



---

---

---

---

---

---

# United Nations Environment Programme



UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.12/Inf.4  
20 September 1999

Original: ENGLISH

---

---

## MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

Eleventh Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties  
to the Convention for the Protection of the  
Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols

Malta, 27-30 October 1999

## ACTIVITIES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT(MCSD)

- **REPORT OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE MCSD  
(UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/5)**
- **REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE  
MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT  
(UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/3)**
- **REPORT OF THE THEMATIC WORKING GROUPS BY TASK MANAGERS  
AND SUPPORT CENTRES (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/4)**



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

**EP**



UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/5  
10 July 1999

ENGLISH

---

---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

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

Rome, 1-3 July 1999

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE MEDITERRANEAN  
COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (MCSD)**

## Table of Contents

### **Main body of the report**

**Annex I** List of Participants

### **Annex II**

Appendix I Indicators for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean

Appendix II Information, Public Awareness, Environmental Education and Participation

### **Annex III**

Appendix I Speech by Dr Klaus Topfer, Executive Director of UNEP

Appendix II Speech by H.E. Mrs Faiza Kefi, President of the MCSD

Appendix III Speech by Mr Francesco Rutelli, Mayor of Rome

Appendix IV Speech by Mr Valerio Calzolaio, Undersecretary of State for the Environment of Italy

## **Introduction**

1. Pursuant to the decision taken by the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) at its Fourth Meeting (Monaco, 20-22 October 1998), the Fifth Meeting of the MCSD was held in Rome from 1 to 3 July 1999, at the kind invitation of the City of Rome.

## **Attendance**

2. The meeting was attended by the following 30 members of the MCSD: Albania, Algeria, Association pour la Protection de la Nature et de l'Environnement de Kairouan (APNEK), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Centre des Régions Euroméditerranéennes pour l'Environnement (C.R.E.E.), Chambers Group for the Development of Greek Islands (EOAEN), City of Rome, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecomediterrania, European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC/EUROCHLOR), European Commission, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Medcities Network, Mediterranean Information Office for Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development (MIO-ECSDE), Monaco, Morocco, Municipality of Silifke, Mediterranean Water Network (Red Mediterranea del Aqua-RME), Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).

3. The following Regional Activity Centres of MAP also attended the meeting: UNEP/IMO Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC), Blue Plan (BP/RAC), Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC), Specially Protected Areas (SPA/RAC), Environment Remote Sensing (ERS/RAC), Cleaner Production (CP/RAC) and Secretariat for 100 Mediterranean Historic Sites.

4. The following United Nations specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations attended the meeting as observers: UNEP/Technology, Industry and Economics Division (TIED), UNEP/Regional Office for West Asia (UNEP/ROWA), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), Council of Arab Ministers responsible for Environment, League of Arab States (CAMRE/LAS), Centre for Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe (CEDARE), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (METAP) and RAMOGE.

5. A full list of participants is attached as Annex I to this report.

## **Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting**

6. Mr V. Calzolaio, Under-Secretary of State for the Environment of Italy, welcomed the participants and thanked the City of Rome for hosting the meeting. UNEP, including MAP at the regional level, had made sterling efforts to protect the environment and he hoped that their fruitful work would continue in the future. Over the past decade, a large number of global environmental conventions had been signed, but it had to be acknowledged that in practice they were not all applied to the same extent. The Italian Government had set up two institutions to assess the impact of the conventions it had signed and he hoped that the MCSD would consider the harmonization of the provisions of such agreements at the Mediterranean level and identify financing sources to guarantee their effective implementation.

7. Ms L. De Petris, Deputy Mayor for Environmental Affairs, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Mayor of Rome. She emphasized that the Mediterranean was rich but vulnerable and the policies and measures adopted for its sustainable development had to be understood, accepted and implemented by all actors, whether public or private. The task would not be easy because collaboration had not hitherto been one of the main characteristics of the region, but it was essential. Since the UNCED, cities and local authorities around the Mediterranean had

shown increasing commitment to sustainable development and Rome had played its role in promoting Local Agenda 21 in the Mediterranean. The authorities of Rome reaffirmed the need to support urban development that was sustainable and a new definition of development and urban management policies.

8. Mr A. Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator of MAP, read out the statement of Mr K. Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP, who regretted that he was unable to attend the Meeting. The Executive Director observed that changes in the Mediterranean region required a refocus on the various elements constituting the region's overall security policy. The Mediterranean was becoming an even more important channel for the movement of vital resources and was developing into an integrated advanced economy with potential for major investment. Hence the need for ecological stability in the Mediterranean within a framework of sustainable development.

