EP

United Nations Environment Programme

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee

Floriana (Malta), 11-12 June 2014

Discussion Paper on MSSD 2.0 Structure and Vision

Review of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development

Discussion Paper on MSSD 2.0 Structure and Vision for MCSD Steering Committee Meeting

1. Introduction

This paper presents initial indications and a proposed vision for the reviewed Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD) for discussion at the June 2014 MCSD Steering Committee meeting. The proposals are based on the outcome of the consultation process undertaken during the first phase of the MSSD review.

From 10th April to 9th May 2014, a wide stakeholder consultation was carried out, focussing on synergies with other regional initiatives, possible issues and the vision for MSSD 2.0. For this purpose a consultation document providing background elements, proposals and questions was submitted to stakeholders in order to elicit their feedback and advice. This consultation document has been widely disseminated: more than 6,000 contacts received an e-mail inviting them to participate to this first stakeholder consultation in the framework of MSSD Review.

With a total of 55 answers, the profiles of participants to the stakeholder consultation are as follows:

MAP FP	MCSD Member	MAP Partner	UNEP/MAP RAC representative	Key stakeholder (Regional / National Organisation)	Other stakeholder, thematic expert
6	7	7	3	18	19

Overlaps: Among the participants to the consultation, 5 MAP FPs are also MCSD Members. 6 out of 7 of the MCSD Members who answered to the consultation are representative of Contracting Parties.

Based on the results of the first stakeholder consultation and on discussions within MAP system, this paper aims at preparing the Structure/Framework for MSSD 2.0. It is structured as follows:

1. Current MSSD 1.0 structure and why we might want to revise it;

2. Issues to be addressed in MSSD 2.0;

3. Initial indications for a structure for MSSD 2.0.

4. Proposed vision for MSSD 2.0

2. Background

At their 18th Ordinary Meeting held in Istanbul, Turkey (December, 2013), the Contracting Parties (CPs) to the Barcelona Convention requested the Secretariat of the Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP) to launch the revision of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD 1.0) with a view to submitting a MSSD 2.0 for consideration and adoption by the CPs at their 19th Meeting (COP19) that will be held in December 2015 in Greece (UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.21/9).

The revision of MSSD 1.0 is led by the <u>Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD)</u> with the assistance of the Secretariat to the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean[1] (Barcelona Convention). The technical work supporting the revision of MSSD 1.0 is being carried out by UNEP/MAP through its Plan Bleu Regional Activity Centre (PB/RAC), with the help of the other RACs.

The MSSD Review was formally launched in Malta on 14 February 2014 by the Maltese Minister for Sustainable Development, Environment and Climate Change, Mr Leo Brincat: see <u>press release</u>. To support the process of MSSD Review, a dedicated <u>website</u> and user platform have been available since February 2014.

3. MSSD 1.0 structure and why we might want to revise it

Adopted in 2005 by all CPs to the Barcelona Convention, MSSD 1.0 provides an integrative policy framework for achieving the vision of a sustainable Mediterranean region and for the deployment of sustainable development policies of riparian countries. It is also a regional response to the global agenda about sustainable development: Agenda 21, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

MSSD 1.0 took into consideration the principles of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (Barcelona Process). It was developed through a broad participatory process, allowing for its adaptation at the national level and taking into account the Mediterranean diversity.

Adopting an integrated approach to economic and social development, environmental protection, and cultural advancement, MSSD 1.0 establishes four objectives aiming at promoting progress towards sustainability in the economic, social and environmental areas and in the field of governance, as follows:

- Objective 1: Contribute to economic development by enhancing Mediterranean assets;

- Objective 2: Reduce social disparities by implementing the MDGs and strengthen cultural identities;

- Objective 3: Change unsustainable production and consumption patterns and ensure the sustainable management of natural resources; and

- Objective 4: Improve governance at the local, national and regional levels.

MSSD 1.0 also established seven priority fields of action and synergy in which it is essential to make real progress, as follows:

1. Better management of water resources and demand;

2. Improved rational use of energy, increased renewable energy use and mitigation of and adaptation to climate change;

3. Sustainable mobility through appropriate transport management;

4. Sustainable tourism as a leading economic sector;

5. Sustainable agriculture and rural development;

6. Sustainable urban development; and

7. Sustainable management of the sea, coastal areas and marine resources.

---

[1] The CPs to the Barcelona Convention are the 21 Mediterranean riparian countries and European Union (EU).

