QSR. During the CORMON meeting, Contracting Parties will be requested to review and agree on the assessment templates and on the indicators they are able to report against. A draft report will be available in January 2017 for the QSR WG/EcAp Task Force review, and further inputs will be provided during the Marine Litter CORMON in February 2017. A Consultant will be recruited for the editing of the report and a relevant institution/organization will be contracted for the creation of the online interactive publication. Peer review of the report will be conducted through the Component Focal Point meetings and MAP Focal Point meeting in 2017, for finalization and launching at COP 20.

72. Proposed Recommendations:

The Bureau agrees with the proposed approach and process for the 2017 QSR, and encourages Contracting Parties to provide data and information to contribute to the Report following review and discussion of a detailed proposal at the CORMON meeting in October 2016.

b) Implementation of IMAP

73. In line with Decision IG.22/7, the period 2016-2017 is focusing on national implementation, since the IMAP initial phase (2016-2019) will integrate the existing national monitoring and assessment programmes in line with the IMAP structure and principles and agreed common indicators. In order to assist the Southern Contracting Parties in their implementation efforts (i.e. to review and revise the existing national monitoring and assessment programmes as appropriate so that national implementation of IMAP can be fulfilled in a sufficient manner), the Coordinating Unit, in cooperation and consultation with all MAP Components, GFCM and ACCOBAMS and with the support of the EcAp-MEDII project, is currently undertaking a capacity assessment of IMAP implementation needs of the Southern Mediterranean Countries.

74. In addition, with the support of the EcAp-MEDII project, country-specific trainings, assisting the development of national monitoring programmes, are under-way and organized in a thematic manner (for biodiversity and NIS, pollution and litter, coast and hydrography). The Secretariat has also published the IMAP and plans to distribute it widely, including in the country level trainings. It has also developed draft Common Indicator Fact Sheets, in cooperation with all MAP Components, GFCM and ACCOBAMS, to further facilitate the national implementation of IMAP, as well as to enhance technical refinements of the various common indicators at regional level.

75. Progress in line with Decision IG. 22/7 is also foreseen during 2016-2017 at regional level since, for a high quality of assessment, baselines and thresholds will need to be agreed on in line with the possible methods set out in the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Guidance document, following the agreed scales of assessment. Regional work on further refinement of GES and targets, as in past practice, will be led by the respective Correspondence Groups on Monitoring (CORMONs), with the first CORMON to take place in October 2016 (Pollution CORMON, which will discuss, among other matters, monitoring and assessment specifics related to contaminants and eutrophication, the pollution and litter draft fact sheets and the Quality Status Report, so-called QSR concept). In order to facilitate the development of the 2017 QSR (in line with Decision IG.22/7) based on the common indicators and assessment fact sheets, an internal EcAp-Task Force has been used to discuss, in line with IMAP, the concept for the development and the structure of the 2017 QSR (see section a).

76. Discussions and coordination is also ongoing on technical level between the Secretariats of ACCOBAMS and GFCM, in order to ensure coordinated efforts in IMAP implementation, including on data-sharing.

77. INFO/RAC has developed a vision paper on necessary steps to develop an “IMAP compatible” INFO/MAP system, noting that data and information sharing needs will be discussed both internally, in the EcAp-Task Force (consisting all components of UNEP/MAP) and in the upcoming October 2016 Pollution and Litter CORMON.

78. Proposed Recommendations:

a) The Bureau agrees with the proposed course of action and welcomes the efforts of the Secretariat to implement IMAP;

b) The Bureau urges the Contracting Parties to accelerate their efforts in developing and submitting to the Secretariat their updated, integrated national monitoring programmes in line with their specificities, and to implement where appropriate the existing monitoring programmes and urgently submit the relevant, already available quality assured data to the Secretariat.

c) Implementation of the MSSD

79. UNEP/MAP submitted, through UNEP Headquarters, in July 2016 a concept note to UN-DESA for a project proposal on the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy (MSSD) implementation, targeting the project funding available for projects addressing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The project proposal is aiming to strengthen the implementation of the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy with the involvement of all relevant Mediterranean stakeholders, in order to achieve outputs 1.3.3, 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2016-2017 (Decision IG.22/20).

80. The Secretariat (Coordinating Unit and Plan Bleu) has drafted a) the “Work plan for the MCSD Steering Committee and MSSD implementation (2015-2017)” and b) the “Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development 2016-2025. Implementation and Monitoring Plan”, which were then sent to the Members of the MCSD Steering Committee for comments. In the absence of comments the documents were finalized. The Secretariat is working on a detailed workplan schedule for the MSSD implementation. It should be noted that the Istanbul Environmental Friendly City Award (progress described above) can be also considered as an element of MSSD implementation, since the award is one of the MSSD 2016-2025 flagship initiatives (Decision IG.22/2).

81. Decision IG.22/17, adopted at COP 19, invited Contracting Parties “to participate on a voluntary basis in a simple MSSD peer review process as described in Annex II of this Decision and requests the Secretariat to support this process”. This activity is foreseen in output 1.3.3 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2016-2017 (Decision IG.22/20). The ToR for the experts to support this peer-review process has been launched and two experts have been selected. An invitation was sent to all MCSD Members representing Contracting Parties on 17 June 2016, inviting them to send the expression of interest for participating as volunteer countries to the 2016-2017 test of simplified peer review mechanism. Following this letter and the respective expression of interest, there is ongoing progress for the appointment of three Contracting Parties, one from each Group, to participate in the process. Montenegro and Morocco have already expressed their interest. Furthermore, a Draft Methodological Report of National Strategies for Sustainable Development Simplified Peer Review Mechanism has been developed. The 1st Working Meeting of the Simplified Peer Review Mechanism (SIMPEER) is organized on 18 October 2016, in Barcelona, Spain, with the aim to review of the methodological report and roadmap as well as the draft structure of the master report on “The MSSD implementation through the simplified peer review mechanism” and prepare the next steps, taking into account countries’ expectations and needs.

82. The MSSD (Decision IG.22/5) foresees that the regular monitoring of the Strategy will be developed through the establishment of a dashboard of sustainability indicators populated for the Mediterranean. This activity is foreseen in output 1.4.2 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2016-2017 (Decision IG.22/20). In this respect, a process for the development of the sustainability indicators has been launched. An initial workshop on “How to monitor the MSSD 2016-2025” was organized in Saint-Laurent du Var, France, on 30-31 of March 2016. Following that, a technical workshop on “How to monitor the MSSD 2016-2025 implementation and the Regional Action Plan on SCP in the Mediterranean?” is organized on 17 October 2016, in Barcelona, Spain. During this workshop, a first version of the MSSD dashboard will be presented and discussed, based mainly on the results of the workshop of Saint-Laurent du Var. At the same meeting, a first set of SCP indicators will be presented and discussed, in relation to the Regional Action Plan for SCP in the Mediterranean (Decision IG. 22/5).