9. Since its inception in 1972, UNEP had given prime consideration to maintaining the integrity of the regional seas, with the Mediterranean as its first and most successful programme. Thanks to the willingness and commitment of the partners concerned, MAP had become an example for other regions. With its dynamic institutional structure, it had constantly sought to integrate the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The revision of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols had contributed to the process by giving due consideration to the major environmental initiatives at the global and regional levels, in particular the adaptation of Agenda 21 to the Mediterranean context. The establishment of the MCSD had also played its part by providing a regional forum for dialogue and forming a bridge between global and regional actions on the one hand, and national and local efforts on the other. It offered a promising framework for the definition of a genuinely Mediterranean sustainable development strategy.

10. The Executive Director pledged UNEP's full support for MAP's activities by promoting them within the UNEP family and with all concerned partners, including United Nations agencies and the UNCSD. To that end, an efficient information and communication strategy would be needed in order to give new impetus and greater visibility to MAP. Together with the MCSD, MAP had a crucial part to play in protecting the environment and promoting sustainable development with a view to building a peaceful and prosperous region. Finally, the Executive Director expressed his deep gratitude to the Mayor of the City of Rome for organizing the Meeting and to the Italian Government for its continuous support of MAP.

11. Ms F. Kefi, Minister of Environment and Physical Planning of Tunisia, President of the MCSD Steering Committee, said it was a great honour to open the Fifth Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development and she wholeheartedly thanked the City of Rome for its generosity. It was encouraging to note that cities were playing an increasingly active role in the MCSD process so that together all partners could succeed in the ambitious task of achieving sustainable development in the Mediterranean in the framework of Agenda MED 21. The Fifth Meeting demonstrated the continuing relevance of the MCSD as a forum for dialogue among all the partners concerned at the regional, national and local levels. Despite many difficulties, the MCSD had already produced effective recommendations and proposed actions on the management of water demand and the sustainable management of coastal zones. Its innovative structure had greatly contributed to its success.

12. After reviewing the items to be discussed, she pointed out that the Euro-Mediterranean processes and GEF offered genuine opportunities for cooperation, which the MCSD must seize. Her own country's national development programmes had been strongly influenced by the Commission's work. She launched an appeal for regional solidarity and concluded by wishing the Meeting every success.

**Agenda item 2: Election of the Steering Committee of the Commission**

13. In accordance with Rule 17 of its Rules of Procedure, the Commission elected the following Steering Committee:

President:	Tunisia
Vice-Presidents:	Chambers Group for the Development of Greek Islands (EOAEN) City of Rome Malta Monaco Turkey
Rapporteur:	World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)

14. During a short discussion on the way in which the list of candidates for the posts of Vice-President had been compiled, several speakers, while not contesting the results of the elections, expressed the view that the process of consultation preceding the Meeting should be conducted in a more transparent manner.

15. Several speakers drew attention to the problem relating to the election of three non-Contracting Party members to the Steering Committee. If their membership of the MCSD was not renewed at the Meeting of the Contracting Parties to be held in Malta in October, the composition of the Steering Committee would have to be reviewed at that time. The solution would be either to elect the members of the Steering Committee until October, when the Contracting Parties would settle the matter, or to agree that the new MCSD would not take up its functions until a later date. In that connection, one representative suggested that the new Commission, with its new composition, should start work as from the Sixth Meeting, while another representative considered that the Commission could suggest to the Contracting Parties that the mandates of the three non-Contracting Party members of the Steering Committee should be renewed. In that connection it was pointed out that there was a need for both rotation and continuity in the membership of the Commission. Finally it was agreed that the matter would have to be left to the Contracting Parties to decide.

### **Agenda item 3: Adoption of the provisional agenda and organization of work**

16. Mr Hoballah informed the participants that in order to assist the Working Groups on Indicators, Tourism and Information to finalize their recommendations, it was planned to set up ad hoc groups, as appropriate, to work outside the plenary sessions.

17. One speaker expressed the hope that such meetings would not be held simultaneously with the plenaries. A representative asked that item 5.5 be taken up during the afternoon session and it was stated that more time would be needed for examination of the strategic review for the year 2000. A speaker considered that the Commission should manage the limited time available to it according to needs: he particularly stressed the necessity of a detailed examination of working methods to ensure that the Commission's recommendations received proper follow-up.

18. In the light of those comments, the provisional agenda and organization of work were adopted.

### **Agenda item 4: Progress report by the Secretariat**

19. Mr Hoballah, introducing document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/3, said that it was based on the results of the very useful Second Meeting of the Steering Committee held in Tunis on 8 and 9 March 1999. The participants had received two reports on that meeting (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.155/2 and 3), of which the former had taken a critical approach in order to provoke a lively discussion on the subject of methods of work, new subjects and selection criteria. Closer

cooperation with UNCSD had been requested. In that connection, he informed the Meeting that both members of the Secretariat and representatives of the MCSD members had participated in the work of UNCSD and had widely disseminated information on the Commission, as a result of which many requests for further documentation were being received.