The matrix in Appendix 1 of the MSSD sums up the logical framework of the Strategy and indicates the inter-relationships between the four objectives and the seven priority areas of action.

4. Advice relevant to the MSSD 2.0 structure from COP18 and the 15th MCSD meeting

This section draws on the conclusions of the 15th MCSD meeting in Malta in June 2013 and the COP18 decision on the MSSD review to draw out key themes relating to issues and structure, which need to be taken into account in the review of the MSSD. At their 15th meeting held in Malta (10-12 June 2013), the MCSD members recommended the revision of MSSD 1.0, highlighting four aspects that are of relevance for the revised MSSD structure:

- '…The global processes following RIO+20 that better embed sustainability, require[d] the Barcelona Convention to renew the MSSD'; and,

- '…current themes were considered valid but work should take place on their structure and articulation.

- Integration of MAP's priority fields of action such as Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and relevant processes such as the Ecosystem Approach (EcAp) should be secured.

- Consideration of other issues such as waste management, environmental education, the circular economy, the green economy and governance, were needed;

The elements of the COP18 decision concerning the MSSD Review that are of relevance are:

- '…Request the Secretariat to ensure that the revised MSSD is articulated with global, regional and MAP processes';

- '…Request the Secretariat to ensure that the revised MSSD includes the integration of MAP's priority fields of action (such as, inter alia, Integrated Coastal Zone Management [ICZM]) and relevant processes (such as, inter alia, the ecosystems approach and the Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Action Plan), and addresses also other issues';

- '…Request the Secretariat to ensure that the revised MSSD integrates the strategic orientations of the SCP Action Plan and other relevant policies'.

Beginning with the considerations related to the Rio+20 outcomes, the decision to launch an intergovernmental process to develop Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is key outcome of relevance to the MSSD Review. The Rio+20 outcome document "*The future we want*" also highlighted a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication as one of the important tools available for achieving sustainable development, and adopted a 10-Year Framework of Programmes (10YFP) on sustainable consumption and production (SCP). In addition, in its section on oceans and sea, key Rio+20 outcomes include the commitment of the Countries to protect, and restore, the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems, and to maintain their biodiversity, enabling their conservation and sustainable use for present and future generations, and to effectively apply an ecosystem approach and the precautionary approach in the management, in accordance with international law, of activities impacting

on the marine environment, to deliver on all three dimensions of sustainable development to be considered in the review.

One of the key processes emerging from Rio+20, the process to develop SDGs, presents an opportunity for the MSSD revision. One of the possible avenues to be explored in the discussions on the revision of MSSD will be the possibility to develop SDGs at the Mediterranean level, which would ensure that the Mediterranean region remains a frontrunner in the area of environmental and sustainability governance. These possible "Mediterranean SDGs" would need to be consistent with global SDGs, while being adapted to the region. The second avenue to explore is therefore how to ensure synergy with the global SDG process guaranteeing coherence between global and Mediterranean regional objectives and targets, while allowing for regional innovation and specificity. A third question to be addressed on the relationship between MSSD review and SDGs relates to the scope of both exercises. While the COP18 Decision on the MCSD Reform advised the MCSD to focus on *'… the further integration of the environment pillar in other public policies, brought about through focusing on the interface between environment and development …'*, the SDGs will cover all pillars of sustainable development. The relationship between the MSSD structure and the SDGs is taken up later in this paper.

A second key element emerging from the conclusions of the 15th MCSD meeting and the COP18 decision relates to synergies and coherence between the MSSD and other regional initiatives, both those led by MAP, as well as those led by other actors. Beyond the need to consider policy initiatives and instruments at the global and regional levels, the MSSD review will need to take on board key existing MAP initiatives and/or instruments such as the Roadmap for the Ecosystem Approach (EcAp) implementation in the Mediterranean, the Action Plan of the Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean (ICZM Protocol), the Regional Framework on adaptation to climate change, the SCP Roadmap, etc. The reviewed MSSD will also need to develop linkages with other existing or to be finalized regional strategies and strategic frameworks such as those lead by Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) on water, alternative energy, education, de-pollution, sustainable cities, etc., and the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (CIHEAM) on food security and forests. In addition, the most relevant EU instruments and tools should also be taken into account.