83. Proposed Recommendations:

The Bureau welcomes the progress in relation to the implementation of the MSSD 2016-2025.

d) Preparation of the revised Resource Mobilization Strategy

84. Through Decision IG.22/1 “UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021”, COP19 requested the Secretariat “to prepare for adoption at COP 20 a new, comprehensive Resource Mobilization Strategy corresponding to the period of the MTS”. This activity is foreseen in output 1.1.4 of the Programme of Work and Budget 2016-2017 (Decision IG.22/20). The Secretariat is currently preparing the TOR for the related assignment, which is to prepare a ground mapping study for identifying funding opportunities for regional and national priorities and update the MAP Resource Mobilization Strategy including the development of coherent MAP-wide communication mechanism targeting donors/partners.

Annex I

Status of Host Country Agreements of RACs

Status of development of Host Country Agreements

Work is progressing slower than anticipated in harmonizing the institutional status of the RACs, as RACs present a very diverse legal status. Revised Host Country Agreements (HCA) are at different stages of maturity, given the specificities of each RAC. The main challenges encountered are summarized below:

PLAN BLEU

There are still differences between France and UNEP on the Plan Bleu HCA. However, discussion is ongoing to reach an agreement as soon as possible.

PAP/RAC

The PAP/RAC HCA has been cleared by Croatia and UNEP. Croatia would like to see all the HCAs cleared and ready before they sign the new HCA for PAP/RAC. It should be noted that the existing HCA, signed in 1996, is not very different from the new one.

REMPEC

The Agreement between the Government of Malta and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) concerning the Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC) was signed in 1990. In November 2006, the IMO Secretary-General sent, a draft HCA to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malta. The signature of the draft is still pending, subject to the outcome of the discussions between REMPEC and Malta on the provisions of the draft regarding the maintenance of the premises, including the undertaking of major works. Once the discussions were concluded, the draft HCA should be signed by the Maltese Government, IMO and UNEP.

SPA/RAC

SPA/RAC relationship with the Tunisian Government is ruled through a Host Country Agreement signed between UNEP and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Tunisia (on behalf of the Tunisian Government) in 1991 and the addendum signed between UNEP and the Tunisian Ministry of Environment in 2013. The Tunisian Ministry of Environment is leading the process for the signature of the new HCA, which implies the involvement of different national competent authorities. Work is underway, although the challenges in coordinating national authorities remain.

SCP/RAC

Work to define an own legal status for the SCP/RAC is on-going (that is a necessary pre-requisite in the process of signing the HCA for the Center). The Spanish Government is working in the definition of the TOR for that specific legal status. The center is currently hosted by the Catalan Waste Agency. No issues have been disclosed concerning possible challenges related to the introduction of a new HCA template.

Annex II

Preliminary analysis of the current status and options and impacts for a shift to Thematic Focal Points

Preliminary analysis of the current status and options and impacts for a shift to Thematic Focal Points

1. Background information on the Focal Points in the framework of the Barcelona Convention/MAP system and the way forward

Focal Points, appointed by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention are an important component of the UNEP/MAP structure, that play a crucial role in reviewing the progress of work and ensuring implementation at national level. As noted in MAP Phase II, in the framework of the Barcelona Convention, MAP Focal Points are currently responsible for the follow up and coordination of MAP activities at national level and for ensuring the dissemination of information. Specific focal points are also appointed to follow up the national implementation of a Protocol or/and the activities of the Regional Activity Centers (INFO/RAC, PB/RAC, PAP RAC, REMPEC, SPA RAC, SCP/RAC Focal Points) and MED POL (MED POL Focal Points)

The establishment of the Focal Points emerged from an early identified need to have national experts appointed in order to guide and support the development of the programmes in the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan. It can be said that this need was first highlighted in the Intergovernmental Meeting on the Protection of the Mediterranean (1975, Barcelona, Spain) that adopted the Mediterranean Action Plan, which in its point 6 (a) requests UNEP Executive Director to “*organize meetings of national experts in order to guide the development of the various parts of the above programme*”.

Later, during the Intergovernmental Meeting of Mediterranean Coastal States on the Blue Plan (Split, Yugoslavia, 1977), the importance of national Focal Points was reaffirmed and the Governments were requested to designate Focal Points for activities relevant to both the Blue Plan (PB/RAC) and the Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC), in order mainly to *carry coordination responsibilities between the national administrations and agencies involved in the implementation*. During the extraordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, in 1982, it was decided to strengthen the role of these Focal Points.

At their 5th Ordinary Meeting (Athens, Greece, 7-11 September 1987) the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention decided to establish a Scientific and Technical Committee and a Socio-Economic Committee (UNEP/IG.74/5, Section II.A), as the two standing subsidiary bodies of the Contracting Parties, which would meet in April/May of each year. The existing structure of national focal points for each component of the Mediterranean Action Plan was maintained, but meetings of such focal points would only be convened on an ad hoc basis when a particular programme development required it (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.1/12). At that time, the MED POL Programme had national MED POL coordinators for each Contracting Party participating in the Programme.

In the framework of the MAP Phase II, adopted by the COP 9 (Barcelona, Spain, 1995) the need for strengthened institutional capacity and policy coordination is highlighted in many instances and its Part III.1 (Institutional Arrangements) explicitly provides for the appointment of Focal Points *to follow-up and coordinate MAP activities at national level, and ensure the dissemination of information*. Furthermore, it is provided that *specific focal points are appointed by the national focal point to follow up implementation of a Protocol or the activities of a Regional Activity Centre*.

The designation of Focal Points of other RACs is officially provided for by certain decisions of the Contracting Parties, such as the decision IG17/10 Annex V adopted by the COP 15 (Almeria, Spain, 15 - 18 January 2008), requesting the Contracting Parties to nominate Governmental FP, Prevention FP, OPRC FP, 24hours FP and mutual assistance FP. In the same sense, the Recommendations

adopted by the Contracting Parties in their Meeting in Montpellier, France, in 1996 (IG8/7) requested the *nomination without delay of National Focal Points related to cleaner production to enable cooperation with CP/RAC (later SCP/RAC)*.