20. While fully agreeing with the critical approach to certain aspects of the organization of work a representative stressed the need to highlight as well some of the positive results obtained. While taking due note of this comment, the Coordinator agreed that the tone of the report had been unusual, but the Secretariat had judged it necessary in this case, particularly in view of the concerns expressed during UNGASS (Rio + 5) in relation to the activities of UNCSD. MAP had therefore decided to try to bring out any shortcomings or failings as soon as possible, in order to take remedial action at an early stage. The approach had been a positive one, aimed at promptly identifying any adjustments that might be needed.

21. Another speaker welcomed the new tendency to speak out, but believed that the agenda for the Meeting should have reflected that innovatory approach. An opportunity should have been provided to discuss the philosophy of the MCSD's work, to find new ways of applying its recommendations through the involvement of civil society, and to explore new methods of work. The Working Groups themselves could reflect on ways of putting their recommendations into effect. In that connection, a speaker considered that it would be necessary to prepare a set of "specifications" setting out the responsibilities and functions of each actor in the Working Groups.

22. The representative of Turkey informed the Meeting that her Government was proposing to set up a Regional Activity Centre for training. A paper was being prepared, including provisions on financing and strategy, for submission to the Meeting of Focal Points to be held in September.

23. The Meeting noted the report contained in document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/3.

## **Agenda item 5: Activity reports by the Task Managers**

### **5.1 Sustainable development indicators**

24. Mr M. Ennabli (Tunisia), joint task manager for the theme with Mr S. Antoine (France), introduced the proposals of the thematic working group (pp. 1-10 of document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/4) and thanked the members of the Group for their constructive work. He emphasized the importance of indicators for sustainable development as a means of monitoring major social, economic and environmental changes in the region and assisting decision-makers in the formulation and implementation of sustainable development policies. The development of these indicators, which had been identified as a medium-term activity by the First Meeting of the MCSD in December 1996, was intended to promote a coherent approach to sustainable development throughout the Mediterranean region, in an initiative which lay within the framework of the Barcelona Convention, the Mediterranean Action Plan and Agenda MED 21.

25. He explained that, from an initial list of almost 250 indicators, a first set of 130 basic indicators had been developed. This common core of indicators took into account the indicators adopted by the UNCSD and the special features of the Mediterranean basin. For 55 of the indicators, the necessary data were available and it should therefore be possible to calculate them in the reasonably short term. However, for the rest of the indicators, further analysis of the availability of the required data would be needed.

26. The Working Group had developed a set of practical proposals for action, subdivided into two sections. The first of these concerned the development of a system of indicators for the Mediterranean region, while the second section consisted of the implementation of the system of indicators by the Contracting Parties. The implementation of the system was intended to help the Contracting Parties, local authorities and economic actors to measure the results of their

efforts and prepare future action, as well as to improve multilateral cooperation in the region and guide the future work of the MCSD. An important feature of the proposals for action would be the preparation of a report on sustainable development in the region every five years, starting in 2002. The Contracting Parties would also be invited to provide MAP with national reports prepared for the UNCSD, establish national environment and development observatories and develop action programmes, with emphasis on training, to build national capacities in the relevant areas.

27. Turning to the table of proposed indicators, he emphasized that they consisted of preliminary indicators which needed to be refined and confirmed. They had been submitted at the present time so that the Contracting Parties could take action as soon as possible on their implementation. Unnecessary delay should be avoided so that governments could make progress towards the achievement of sustainable development.

28. Mr Antoine paid tribute to the other partners, such as OECD, EUROSTAT, UNEP, EEA and the UNCSD, which had been associated with the activities of the Working Group. He also thanked Slovenia and Tunisia for testing the implementation of the indicators. He emphasized the importance of indicators for sustainable development for the Mediterranean region which, unlike groups of States such as the European Union, did not yet have the necessary structures in place for the compilation of information on sustainable development. Although the proposed indicators would need further refinement, he urged rapid action by the States in the region on this important issue.

29. In a broad-ranging discussion, all the speakers commended the Working Group on its concrete proposals and emphasized the importance of indicators for sustainable development for the Mediterranean region. By way of illustration, it was recalled that the development of such indicators at the level of the OECD had played a major role in promoting the integration of environmental factors into other policy areas. The proposals made by the Working Group therefore constituted a good starting point. However, it was extremely difficult to formulate mature indicators for sustainable development and further refinement would undoubtedly be needed.

30. In this connection, several speakers emphasized the need to ensure that the indicators did not merely reproduce existing national statistics, particularly on environmental issues. Indicators for sustainable development would only offer their true added value if they fully combined social, economic and environmental factors, including such aspects as employment and health. Further refinement would also be required for the indicators relating to water, which currently gave too much emphasis to water quality, particularly of drinking water, but tended to ignore the issue of the availability of water for such essential activities as agriculture. Indicators for information, awareness and participation should also be developed.