5. Issues to be addressed in MSSD 2.0 and clustering of SDGs focus areas

According to the preliminary results of the first stakeholder consultation, many of the critical issues affecting the Mediterranean region were well-captured in MSSD 1.0 and should be retained in its revision. Issues pointed out by stakeholders have been clustered around a set of themes, which are presented in Table 1 below. While this list of issues only represents a broad-brush summary of the issues raised through the consultation (see more detail in the *Summary of Consultation* document that accompanies this paper), and a more detailed summary will be presented during the MCSD SC meeting, it is considered useful to present an indicative list of emerging themes here, which may guide the thinking of the Committee and inform the proposal for an MSSD 2.0 structure (see Figure 1). As may be expected, many of these themes correspond well with the themes emerging from the SDGs formulation process. Table 2 provides an indication of how these themes map into the SDGs. It is important to note in this regard that the SDGs are being elaborated at some level of detail so thematic correspondences between MSSD themes and SDG areas may emerge at a more detailed level when the full breadth of MSSD issue submissions is compared to the SDGs elaborated at a greater level of detail.

Table 1: Set of themes emerging from responses to MSSD Review Phase 1 consultation

Population/Demography
Social issues
Environment/Biodiversity
Sea and coastal areas
Climate Change
Water
Energy (and extractive sector)
Transport
Tourism
Agriculture, rural development, and forests
Waste
Urban development
Green economy
Governance

Table 2: Relationship between themes emerging from MSSD Review Phase 1 consultation and the SDGs

Population	- Focus area 1. Poverty eradication, building shared prosperity and promoting equality. End poverty in all its forms everywhere - Focus area 10. Sustainable cities and human settlements. Build inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements
Social issues	- Focus area 3. Health and population dynamics. Healthy life at all ages for all - Focus area 4. Education and life-long learning. Provide quality education and life-long learning for all - Focus area 5. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Attain gender equality and women's empowerment everywhere
Environment/Biodiversity	- Focus area 14. Ecosystems and biodiversity. Protect and restore terrestrial ecosystems and halt all biodiversity loss
Sea and coastal areas	- Focus area 13. Conservation and sustainable use of marine resources, oceans and seas. Take urgent and significant actions for the conservation and sustainable use of marine resources, oceans and seas
Climate Change	- Focus area 12. Climate change. Take urgent and significant action to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Build a climate change goal based on the outcome of COP21 of the UNFCCC
Water	- Focus area 6. Water and sanitation. Water and sanitation for a sustainable world
Energy (and extractive sector)	- Focus area 7. Energy. Ensure access to affordable, sustainable, and reliable modern energy for all
Transport	- Focus area 10. Sustainable cities and human settlements.

	Build inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements
Tourism	
Agriculture, rural development, and forests	- Focus area 2. Sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition. End hunger and improve nutrition for all through sustainable agriculture and improved food systems
Waste	- Focus area 10. Sustainable cities and human settlements. Build inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements
Urban development	- Focus area 10. Sustainable cities and human settlements. Build inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements
Green economy	- Focus area 8. Economic growth, employment and infrastructure. Promote sustainable, inclusive and sustained economic growth and decent jobs for all - Focus area 9. Industrialization and promoting equality among nations. Promote sustainable industrialization and equality among nations - Focus area 11. Sustainable Consumption and Production. Promote SCP patterns
Governance	- Focus area 15. Means of implementation/Global partnership for sustainable development. - Focus area 16. Peaceful and inclusive societies, rule of law and capable institutions.

Source (SDGs): ***Working Document for 5-9 May Session of Open Working Group (UN)***

6. Possible structure/framework for MSSD 2.0

On the basis of the discussions in the previous sections, the MCSD SC is invited to consider whether there is a need to revisit the structure of the MSSD in its review, or whether the current structure, based on key environmental or economic sectors, and governance, is still relevant. One of the main constraints with the current structure is that, being focussed on key environmental media and economic sectors for the Mediterranean, it does not allow for the consideration of cross-cutting approaches and tools such as the green economy, which is a key output from Rio+20, as well as climate change, a key issue for the Mediterranean and surely not to be addressed solely with energy. At the same time, the stakeholder community is well-structured around these environmental themes and economic sectors, so some form of advantage in this respect would be lost if these well-established themes do not retain some prominence in the revised MSSD. Another option would be to base the MSSD 2.0 structure around a set of 'Mediterranean' SDGs. In this respect, there are, at least, three options for MSSD 2.0 Structure/Framework, as follows:

1. Keeping the MSSD 1.0 seven priority fields of action (since many MSSD 1.0 issues remain valid today in terms of sustainable development);
2. Basing the structure/framework on new emerging and/or transversal cluster of issues; and
3. Basing the structure on a set of SDGs for the Mediterranean.