Furthermore, two Protocols explicitly require the designation of National Focal Points to support their implementation, namely the SPA/BD Protocol in its article 24, and the ICZM Protocol in its article 30. Under these Protocols the Focal Points are requested to serve as liaison with the Centre on the technical and scientific aspects of the implementation of the Protocol and to disseminate information at the national, regional and local level.

Decision IG 17/5 (Governance Paper) adopted by the COP 15 (Almeria, Spain, 2008) provides for a clear and detailed description of the role of the Focal Points (both MAP and RAC Focal Points), including information about their designation process and main tasks. As already described above, Focal Points are designated by the Contracting Parties and their main tasks include, among others, coordination and liaison between the Secretariat or the RACs and the national authorities, support of implementation at national level of the policies and Programmes adopted in the framework of the MAP /Barcelona Convention or the RACs, coordination with different national authorities, communication, dissemination of information etc.

Although the current system of Focal Points has successfully worked in practice during the past years, the Contracting Parties have decided that an institutional reform of the Focal Points is required in order to *enhance effectiveness, coherence, and transparency in the governance of the Barcelona Convention/MAP system*. The goal is to shift from Focal Points per MAP component to Focal Points per thematic area/Protocol (thematic focal points), as stated in the Annex II of the Decision IG.21/13 (Governance) adopted by the COP 18. Their responsibilities will remain more or less the same as, according to the aforementioned decision, they will perform the functions assigned to Focal Points under Article 24 of the SPA/BD Protocol and Article 30 of the ICZM Protocol. Furthermore they will be the national liaison for the implementation of the technical and scientific aspects of thematic Protocols and in this context cooperate with the Secretariat and the corresponding supporting Centres as well as disseminate information at the national, regional and local level.

This institutional reform is also addressed in the UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021, adopted by the COP 19 in 2016 (Decision IG.22/1), since the indicative key output 1.1.3 for Governance issues, provides for an examination of impacts of a transition to Thematic Focal Points within the UNEP/MAP system for consideration at the COP 20, in view of strengthening the interlinkages between Core and Cross-cutting themes and facilitating Coordination at national level across the relevant sectors.

The Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention at its 82nd Meeting requested the Secretariat to prepare a preliminary analysis of the current status and the options and impacts for a shift to a Thematic Focal Point system taking into account current practice as appropriate of other multilateral agreements and to submit it for further discussion and guidance at its 83rd Meeting (UNEP(DEPI)/MED BUR.82/7). Regarding other MEAs, the examples of OSPAR and HELCOM were examined. In the HELCOM and OSPAR Commissions, there is no focal point system similar to that of UNEP/MAP. The Meetings of the Permanent Groups and time-limited Groups of HELCOM as well as the Main Committees of OSPAR play a similar role with the Focal Point Meetings, as they bring together representatives of the Contracting Parties that work on implementation of the different programmes. However, the nature of these structures and the role of the representatives is more technical and not as political/governance-related as the Focal Points of the UNEP/MAP system.

More specifically, in the OSPAR system, the role of the MAP Focal Points is carried out by the Heads of Delegation and by the recently established Coordination Group that has among its responsibilities to coordinate the work of the main Committees in facilitating the development of common indicators, in view of enhancing the implementation of the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD). The

equivalent body of the MAP Component Focal Points in the framework of OSPAR is the five main Committees. The main Committees are thematic, covering the areas addressed by the OSPAR Commission: (a) Hazardous Substances and Eutrophication, (b) Offshore Industry, (c) Radioactive substances, (d) Biodiversity Committee, (e) Environmental Impacts and Human Activities. In the governance provisions for the main Committees found in the OSPAR Rules of Procedure¹, it is noted that the Chairmen shall hold office for two years, unless the main committee decides otherwise when making an election, and that one of the chairman's tasks shall be the reporting as specified in that main committee's terms of reference.

2. Options and impacts for a shift to thematic Focal Points

Under the current situation, there are two types of Focal Points in the framework of UNEP/MAP system, namely the MAP Focal Points and the MAP Component Focal Points that are relevant to each MAP Component (MED POL and Regional Activity Centers).

Following the mandate given by the Contracting Parties at COP18 to shift from the MAP Component Focal Points to Thematic Focal Points, a preliminary analysis was performed in order to examine the main strengths and weaknesses of the current system, as well as those of a Thematic Focal Point system. As themes for the Thematic Focal Points, the six themes of the UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021 (Decision IG.22/1) were considered as the most relevant, i.e. the three core themes (themes 1-3), namely Land and Sea-based Pollution, Biodiversity and Ecosystems, and Land and Sea Interaction and Processes, and the three cross-cutting themes (themes 4-6), namely Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP), and Climate Change Adaptation. The results of the preliminary analysis are presented in the following table.

Component FP system	Thematic FP system
Strengths	
Seven component focal points per Contracting Party: bring together multidimensional expertise; represent different national sectors/actors, address the entire MAP scope of action, play a crucial role in the technical implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols	Six thematic focal points as per the main themes of the MTS will facilitate MTS implementation
Long standing experience and stability, effective follow up of implementation of the Protocols	More effective way of collaboration between Thematic Focal Points expected at national and regional level. Shifting to thematic focal points could enhance national coordination and integration
Clear communication and effective ways of collaboration between the Focal Points and the MAP Components (i.e. between the Secretariat and the national governments) have been established under the current system	The cross cutting Thematic Focal Points are expected to provide added value to the work of the entire system and will not be any longer on a sectorial basis, reducing silos
The Focal Point system as it stands now covers the work undertaken by all the MAP Components (this is particularly important for RACs that are	Enhanced effectiveness, integration and transparency in the governance of the Barcelona Convention/MAP system is expected