31. Several speakers also called for more work to be carried out on the proposals for action. The distinction made by the Working Group between the development of indicators and their implementation was not entirely valid, particularly with regard to capacity-building activities. Further refinements would therefore be needed to develop a dynamic and concise proposal for consideration by the next meeting of the Contracting Parties in October 1999.

32. A number of speakers raised the question of the availability of the national data required for the compilation of the proposed indicators for sustainable development. More work would be required to identify the indicators for which data could be obtained in the near future and to assess the comparability of the data. Several speakers also warned that capacities for the compilation of the required data varied widely between industrialized and developing countries. Care should therefore be taken to develop indicators for which data could be produced by countries at all levels of development.



33. The MCSD was informed in this connection that Turkey was establishing an environment and development observatory, which would greatly contribute to national efforts to achieve sustainable development, as well as increasing its capacity to collaborate with partners in other countries. Morocco was taking steps to establish a national database on sustainable development, which would be built up in collaboration with civil society giving due consideration to the recommendations of the MCSD. However, many speakers called for increased cooperation and assistance to build capacity at the national level and develop networking arrangements among the competent national institutions. The representative of the Blue Plan noted, in this respect, that a meeting of representatives of national observatories would be held in Tunisia in November with the very important objective of promoting networking in this field. He added that the indicators proposed by the Working Group had already been validated in Slovenia and Tunisia and that similar processes were now being undertaken in other countries in the context of capacity-building activities, including Morocco. Moreover, he informed the MCSD that the European Commission had recently entrusted Blue Plan with the implementation of an important project on environmental statistics in the Mediterranean region (MEDSTAT) for the next three years.

34. The members of the MCSD emphasized that, although the proposed indicators were by no means perfect, there came a moment when action had to be taken. The proposals of the Working Group should therefore be submitted to the Contracting Parties and, once approved, should be integrated into the programme of work of MAP. Although little regular budget funding was currently available, donors should be sought for a substantial project in this important area. A mechanism should also be developed so that the MCSD could continue its work in this field.

35. Responding to the discussion, the joint task managers welcomed the many constructive suggestions that had been made, particularly for the further refinement of the proposed indicators and proposals for action. Mr Ennabli re-emphasized the dynamic nature of the process of developing indicators "for" rather than "of" sustainable development and their vital role in promoting the adoption of integrated economic, social and environmental policies. He added that the Blue Plan was proposing to develop a glossary which would provide clear definitions of the various indicators and the methods to be followed for their compilation. A preliminary set of papers had already been produced for certain indicators which gave an idea of the possible form of the final results. He reassured those who had expressed concern about the capacity of developing countries to produce the necessary data and emphasized that this would be on a voluntary basis. Both joint task managers stressed the importance of encouraging the Contracting Parties to take action rapidly and of disseminating information on the indicators as widely as possible, for example on the MAP website.

36. The proposals for action on this theme were revised, in consultation with the members of the MCSD, to take into account the comments made during the discussion. It was agreed that the revised proposals for action would be submitted to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties in October 1999. The revised proposals for action are contained in Annex II.

## 5.2 Tourism and sustainable development

37. Mr G. Giourgas (EOAEN), joint task manager for this theme with Ms A. Rambla Gil (Spain), introducing the recommendations and proposals for action on the theme (pp. 11-17 of document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/4), emphasized the difficulties involved in developing coherent conclusions and proposals on such a vast subject as tourism, which was integral to life and culture in the Mediterranean basin and involved not only considerations of space and time, but also of human presence. The Working Group had endeavoured to develop innovative proposals which offered clear added value for this essential social phenomenon, in which it was so difficult to promote effective change. However, only a limited number of responses to the questionnaire had been received.

38. The complexity of tourism included the dangers of what was, in many cases, a sort of monoculture which could be very fragile, particularly in the event of crises such as conflicts and epidemics. In general, tourists themselves exerted a certain pressure for environmental improvement when they demanded satisfying tourist destinations. However, the situation with regard to tourism varied widely in Mediterranean countries, in terms of both its importance and the effectiveness of the policies adopted. In all cases, continued efforts needed to be made, particularly through training and the exchange of information, to improve capacities and awareness of how a sustainable development dimension could be integrated into the tourist industry. This was particularly important in the case of small island economies, which consisted of isolated micro-societies for whom the sustainable development of tourism was vital for their economic and social development, and even their human survival.