The analysis in the previous section indicates that some convergence between the emerging themes being identified through the MSSD review and the SDGs does exist. This suggests that, options 2 and 3 could provide a similar set of themes since there is a high level of correspondence between them. Based on the considerations above with respect to the need to take on the new transversal SD themes with more flexibility, it is possible to suggest the following initial indications for a MSSD 2.0 thematic structure, which might need to be updated once the detailed analysis on the Phase 1 consultation is finalized for the MCSD SC meeting. On this basis, the following clusters could be proposed as a possible thematic basis for MSSD 2.0:

1. <u>Seas and coasts (linked to the Aichi objectives and Good Environmental Status (GES) of Mediterranean ecosystems)</u>. This axis could be linked to the EcAp roadmap, taking also into account activities related to the conservation of the Mediterranean biodiversity (RAC/SPA, IUCN Med, MedPAN). It could also be linked to the ICZM Action Plan.

2. <u>Urbanisation (linked to Sustainable Cities)</u>. This theme is also related to the Action Plan for the implementation of the ICZM Protocol (ICZM Action Plan - PAP/RAC) and could also include land transport and energy.

3. <u>Natural resources, Agriculture and Food Security</u>. This could be also linked to terrestrial habitat protection and fresh waters.

4. <u>Climate Change</u>. This theme could be linked to the Mediterranean Regional Climate Change Adaptation Framework requested by the Parties.

5. <u>Green economy Transition:</u> This could be linked *inter alia* to resource efficiency and waste, green jobs, green public procurement, economic instructions, and the SCP roadmap for the Mediterranean, developed by Switch-Med project (SCP/RAC).

6. <u>Governance, which could address issues such as financing (although this could also go under Green Economy), Arhus convention</u>-related issues such as public participation, environmental research and innovation including cooperation, inclusivity, gender and environment.

There are a couple of themes that are not immediately addressed through the links presented in Table 2. One of them, and perhaps one of the most important themes, is poverty eradication. This is a key theme for the Mediterranean and for sustainable development. <u>What the MCSD SC must consider, given the emphasis in the MCSD COP18 decision to focus on the interface between environment and development, is how poverty can be addressed within the proposed MSSD 2.0 structure.</u> Two options for consideration are either to address poverty as a cross-cutting theme throughout the Strategy, or to address poverty under the cross-cutting themes, along with issues such as gender. Given the importance of poverty eradication, it needs to retain some form of prominence. In addition, <u>the tourism sector is one that is not easy to fit into this proposal; however it might be able to be addressed under the green economy. It must, given its dominance in the Mediterranean, be given importance in MSSD 2.0.</u>

7. Proposed vision for MSSD 2.0

The current MSSD 2.0 vision is contained in the following text:

The Strategy is based on a long-term vision of a "sustainable" Mediterranean that is politically stable, prosperous and peaceful. This vision is based on a proactive choice of a "win-win" scenario in which the co-development of the North and the South is promoted,

while exploiting the positive synergies of efficient environmental, developmental and economic management"

Key elements in the MSSD 1.0 Vision are:

- politically stable,

- prosperous

- and peaceful.

- a "win-win" scenario in which the co-development of the North and the South is promoted,

Based on the 2013 Istanbul Declaration and the EcAp vision, the MSSD Review Consultation Document presented the following possible vision, drawing on elements of the EcAp vision and the 2013 Istanbul Declaration from COP18:

A sustainable Mediterranean region that is politically stable, prosperous and peaceful. Socioeconomic development as well as human health and wellbeing are jointly sought and depend on healthy Mediterranean marine and coastal ecosystems that are productive and biologically diverse.

Key elements in the proposed MSSD 2.0 vision are:

- politically stable,

- prosperous

- peaceful

- socio-economic development

- health

- wellbeing

- healthy Mediterranean marine and coastal ecosystems that are productive and biologically diverse.