¹ As revised at OSPAR 2001 (Annex 29), OSPAR 2002 (Annex 10), OSPAR 2005 (Annex 25). Editorial amendments made at OSPAR 2012 (see OSPAR 12/22/1, §§12.5-12.6). Rule 39 – Jurists/Linguists amended at OSPAR 2013

not clearly linked to a Protocol, while on the same time play a crucial role in the development and implementation of the Barcelona Convention)	
Within the framework of overall assessment / improvement of the effectiveness of the Barcelona Convention-UNEP/MAP system as provided by the Governance Decisions of recent COPs (e.g. COP 15, COP 17, COP 18)	A shift to Thematic Focal Points could be timely linked to parallel processes such as the Assessment of MAP II (follow-up to COP 18 and COP 19)
	Take advantage of the experience of other bodies using similar structures, such as OSPAR and HELCOM as appropriate
	More technical and less political Focal Points would be formed. This will create opportunities for enhanced technical work by the Focal Points
Weaknesses	
The current system needs to be better aligned with the legislative structure of UNEP/MAP, since two Protocols explicitly require the designation of National Focal Points to support their implementation, namely the SPA/BD Protocol (article 24) and the ICZM Protocol (article 30)	Thematic focal points may not have the competence and representation to address the entire scope of the theme for which they will be responsible (i.e. pollution)
Lack of integration and coordination between the different sectorial/Component Focal Points at Contracting Party level	New Focal Points will have to be appointed, which may hinder the continuity of work and gathered experience of the current Focal Points (in case those Focal Points are different from the existing)
Sectorial and silo approach prevail	The problem of lack of coordination and integration may not be resolved (e.g. in the OSPAR example, thematic Groups had problems of integration and coordination, which recently lead to the creation of a new body, the Coordination Group)
	Some MAP Components that are crucial for the implementation of the Barcelona Convention may be left without Focal Points. At the same time, the channel of communication may be difficult: how will the Thematic Focal Points communicate with the respective components? It is not clear how the above will affect the operation of the UNEP/MAP system in the long term
	Some of the Thematic Focal Points may have a broader agenda, while others may have a more limited, creating a lack of homogeneity. On the same time there may be an overlap in the work of the different Thematic Focal Points (as for example in OSPAR)

	The shift may lead to the creation of more technical and less political/governance related Focal Points (as is the case for OSPAR and HELCOM). This will create opportunities (see above), but has also weaknesses in relation to the capacity of Focal Points in relation to decision making
--	---

Apart from the above strengths and weaknesses, there are also certain **preconditions** for a successful shift to a Thematic Focal point system:

Thematic focal points should be established by a COP decision. To fully align with the legislative structure of UNEP/MAP, it should be ensured that the establishment of the thematic FP for Biodiversity and ICZM is not in contradiction with the respective articles of the two Protocols
It is crucial to clarify the tasks of the Thematic Focal Points, vis a vis the implementation of the Protocols

Following the above analysis, together with the background information and the current practice of other MEAs, the following main options are proposed:

1. Shift on a trial basis of the PAP/RAC and the SPA/RAC Focal Points to ICZM and SPA/BD Focal Points respectively. This shift will cover the designation of National Focal Points to support the implementation of the ICZM Protocol and the SPA/BD Protocol. These Focal Points will also play the role of the focal points for theme 2 and for themes 3 and 4 of the MTS respectively, without changing the rest of the MAP Component Focal Points.
2. Option 1 and the combination of the other Component Focal Points as Thematic Focal Points (MED POL and REMPEC FPs to be both considered as Thematic FPs for theme 1; Plan Bleu and PAP/RAC FPs as focal points for theme 6 (climate change); SCP/RAC FPs as focal points for theme 5. Plan Bleu Focal Points will also contribute to the implementation of MSSD related activities.

Some further considerations arising from the analysis presented above, are the following:

- a) One of the main reasons for the suggested shift to Thematic Focal Points, as also noted in Annex II of Decision IG.21/13, is that this is explicitly required in the SPA/BD Protocol (Article 24) and the ICZM Protocol (Article 30)
- b) The shift of Focal Points in the case of these two Protocols (SPA/BD and ICZM) are not expected to largely affect the balance of the current system, since these two Protocols are closely linked to two specific Regional Activity Centers (SPA/RAC for the SPA/BD Protocol and PAP/RAC for the ICZM Protocol), as explicitly mentioned in the text of the Protocols
- c) The lack of integration and coordination between the different sectorial Focal Points, which is a flaw of the current system, will not necessarily be resolved with the shift to Thematic Focal Points (as the OSPAR experience has shown, where Committees tend to function much like separate entities, creating therefore the need for a new body, the Coordination Group)

- d) A role for the focal points in the implementation of the Programme of Work could be envisaged during the entire biennium and not only during the biennial focal points meeting (as is for example the case for the OSPAR Committees).

Due to the above, it is proposed to proceed initially with a shift to Thematic Focal Points for the SPA/BD and the ICZM Protocols. It is expected that the process, challenges and impact of such a shift can provide useful input for further examination of this issue in the future.

Irrespective of this shift, however, the process of internal coordination at Contracting Party level is absolutely necessary to achieve coherence and integration of all relevant policies and to facilitate the effectiveness of the operation of the Barcelona Convention - UNEP/MAP system, the successful implementation of the Ecosystem Approach and the achievement of the Mid-Term Strategy's vision. Furthermore, the Coordination at Secretariat level, between the Coordinating Unit and all MAP Components, is also very important to ensure coherence and efficiency in the Barcelona Convention - UNEP/MAP system. The work of the Executive Coordination Panel and of ad hoc, horizontal, Task Forces is very useful in this respect. Finally, the coherence and integration between the works of the different focal point groups (Thematic or Component), through - for example - joint meetings, is a very useful practice and should be followed as appropriate.

Annex III

TORs for the Assessment of MAP II

Terms of Reference of MAP II Assessment

1. Background

At COP 18 (Istanbul, Turkey, 3-6 December 2013) the Contracting Parties adopted Decision IG.21/16 on the *Assessment of the Mediterranean Action Plan* and decided to “Launch a process to assess MAP phase II with the intention of addressing effectively the challenge of sustainable development and the irreversible nature of impacts on the environment and resources, with a view to proposing a Decision on the appropriate way forward including the possible adoption at the 19th meeting of the Contracting Parties of MAP phase III;”.

At COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016), the Parties decided in favour of the option ii contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/23 on the implementation of decision IG.21/16 on the *Assessment of the Mediterranean Action Plan*. Accordingly, the Mediterranean Action Plan Phase II document would be adjusted to reflect the key developments made in the Mediterranean Action Plan system with regard to thematic issues. The Contracting Parties also agreed that an open-ended working group of the MAP focal points, under the guidance of the Bureau, should be assigned to update the document for submission to the Contracting Parties at their twentieth meeting. The Group would require at least one meeting during 2016-2017.