39. One of the main concerns in developing the proposals for action had been that it was impossible to promote the sustainable development of tourism in a situation which was tantamount to anarchy. The inadequacy of the existing policy, institutional, legislative and technical framework was noted. Many measures could be taken to develop this framework, including the establishment of observatories covering the impact of tourism, the promotion of quality initiatives and environmental management systems, the establishment of networks of tourist professionals, the development of pilot tourist destinations and efforts to extend the tourist season all year round. A number of specific tools had been proposed to achieve the appropriate objectives, including the publication of a white paper on tourism and sustainable development in the Mediterranean, the development of guidelines on good environmental practices in the tourist sector and the establishment of financial mechanisms through which the sector could contribute to various initiatives and projects in this field.

40. The members of the MCSD welcomed the valuable work which had been achieved by the Working Group and expressed understanding that many different points of view had had to be taken into account. However, several speakers noted that environmental considerations, in particular with regard to the coastal and marine environment deserved more attention. The proposals, while constituting a good starting point, would therefore need further refinement with a view to placing greater emphasis on the integration of environmental and sustainable development issues into the framework of tourism. The proposals should also take into account the action which could be taken to promote specialized forms of tourism, such as cultural and environmental tourism, leisure activities, as well as national tourism, in addition to more conventional forms of international tourism. Moreover further work would be required to develop a more concise proposal for submission to the Contracting Parties.

41. Many speakers emphasized the great importance of tourism in the life and economies of Mediterranean countries. The tourist industry had a major impact on the Mediterranean environment, which meant that any effective action to improve the environment and promote sustainable development in the region needed to involve the industry very closely. However, tourism was a very complex industry, involving a multitude of actors, including those who were directly concerned with the industry, such as tour operators, hotels and restaurants, as well as their suppliers, other economic actors in adjacent areas and the public authorities at all levels. This complexity made it very difficult to bring together all the actors involved for the development of the global and integrated vision which was required to achieve a sustainable tourism sector. However, voluntary initiatives and self-control schemes offered potential for progress. For example, UNEP/TIED had been involved in a recent initiative bringing together a number of tour operators to analyse how voluntary schemes could be organized. Standardization projects, such as ISO 14000 could also be valuable, although emphasis needed to be placed on building the necessary capacity during their implementation in developing countries. When the proposals for action were reviewed, greater importance should be given to these aspects.

42. Several speakers emphasized the importance of directing action not only towards

Mediterranean countries, but also the countries of origin of tourists. Any serious improvement in the environmental performance of the tourist industry in the region would need to be demanded, in the sense that tourists would need to be made aware of the attitude and practices which needed to be adopted to promote the sustainable development of tourist destinations. They should not expect to be able to maintain the same levels of consumption, for example of water, as in their own countries. Reference was made to a number of initiatives which had been taken in this sense, including the preparation of a brochure for tourists to increase their awareness and involve them more fully in efforts to promote a more sustainable tourist industry. Tour operators which were based in the countries of origin of tourists also needed to be involved more closely in the related activities and should contribute more substantially to the balanced and sustainable development of tourist destinations.

43. Reference was also made to the importance of ensuring that the principles of sustainable development were fully taken into account by all the actors involved in the development and implementation of policies for land-use and development planning. In many tourist locations, holiday homes were built without any planning, or in avoidance of the relevant rules. It was particularly important in this respect, when developing new tourist destinations, both in developing countries and in hitherto undeveloped areas of industrialized countries, to make sure that the mistakes of the past were not repeated.

44. Many speakers focused on the need to promote further networking and exchanges of information, including between the competent bodies at the national level and NGOs active in the field. It was noted in this respect that the Coordinating Unit did not have sufficient resources to play an active role in managing and developing such networks. It should therefore fulfil the function of a facilitator to encourage the process. In this connection, care should be taken to build on the work carried out by other bodies. This included the recent meeting organized in Lanzarote by UNEP and the World Tourism Organization as a follow-up to the Barbados Conference to bring together representatives of small developing island States and other islands; the conclusions of the International Congress on Sustainable Tourism in the Mediterranean, organized by MED Forum in October 1998; and guidelines with the necessary added value adopted in the Mediterranean context, such as codes of good conduct. In addition, the report of the Working Group should be communicated to the Euro-Mediterranean Forum on Tourism.

45. A few speakers welcomed the proposal to study the feasibility of setting up a Mediterranean support mechanism for sustainable development objectives in the tourist industry. It was noted that structures bringing together professionals in the tourist industry had been developed in other regions, such as the Caribbean, but not in the Mediterranean. However, it was also recalled that very careful consideration needed to be given to the real purposes and functions of any proposed new bodies or funds before any practical steps were taken for their establishment.