Table 3 presents the results from the Phase 1 consultation on the MSSD 2.0 (about Vision). In all 11 responses referred to the elements in the vision that are environmental, 13 social and 25 economic. In addition, 26 respondents mentioned governance issues. It must be noted in this respect that respondents often re-iterated the elements of the vision of the one proposed in the consultation document, which itself noted two aspects of governance: stability and peace. Table 4 summarizes some of the comments received about the MCSD vision that were not related to specific elements of the vision.

Some conclusions may be drawn from the consultation results. First, there is some convergence on how to state the environmental elements in the vision, which may be minimally adjusted to take on board the concepts of carrying capacity and sustainable use of resources. Second, there seems to be a strong emphasis on economic and environmental-economic concepts such as prosperity, but also concepts from

environmental economics such as ecosystems services and decoupling. Third, there is also a strong emphasis on governance issues, particularly peace and stability, although these two items were mentioned in the proposed MSSD 2.0 vision in the consultation document. Elements on cooperation and participation/democracy were also proposed, as well as inclusiveness and the concept of a shared vision. Fourth, in terms of social issues, the most often-highlighted issue is health, although this was also 'suggested' in the consultation document, followed by territorial imbalances (migration especially to coastal areas) and quality of life. Another final consideration that overall the expectation seems to be that rather than deliver on the social aspects of sustainable development, the MSSD 2.0 is expected to deliver, rather on environmental and economic goals, particularly focusing on synergies in these two areas, while not leaving out social issues.

Table 3: Elements of the MSSD 2.0 vision by number of mentions

Pillar of Sustainable Development	Element in vision	Number of mentions
Environment	productive, biologically diverse, healthy ecosystems	6
Environment	resource sustainability	2
Environment	ecological limits/carrying capacity	1
Environment	long term conservation of key elements of marine biodiversity	1
Environment	landscape approach	1
Society	health	4
Society	territorial imbalance/migration	3
Society	quality of life	1
Society	culture	1
Society	community	1
Society	higher education/research/science/innovation	1
Economy	well-being	5
Economy	prosperous	5
Economy	development	3
Economy	sustainable energy	3
Economy	livelihoods	2
Economy	wealth creation	1
Economy	international trade	1
Economy	ecosystem services	1
Economy	economically vibrant	1
Economy	generating jobs	1
Economy	Bio-economy	1
Economy	decoupling	1
Governance	stability	5
Governance	peace	5
Governance	collaboration/cooperation	3

Governance	participatory/democratic	3
Governance	Inclusion/equality	3
Governance	united/'collectively desirable'/shared objectives	3
Governance	transparency	1
Governance	future generations	1
Governance	Risk management	1
Governance	international community	1

Table 4: Comments received about the MCSD vision that were not related to specific elements of the vision

Comment
Balance all elements of SD
Link to Sep 2014 SDGs report
Remove reference to stability
Strengthen environmental pillar of MSSD
Remove words 'socioeconomic' and 'marine and coastal'
The words 'sustainable' and socioeconomic' are redundant
Other vision statements to check:
Blue Growth and UNEP Green Economy
UfM Ministerial declaration on ENV and CC
MSESD
South East Europe 2020 Strategy – Jobs and Prosperity in a European Perspective
Bologna Charter and Ljubljana Declaration

On the basis of these considerations, an updated vision is proposed for the consideration of the MCSD SC, as follows:

A Mediterranean that is a stable, prosperous and peaceful region of cooperation and shared aspirations towards sustainable development, job creation and resource efficiency, which also protects human health and quality of life within the carrying-capacity of healthy, productive and biologically-diverse ecosystems, brought about through inclusive, participatory governance systems that take also into account the needs of current and future generations.

8. Conclusion

This paper seeks to stimulate discussion in the upcoming meeting of the MCSD SC on a possible structure and vision for the revised MSSD. It has done so on the basis of initial results obtained from the MSSD Review Phase 1 consultation process. Since responses to that process are still being received, some elements of this paper may need to be updated during the SC meeting. Once the decisions regarding structure and vision have been taken within the MCSD SC meeting, the next phase of the MSSD Revision will be able to commence, namely the drafting of the new strategy on the basis of thematic working groups addressing the various themes of the structure.