At the 82nd Meeting of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, the Coordinator presented to the Bureau the proposed course of action for the implementation of the COP 19 conclusions on this matter for endorsement. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to undertake the following course of action for the implementation of the COP 19 conclusions:

- (a) the Secretariat to prepare TORs for the assignment taking also into account the MSSD, to be shared with the Bureau at its 83rd Meeting;
- (b) the Secretariat to send invitations to the Focal Points to participate or appoint their representatives on the open-ended Working Group (WG);
- (c) the Bureau to nominate one of its members to lead the work of the Working Group with Secretariat's support;
- (d) the Working Group to hold its meeting in the first quarter of 2017 (if the external funds are available);
- (e) the Working Group to prepare its conclusions in time for submission to the 84th Meeting of the Bureau; and
- (f) the Bureau to provide its recommendations to the Meeting of MAP Focal Points in 2017 to be presented at the COP 20 together with the conclusions of the Working Group.

2. Tasks of the Working Group

In order to implement option ii contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/23, on the implementation of decision IG.21/16 on the *Assessment of the Mediterranean Action Plan*, the Mediterranean Action Plan Phase II document needs to be adjusted to reflect the key developments since its adoption in COP 9 (Barcelona, Spain, 5-8 June 1995). As noted in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/23, there is a deep matching of the thematic areas of MAP II, with effectively addressing the challenge of sustainable development and the irreversible nature of impacts on the environment and resources. Option ii appreciates that there is a need, nevertheless, for certain updates in the text of MAP II to reflect the evolution of the reality of sustainable development and of the MAP system itself. On the same time, the context of MAP II, its objectives, thematic priorities and activities are still relevant, as its text is flexible enough to accommodate new global developments and

it is fully complemented by the new tools and instruments, comprehensive protocols and amendments that the MAP system has adopted and implemented.

The task of the WG is therefore to factually update MAP II in order to reflect the evolution of sustainable development and of the MAP system itself. In order to do so, three main steps are identified:

- i) Identify the main evolutions since the adoption of MAP II and the relevant COP decisions and other documents that reflect them,
- ii) Identify the main parts/sections of MAP II that are outdated and require factual updates, and
- iii) Update the MAP II text based on the evolutions since its adoption, and especially the parts mostly in need of update, and agree on the updated text for submission at the MAP Focal Points and COP 20.

In the following section of this document a brief summary of the main evolutions since the adoption of MAP II is presented, in order to facilitate the work of the open-ended WG.

3. Main evolutions since the adoption of MAP II

As described in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/23, MAP Phase II was adopted twenty years ago and the MAP agenda has since evolved in response to the global agenda. The main evolutions include:

Developments in the MAP system since the adoption of MAP Phase II

- Entry into force of the amended Barcelona Convention in 2004;
- Entry into force of the Offshore Protocol in 2011;
- Adoption of a new Protocol on Hazardous Wastes in 1996, entry into force in 2008;
- Adoption of amended SPA and Biodiversity Protocol in 1995, entry into force in 1999;
- Adoption of new Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in 2008, entry into force in 2011;
- Adoption of the amended LBS Protocol in 1996 (entered into force in 2008) and of ten Regional Plans with Programmes of Measures and Timetables for their implementation, as provided for in Article 15 of the LBS Protocol;
- Adoption of the Strategic Action Programme to Address Pollution from Land-based Activities (SAP-MED) in 1997, as well as adoption of the NAPs in 2005 and revision in 2015;
- Adoption of the Strategic Action Programme for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (SAP-BIO) in 2003;
- Adoption of the amended Prevention and Emergency Protocol 2002, entry into force in 2004;
- Adoption of the Regional Strategy for Prevention of and Response to Marine Pollution from Ships in 2005;
- Establishment of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) in 1996;
- Adoption of the roadmap and timetable to implement the Ecosystem Approach in the Mediterranean including the vision, goals and the Mediterranean Ecological Objectives and GES targets (Decisions IG.17/6, IG.20/4 and IG.21/3);
- Adoption of the Almeria Governance Paper (Decision IG.17/5);
- Adoption of the UNEP-MAP Five Year Programme of Work 2010-2014 (Decision IG.19/17, Appendix I);
- Adoption of the Governance decision at COP 18 (Decision IG.21/9);
- Adoption of the UNEP/MAP Mid-Term Strategy 2016-2021 (introducing a six-year cycle) at COP 19 (Decision IG.22/1);

- Formulation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development in 2005, and renewed commitment with the Adoption of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development 2016-2025 at COP 19 (Decision IG.22/2);
- Adoption of the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Mediterranean Sea and Coast and Related Assessment Criteria (IMAP) at COP 19 (Decision IG.22/7);
- Adoption of the Regional Action Plan on Sustainable Consumption and Production in the Mediterranean at COP 19 (Decision IG.22/5);
- Endorsement of the Regional Climate Change Adaptation Framework for the Mediterranean Marine and Coastal Areas at COP 19 (Decision IG.22/6).

Developments outside the MAP system since the adoption of MAP II

- The Rio+10 and Rio+20 Conferences, especially in the fields of:
 - Green Economy;
 - Climate Change;
 - Sustainable Consumption and Production.
- The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development including its Sustainable Development Goals (adopted at the United Nations Summit in September 2015);
- Wide recognition and application of the Ecosystem Approach;
- Increased attention to Climate Change:
 - IPCC Fourth and Fifth Assessment Reports;
 - Adoption of the Paris Agreement.
- Widened legislation on marine and coastal environment of the EU, with particular focus on the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Marine Spatial Planning Directive;
- Increased emphasis on Environmental Governance:
 - Establishment of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA);
 - Strengthening of the International Framework of Sustainable Development, and especially the establishment of the High Level Political Forum (HLPF);
 - Emergence of other actors in the Mediterranean (e.g. establishment of the Union for the Mediterranean as evolution of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership/Barcelona Process, World Bank, GEF);
 - Developments in the ocean governance at the global and UN level (e.g. ABNJ, MPAs, Deep Sea Mining).