46. In view of the time which would be required to substantially review the proposed conclusions and recommendations to take into account the comments made during the discussion, the MCSD decided to entrust the Coordinating Unit and the two task managers, with the support of the Centres concerned, with the responsibility for adapting them to the comments which had been made. The revised texts would be sent out to all the members of the MCSD towards the end of September and they would be given two weeks to make any further comments that they considered necessary. The Meeting was informed that a working session would be held on 22 and 23 August 1999 so comments should be sent to the Coordinating Unit by the end of July at the latest. In this way, a substantive proposal could be submitted to the meeting of the Contracting Parties, which could then decide on the action to be taken to follow it up.

### 5.3 Information, awareness, environmental education and participation

47. Mr M. Scoullos (MIO-ECSDE), joint task manager for the theme, introduced the progress report on the Group's work and the proposed recommendations for the Contracting Parties (pp. 18-26 of document UNEP(OCA)/MED.WG.156/4), together with a background document produced using mainly MIO-ECSDE resources.

48. The background document analysed the present situation of information, awareness and public participation, and reviewed the role played by other partners in the dialogue.

49. Part A showed that, despite the fact that a high percentage of the public was worried about global environmental threats and thought that they should be tackled urgently, their perception of ways in which they could help to protect the environment was somewhat simplistic. The concept of sustainability was also very poorly understood. Environmental organizations were seen as the most trustworthy source of information on the state of the environment, whereas the public authorities appeared much further down the scale, highlighting a lack of confidence in the authorities, a trend that had to be reversed. The cost/benefit ratio of spending on information and education did not follow a linear progression: a large amount had to be invested initially in education and raising awareness before progress could be seen, but subsequently similar results could be achieved by spending smaller amounts. In most Mediterranean countries, the initial spending level had almost been reached so only a little more effort was needed before substantial progress could be made.

50. Part B of the background document described Mediterranean specificities and contained a review of the issues identified by major NGO conferences. It was interesting to note that the topics deemed most critical were, in order of importance, water, soil erosion, forest fires and waste, followed by pollution, biodiversity, and climate change.

51. The review of legal provisions in Part C was not yet complete, but the Aarhus Convention provided a comprehensive legislative framework.

52. One positive development noted in the document was the number of thriving environmental education programmes and the MCSD could do much to strengthen them still further.

53. Turning to proposed recommendations, he said that although the main task entrusted to the Working Group had been completed, it had to be made clear that the work should be pursued because the subject was both an important component of the work of the other Groups and a crucial element in itself.

54. During the ensuing discussion, the participants congratulated the Working Group on the quality of its work. One speaker underlined the importance of reviewing and adopting the approach to the issue of information, communication, education and participation. In order to be effective, it was suggested that awareness-raising techniques be adapted to gender and age and that environmental educators be given at least one month's training in how to put over their message. Existing structures that were familiar with local languages and customs should be used, rather than MAP, for the dissemination of the environmental message at the local level.

55. Some participants drew attention to the important role played by information and communication in promoting the ratification and implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols. Dissemination, using appropriate techniques, should be through the Focal Points and should take place before considering application of the Aarhus Convention. Several participants considered that the Working Group's recommendations should be implemented by the MAP Focal Points, taken into account by MAP in its work, and incorporated into the work of the MCSD thematic groups.

56. Several participants considered that four or five practical recommendations should be singled out for submission to the Contracting Parties. The other proposals could be taken into account for the MAP information strategy to be submitted to the next Meeting of the Contracting Parties.

57. The Coordinator recalled that pressure from the public and NGOs had been instrumental in the elaboration and adoption of environmental policies. Environmental education and information were vital and could help to resolve problems with minimum expenditure.

58. Mr Scoullos (MIO-ECSDE) pointed out that the recommendations were intended to be a framework for the necessary legal and institutional provisions for enhancing mobilization and participation, which could not be done through just a few small concrete recommendations. The proposals could perhaps be divided into two lists so as to provide the Contracting Parties both with the framework suggested by the Working Group and with a small number of practical recommendations while at the same time keeping in mind the general picture. He explained that the reason why certain issues continued to appear was the need to remind people that they were still pending and had not yet been resolved.

59. Finally, the task managers were asked to consult with concerned colleagues and identify four or five concrete recommendations for submission to the Contracting Parties, taking into account the views expressed during the meeting and these are attached as Annex III.

#### 5.4 Free trade and environment

60. Mr R. Salman (Lebanon), task manager for the theme, introduced the proposed programme of work (pp. 27-33 of document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG/156/4), underlining the particularly complex nature of the issue and the fact that the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership was a special factor to be taken into consideration in this respect. The Working Group proposed that the key sectors to be analysed should be agriculture, industry, and consumption patterns, taking into account national studies as well as sectoral studies at the national and regional levels. Comparative studies to be carried out in certain Mediterranean countries and retrospective studies of other free trade zones would lead to a better understanding of the impact of environmental policies on free trade in the region and of the legal, institutional, economic and technical factors affecting the balance between free trade and the environment in the Mediterranean. They would also provide data, facilitate decision-making and ensure that the issue was included in the sustainable development agendas of the countries concerned.

61. After describing the case study for Lebanon, he outlined the proposal for an action plan. During Phase I, from July 1999 to June 2000, the future European Union study envisaged by the European Union might contribute towards increasing knowledge of free trade and environment policies in the 12 non-Community Euro-Mediterranean partners. The research axis to be elaborated by each Mediterranean country according to its specificity would be defined and the practical lessons to be learned from other regional and national experiences would be drawn. The information spectrum would be extended to cover the whole Mediterranean through data collection, compilation and analysis. It was also proposed that a Mediterranean workshop on free trade, environment and sustainable development be held. The initial results of the work and proposed guidelines would be submitted to the next MCSD meeting.

62. In the course of Phase II, from June 2000 to June 2001, all the agreements entered into by Mediterranean countries would be assessed in terms of local and regional policies. Proposals on financial mechanisms, economic instruments and public policies to enhance the balance between free trade and the environment would be developed and practical recommendations would be prepared for Mediterranean decision- and policy-makers. In order to reinforce the

synergy between free trade and sustainable development, the capacities of Mediterranean countries would have to be strengthened. The Working Group's observations, findings and proposals would be put before the seventh meeting of the MCSD.

63. Some activities would be ongoing in both phases, for example, collaboration with other similar initiatives, the exchange of experience, the identification of available mechanisms and funds, the involvement of all Mediterranean countries as well as relevant actors and policy-makers, and broad dialogue and consultation between the public and private sectors.

64. The difficulty of gathering standardized homogeneous data for the purposes of comparison, time constraints and the availability of funds were potential problems that might affect the Group's work. Lastly, networking and involving all the actors were two of the factors that would determine the success of the programme.

65. During the ensuing discussion, the participants congratulated the Working Group on the quality of its work. Several participants drew attention to the scale of the task before the Group and wondered whether it would be able to carry out such an ambitious programme. The Group was urged to collect information on the environmental impact of other free trade areas and it was pointed out that any free trade model that did not take into account Mediterranean specificities was doomed to failure and might even have a negative impact. The work being done in other international organizations on trade and environment, for example, the work within the WTO on the effects of environmental measures on trade, should be reviewed.

66. One participant noted the absence of a social dimension in the proposed programme of work and expressed the view that services should be included in the programme of study in place of consumption patterns and that the effect of the single European currency on trade should be added. Other participants warned against an excessively broad approach and recalled that some of the subjects were already being dealt with elsewhere.

67. Another representative conveyed his concern that environmental and cultural aspects had been neglected in the financial components of the association agreements concluded between the European Union and the members of the future Mediterranean Free Trade Area. The Contracting Parties, and particularly their ministries of finance, should be urged to call for the involvement of ministries of environment and culture, as well as representatives of civil society, in the discussion and conclusion of agreements on financial mechanisms. The Working Group was also encouraged to include more countries among its members because they were ultimately responsible for elaborating trade policies.

68. The representative of METAP, which had also provided support to the task manager, explained the methodology followed in conducting case studies on several Mediterranean countries. The impact of free trade was felt in two stages: in the first place, environmental regulations had an impact on the price of exports, but subsequently the effects were felt by imports, so competitiveness within southern Mediterranean countries could be affected.

69. The representative of CAMRE/LAS informed the MCSD that the General Secretariat of the LAS was planning to hold an Arab Regional Seminar on "Trade and Environment" from 5-7 September 1999 in cooperation with the Egyptian Agency for Environmental Affairs, UNEP and CEDARE

70. The Commission endorsed the programme of work proposed by the Working Group and expressed the wish that it would be given priority by the Sixth Meeting of the MCSD.

## 5.5 Industry and sustainable development

71. Mr G. Guerrieri (Italy), joint task manager for this theme with Mr M. Si Youcef (Algeria), surveyed the Group's work since the Fourth Meeting of the MCSD, drawing particular attention to the use made of external experts (pp. 34-38 of document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/4). The overall objective had been to analyse the implications of the entry into force of the revised LBS Protocol and its Strategic Action Programme (SAP) in the context of sustainable development. The Group's aims had been highly practical, with special attention being given to identifying concrete action to stimulate governments and local authorities to launch policies that would encourage domestic enterprises and competitiveness. A second aim had consisted in identifying motivations for small and medium-sized enterprises to invest in re-organizing their production methods so as to be in line with the requirements of the LBS Protocol and the SAP. The Group attached great importance to industry outreach, the exchange of information and capacity-building for "actors for improvement". He drew the Meeting's attention to the report of the Workshop on Industry and Sustainable Development held in Massa on 14 and 15 May 1999.