4. Process and Timeline

The work of the open-ended WG will be guided by the decisions and recommendations described in the section on Background. More specifically, it is proposed that:

- During its 83rd Meeting, the Bureau will nominate one of its members to lead the work of the Working Group with Secretariat's support;
- After the 83rd Bureau meeting, by mid-November 2016, the Secretariat will send invitations to the Focal Points to participate or appoint their representatives on the open-ended WG;
- Once the WG is set, the Secretariat will facilitate its work and provide necessary background information;
- The WG will work mainly through electronic means.
- The WG will hold a two-day meeting in the first quarter of 2017 (February/March 2017), provided that external funds are available. The meeting will be held in Athens, Greece (UNEP/MAP Headquarters) and interpretation will be provided in English and French. The Secretariat will continue efforts to secure the external resources of EUR 70,000, in order, inter alia, to enable the realization of this meeting;
- Following this meeting, the WG will finalize its conclusions in April 2017, for submission to the 84th Meeting of the Bureau (planned for June 2017);

- The Bureau at its 84th Meeting will discuss the issue and provide its recommendations to the Meeting of MAP Focal Points in 2017 (planned for September 2017);
- If necessary and provided that external funds are available, a one-day meeting of the WG may be organized back-to-back with the MAP Focal Points Meeting, in order for the WG to revise its input taking into account the recommendations of the Bureau;
- Following the discussion in the MAP Focal Points Meeting, the final document will be presented (in the form of a Decision) at COP 20 together with the conclusions of the Working Group.

5. Indicative budget

Meeting of WG (2 days in February/March 2017)	50,000 EUR
Meeting of WG (September 2017-before NFP Meeting)	10,000 EUR
Consultant (to facilitate the WG)	10,000 EUR
TOTAL	70,000 EUR

Annex IV

MAP Partner Applications Evaluation Table

INFORMATION ON THE APPLICANTS

ACRONYM	FULL NAME	Country	Aims
UNISI	Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) Mediterranean, hosted and managed by University of Siena (UNISI)	Italy	The mission of UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) is to mobilize global scientific and technological expertise to promote practical problem solving for sustainable development, including the design and implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). High quality of didactics and research based on international dimension. Promotion of sustainable developments.

EVALUATION**General conditions for accreditation****Two categories of NGOs are eligible for observer status**

	UNISI
International and regional NGOs	√
National and local NGOs from Mediterranean riparian states.	√

Both categories of NGOs should satisfy the following general conditions:

	UNISI
be representative in the field(s) of their competence and fields of action by the Mediterranean Action Plan Barcelona Convention and its Protocols;	√
be able, through their work, to support the achievement of the objectives of the Mediterranean Action Plan/Barcelona Convention and its Protocols;	√
be able to make known the work of the Mediterranean Action Plan/Barcelona Convention and its Protocols in the region and/or their respective countries;	√
be able to contribute, through a specific project or programme, to the implementation of MAP/Barcelona Convention and its Protocols programme of activities;	√
be able to contribute, through a specific event or manifestation linked to a Mediterranean Action Plan field of activity, to public awareness-raising;	√
be able to provide, through their specific activity or experience, expert advice on the definition of Mediterranean Action Plan policies, programmes and actions;	√

be able regularly to disseminate information to their members, where applicable, on the standards, activities and achievements of the Mediterranean Action Plan/Barcelona Convention in their own field(s) of competence;	√
be able to furnish, either spontaneously or at the request of the Mediterranean Action Plan's different bodies, information, documents or opinions relating to their own field(s) of competence.	√

Part II: Specific accreditation criteria and procedures

Accreditation

The following criteria apply to international and national/local NGOs:

	UNISI
to have legal status; terms of reference, objectives and scope of activities related to one or more of MAP's areas of activity and to the scope of the Convention and its Protocols;	√
to have existed for at least 4 years;	√
to submit financial and activity reports from the last two years;	√
to operate democratically;	√
to have their regional office or headquarters in a Mediterranean country;	√
to demonstrate proof of general or specialised, technical or scientific competence on issues related to the activities of MAP, the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols;	√
to demonstrate what contributions the NGO could make to MAP and the Convention and Protocols.	√

The following specific criteria apply to national/local NGOs:

	UNISI
NGO objectives genuinely related to the marine environment and coastal zones;	√
NGOs participating or wishing to participate in specific national or local programmes or projects on the implementation of the objectives of the MAP/Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.	√

Annex V
Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award
Nomination and Selection Process

Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award

Nomination and selection process

Introduction

Through the Istanbul Declaration adopted at COP 18 (Istanbul, Turkey, December 2013), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, recognizing the importance of coastal cities and communities as key actors for the implementation of the MAP/Barcelona Convention, its Protocols and relevant Strategies and Action Plans and resolved to engage with them, established the Environment Friendly City Award to be conferred to coastal cities by setting out nomination and selection principles and criteria for such award.

Through Decision IG.22/19 adopted at COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016), the Contracting Parties decided to establish the Environment Friendly City Award to be conferred to Mediterranean coastal cities, and name it the “Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award”. The Annex of Decision IG.22/19 contains the main elements of the Award, based on the outcome of a dedicated workshop held in Ankara, Turkey, on 25-26 May 2015.

The following text further elaborates on the process of nomination and selection of the award, while the Application Form (Appendix of the present document) is based on the annotations to the proposed categories listed in the Annex of Decision IG.22/19.

For the purpose of finalizing the nomination and selection process and criteria, a Task Force was created, composed of representatives from the RACs and MED POL, led by the Coordinating Unit. As the launching of the Award is a complex undertaking and the timeline for preparing and granting the first edition of the Award is very tight, the first edition of the Award will be a pilot one, i.e. based on the experience and the lessons learnt from this first edition the relevant process and criteria may be revised as appropriate for future editions.

Relevance, definition and main elements

While anthropogenic pressures on the coastal zones of the Mediterranean Sea are continuously increasing, coastal cities and communities are key actors for the implementation of the MAP/Barcelona Convention, its Protocols and relevant Strategies and Action Plans. There is a close link between the environmental condition of coastal urban areas and specific Protocols, especially the Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean and the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities.

Furthermore, the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD 2016-2025) - adopted at COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016), as a strategic guiding document for all stakeholders and partners to translate the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development at the regional, sub-regional and national levels (Decision IG.22/2) - includes “Planning and managing sustainable Mediterranean cities” as one of its six objectives, while the Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award is specifically mentioned as a flagship initiative under Objective 3/Strategic direction 3.1 of the Strategy. Relevant priorities are also contained within the Sustainable Consumption and Production Action Plan (Decision IG.22/5) adopted at COP 19 (Athens, Greece, February 2016), and especially under its priority area “Housing and construction”, as well as within the Action Plan for the Implementation of the ICZM Protocol for the Mediterranean (Decision IG.20/2) adopted at COP 17 (Paris, France, February 2012).

A sustainable coastal city is: “A coastal city in harmony with the sea, utilizing its resources efficiently, equitably and sustainably, reducing its impact on marine and coastal environment and climate change, and managing the environment for the benefit of current and future generations”. Therefore, an environment friendly city is a coastal city in which people enjoy a high quality of life and where sustainable development takes place within the carrying capacity of healthy ecosystems.

The Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award aims to recognize and reward the efforts of local authorities to improve the environment and the quality of life and promote sustainable development in Mediterranean coastal towns and cities. Such an award will encourage local authorities to move towards a more environment friendly future and enable them to act as a role-model to inspire other towns and cities.

Applications should be submitted by the local authority of a town or city, which has a coast on the Mediterranean Sea, whose borders are as described in the Barcelona Convention. There is no size or population reference, i.e. both small towns or metropolitan cities are eligible to apply. It is encouraged to develop partnerships with NGOs, scientific community, private sector or other stakeholders for the submission.

The application should be signed by the mayor or his representative (an alternative option could be not to provide a signature on the form, but to accompany the filled form with a mayoral declaration).

The evaluation will be undertaken through the criteria/annotations proposed in the Annex of Decision IG.22/19, defined under four main categories:

- i. Nature and Biodiversity Protection
- ii. Built Environment
- iii. Social, Economic and Cultural Sustainability
- iv. Governance

For this purpose an application form has been developed, as in Appendix of the present document. The application has two main parts. The first part is comprised by open questions, in order for the local authorities to introduce their case. The second part consists of specific questions/criteria based on the four main categories noted above and the annotations listed under each of these categories in the Annex of Decision IG.22/19.

In addition to the proposed criteria, the historical perspective of the candidate city will also be considered. The improvements observed in the city are very important regarding the city's efforts towards sustainability, the progress achieved as compared with its past, as well as the city's efforts and perspectives for further future improvement. Improvement achieved will be a benchmark criterion.

Regarding the evaluation methodology, a number of alternatives can be considered: Either equal weight could be granted to each of the four main categories or the weight can vary for each category based on the number of criteria listed under it (see Appendix). Furthermore, the evaluation of the historical perspective and progress of each candidate city could be either incorporated under each of the four main categories or granted a separate weight in the evaluation. Based on the Bureau's guidance on this issue during its 83rd Meeting, the Task Force and/or the Technical Committee described at the following section of this document, will derive the exact weight of the evaluation criteria before the call for the Award is launched.

Nomination and selection process

After the second meeting of the Bureau of each biennium the submission of applications will be opened and Mediterranean coastal cities will be invited to apply. The Bureau will decide on the exact timeline of applications for each biennium. The submission of applications will be done through the UNEP/MAP website.

The call for submissions will be launched by a news brief and will be distributed to all Contracting Parties through a letter signed by the President of the Bureau and the Coordinator of UNEP/MAP. It will also be advertised via online communication tools, such as social media, MAP and Components' websites and email networks, including through the MAP and RACs Focal Points, MCSD members and MAP Partners. The Task Force will develop a communications / dissemination plan for the award, indicating main target groups, messages to be delivered, communications tools to be used; the logo and the slogan accompanying the award will be part of this plan.

Past winners may not apply for a period of 5 biennia (ten years) after they held the Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award.

Local authorities will be invited to submit their applications in English. The application form, prepared on the basis of the criteria presented in the Annex of Decision IG.22/19 as further elaborated by the Task Force, is attached as Appendix to this document. Questions are allowed before submission. A helpdesk will be established by the Secretariat when the call of submissions is launched and questions by possible candidate cities will be answered by that helpdesk.

The selection is proposed to be carried out in three steps, with the involvement of the following three bodies:

- i. Secretariat: UNEP/MAP Coordinating Unit
- ii. Technical Committee: The Task Force composed of representatives from the RACs and MED POL, led by the Coordinating Unit, supported by 3 independent eminent experts.
The experts will be selected by the MCSD Steering Committee (based on alternative proposals by the Secretariat) and should have different backgrounds and experience, relevant to the scope of the award and the four main categories of evaluation criteria noted above.
- iii. Jury: The Bureau members and the President of the MCSD Steering Committee

First step: With the end of the submission deadline, an initial screening will be conducted by the Secretariat to ensure that the candidate cities fulfill the eligibility criteria and that the submission forms are correctly filled. The Secretariat will then forward the files of the candidate cities to the Technical Committee.

Second step: The Technical Committee will prepare an evaluation report and nominate up to three (3) candidate cities for the Award. The Committee will bring these nominations to the last Bureau meeting of each biennium for the final decision by the jury. The nomination should be made approximately two months before the last Bureau meeting of each biennium.

Third step: During the third Bureau meeting of the biennium, the jury will select the city. Representatives of the three candidate cities will be invited to the Bureau meeting to present their cases, together with their future plan of action, and provide clarifications to the jury. Following the presentations, the jury will deliberate to assess the candidacies and decide a winner. Every effort should be made to take a decision by consensus. If no consensus can be reached, 5/7 majority should be applied. In the case of more than one winner, geographical balance should be ensured.

The Award will be conferred during the next COP meeting by the President of the Bureau and the Coordinator of UNEP/MAP.

The Award will consist of an honorary board (plaquette / commemorative object) and the permission to use the logo of the Award by the winning city/town. Media coverage and visibility will also bring added value.

Proposed indicative budget (for the biennium)

Graphic identity/slogan & promotion/dissemination actions of award scheme	10,000 EUR
Award (plaquette / commemorative object / ceremony costs)	6,000 EUR
<i>Travel & Accommodation costs:</i>	
Costs for Technical Committee meeting (incl. three experts)	11,000 EUR
Presence of MCSD President in jury meeting	1,000 EUR
Presence of city representatives in jury meeting	3,000 EUR
Possible site visits to applicant cities	6,000 EUR
Cost of participation of the Mayor or representative in the Award ceremony	1,000 EUR
Helpdesk	6,000 EUR
TOTAL	44,000 EUR

Appendix

Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award
Application Form

Istanbul Environment Friendly City Award

Application Form (2nd draft)

City Introduction and Context

City:

Country:

Date of submission:

Competent authority:

Contact person (Name, Last name, position,
email, telephone, postal address):

Overview of the application: motivation and vision for the future (maximum 1 page).

Describe the main environmental problems faced by the city due to geographical, social and economic factors and what actions have been taken to face them (maximum 1 page).

Progress achieved in the city during the last 5-10 years in relation to environmental protection and sustainable development (please describe briefly the key achievements, in maximum ½ page).

Has an environmental award or other related distinction been received in the past (maximum ½ page)?

Please, complete:

Indicator	Value	Year of data
Population (Inhabitants)		
Total area (Km ²)		
Distance from the coast (Km)		
Population density (Inh./km ²)		
Coastline length (m)		
GDP (€/Capita)		

You are kindly requested to answer the following questions, which are separated in four main categories. If your answer is “Yes” or “In process”, please fill the relevant tables to justify your answer according to the given indicators. Please try to respond to most questions. Provide a short description of measures, projects, initiatives and achievements, focusing on the last 5 years. Where appropriate, please provide available evidence of the measures taken (e.g. Environmental certificates).

i. Nature and Biodiversity Protection

- Has your city taken climate change related measures?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Mitigation: Showing GHG reduction efforts (e.g. GHG emissions in tons per capita in 2005 & in 2015)	
Adaptation: Demonstrating enhanced or maintained resilience of natural systems (key habitats and species / carbon sinks) against climate change impacts	
Adaptation: Improved urban resilience to natural and human induced risks based on prevention, preparedness and response (in particular against sea level rise)	

- Has your city taken measures for marine and coastal ecosystem protection?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Protecting coastal and marine ecosystems	
Contributing to the establishment and the management of protected areas (of international / regional labels)	
Preserving natural coastline	
Progress to reach the Good Environmental Status related to biodiversity (6-year cycle)	

- Is your city making wise/efficient/sustainable use of natural resources?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Efficiency in water use (e.g. leakage as % of water supply, annual water exploitation, rate of reused water) Sustainable use of land-based resources (sand, gravel, etc.)	
Sustainable use of marine and coastal resources The city's footprint remaining within a given range that is meaningful in the context of the Mediterranean region	

ii. Built environment

- Does your city have resilient coastal infrastructure?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Existence of flood management and coastal protection measures (soft and/or hard infrastructure)	
Defined set-back line for protecting against future sea level rise and preserving free access to the coast	

- Does your city proceed to a sustainable land use?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Promoting green urban areas (e.g. m ² per number of inhabitants)	
Limiting coastal urban sprawl	
Free access of public to the shore/beaches	
Mixed use neighborhoods	
Demonstration of easy access to basic services	
Barrier-free urban design for disabled groups	

- Is the city's local transport plan friendly to the environment?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Promoting walking, cycling and public transport	
Promoting car-free settlements	
Limitations and management of access of private cars to the city	

- Is your city taking measures related to the pollution and waste?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Air quality within allowed standards (including progress made)	
Bathing water quality within allowed standards	
Waste water management and treatment infrastructure available and functioning (e.g. % of the city population served by waste water collection, % of primary, secondary and tertiary treatment)	
Light intensity within allowed standards (including the marine and coastal areas) & measures to reduce the ecological impacts of artificial light	
Measures to reduce noise level in city, including the marine areas	
Describe the solid waste management infrastructure available and functioning	

Types of waste treatment techniques used with relevant % (as well as % of city population with regular solid waste collection)

Existence of open dump sites

Waste segregation put into place

3Rs (Reduce-Reuse-Recycle) (including % of the city's solid waste that is recycled & % of organic waste composted)

Marine litter removal/clean up

- Is your city's water system sustainable?

Yes

No

In process

Indicator

Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years

Availability and affordability of water for human use (e.g. % of population with potable water supply service)

Efficient and sustainable water demand management (e.g. % of city population benefiting from rain water collectors)

- Does your city promote energy efficiency?

Yes

No

In process

Indicator

Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years

Promoting/demonstration of energy conservation in buildings

Production and use of renewable energy (e.g. % of total energy derived from renewable sources, as a share of the city's total energy consumption)

- Does your city promote green settlements, building materials and technological systems?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Promotion of local and recycled materials	
Focusing on reuse of brownfields for urban transformation	
Amount (m ²) of green areas per population (e.g. urban public open space per capita)	
Construction of green buildings or retrofitting of existing buildings	
Budget allocation for retrofitting of historical building	

iii. Social, Economic and Cultural Sustainability

- Does your city promote integration and solidarity for its citizens?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Upgrading slums/informal/illegal settlements	
Promoting mixed income neighborhoods	
Building child-friendly settlements (e.g. Child-friendly city recognitions)	

- Does your city promote and ensure the sustainability of local cultural values and traditions?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Efforts/budget allocation for renovation/retrofitting/rehabilitation of historical buildings and settlements (e.g. projects of rehabilitation of historic centers)	
Promotion of Ecotourism and Hospitality	

- Does your city promote green economy?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Sustainable consumption and production Eco-innovation, sustainable employment and green jobs	
Promoting local market, short channels, and the circular economy principles	
Promoting women entrepreneurship	
Promoting territorial synergies (connections with neighboring settlements and hinterland)	

iv. Policy and Governance

- Has your city developed policies for environment and sustainable development?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Existence (with allocated budget) of environmental policy, strategies and action plans for sustainability	
Existence (with allocated budget) of resilience policy (natural disasters)	
Existence (with allocated budget) of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategy	

- Do the city's authorities promote environmental planning and management?
 - Yes
 - No
 - In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Urban planning	
ICZM (national or local) existence and implementation (with budget allocation)	
Promoting strategies for sustainable mobility (with budget allocation) (e.g. integrated public transport systems; promotion of public transport, bicycles)	
Pollution prevention action plans for water, waste, air, noise (with budget allocation)	

- Are there appropriate institutional measures in place?

Yes

No

In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Accountable and transparent local government	
Partnerships with NGOs and other stakeholders	
Participation in decision-making (empowered society)	
Capacity enhancing	

- Does your city promote and support implementation and monitoring?

Yes

No

In process

Indicator	Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years
Existence of standards, rules and regulations for developers/investors	
ICZM implementation practices	
Demonstration/achievements of green public buildings, green transport systems, etc.	
Definition and adoption of a monitoring system (e.g. dashboard of sustainability, urban observatory of the environment and sustainable development)	
Sustainable finance (fees, taxes, etc.)	
Green procurement	

Sustainable municipal finance (percentage devoted to environmental management)

- Is communication and outreach promoted?
Yes
No
In process

Indicator

Evidence of the measures/progress achieved in the last 5 years

Public awareness on sustainability/environment (with budget allocation)

Education and training programs/activities (on environment and sustainability) targeting adults and children (with budget allocation/person assigned)

International cooperation and networks