72. Referring to the Work Plan, he pointed out that under each proposed activity the participants would find a project manager, project partners, the expected output and a timetable. He proceeded to outline the various projects contained in the report, expressing his confidence that all documents and activities relating to specific issues would be presented as draft projects at the proposed date by the project managers to the task managers and then sent to the members of the Thematic Group for final approval and implementation during the coming biennium. After inviting the Meeting to endorse the Work Plan, he stated that a further consultation meeting might be needed to finalize all the tasks and hoped that funding could be found for it either in the MAP budget or from extra-budgetary sources.

73. The representative of CP/RAC said that the Work Plan should refer to the promotion of cleaner production itself, not just to the promotion of the International Declaration on Cleaner Production, and offered to share CP/RAC's experience on the issue. Moreover, he offered the CP/RAC experience for training activities in cooperation with UNIDO/ICS.

74. The representative of UNEP/TIED offered her organization's continued cooperation in developing specific activities for the Mediterranean. She was pleased to note the International Declaration on Cleaner Production, but pointed out that signing it was a first step only; it had to be implemented in practice. In that connection, she referred to the need to educate professionals in small and medium-sized enterprises.

75. The representative of the Italian National Environmental Protection Agency drew attention to a second version of the report on cleaner production in the Mediterranean and said that a final version would be presented to the international seminar that would be organized with UNEP/TIED and ECOMED and would be held at the end of 1999. In this connection, she called for a reinforcement of collaboration with CP/RAC, also taking into account the possibility of bilateral agreement.

76. In the course of the discussion, all speakers congratulated the joint task manager on the detailed and practical proposals he had presented. Some questions were raised concerning the cost of the proposed activities, and in particular the financing of those carried out by CP/RAC under a budget provided by Spain. Several representatives drew attention to the importance of encouraging small and medium-sized enterprises. A participant stressed the need to examine the whole question of industry and sustainable development in the Euro-Mediterranean context, as well as to pay particular attention to the social implications. With reference to the proposed training workshop for managers of large industrial zones, a participant suggested that the focus should also be on individual small and medium-sized enterprises that were not incorporated in large zones, which was generally the case throughout the Mediterranean area.

77. Mr S. Civili, MEDPOL Coordinator, referring to the financing of the proposed activities,

said that where MEDPOL was concerned, funds were available under the current budget, and he believed that this was also the case with regard to UNIDO and CP/RAC. As far as small and medium-sized industries were concerned, the Massa workshop had felt that they might be the relevant issue in the future. He pointed out that the term "large industrial zones" referred normally to large areas grouping several small enterprises under a single environmental management.

78. Mr Guerrieri recalled that it was necessary for small and medium-sized enterprises to be fully aware of the benefits of eco-efficiencies and the proactive approach to making environmental improvements. It was generally recognized that the larger chemical industry groups had made significant contributions to reducing emissions and pollutants through a mixture of regulatory and voluntary instruments and measures. In that sense, it was important to have the cooperation of CEFIC/EUROCHLOR, whose members were already engaged in voluntary initiatives as "responsible care", which also involved smaller companies.

79. Special attention had been given to the formulation of activities, taking care to avoid additional costs. The proposed activities were designed to fit as far as possible into existing programmes for which budgets were already available. If for any reason shortfalls should occur, alternative funding would be sought.

80. The MCSD agreed that there was a broad consensus in favour of pursuing the various practical activities set forth in the Work Plan, but in close cooperation with partners such as UNEP/TIED and professional associations, with a view to submitting the results to the Sixth Meeting of the MCSD.

#### 5.6 Management of urban development

81. Mr J. Parpal (MEDCITIES), joint task manager for the theme, introduced the proposed programme of work (pp. 39-42 of document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG/156/4), for which a large part of the financial resources had been committed by Contracting Parties or international institutions. The Group had decided to evaluate the present situation in order to identify the set of issues that would serve as a framework for the preparation of recommendations to the Contracting Parties. It had also decided to prepare a methodology and a programme and to identify the methods of implementing them. As could be seen in the report, three meetings had already been held. At the initial experts' meeting held in Seville, it had been decided to focus on the general and sectoral aspects, and ways of promoting cooperation in training, exchange of experience, best practices, and indicators *inter alia*. The agenda and documents for the first expert meeting held in Split were listed in the report. This meeting had concluded that, bearing in mind the economic and institutional capacity constraints, rapid urban growth could cause functional imbalances that were often extremely serious and had an impact on natural resources, economies and living standards in cities.

82. The Working Group proposed three axes for its programme: firstly, institutional strengthening of local authorities, particularly as regards the supply of services, urban planning and upkeep, and participation; secondly, various sources of financing for cities; lastly, the exchange of experience and cooperation.

83. Mr Antoine, at the request of Mr Parpal, informed the Commission that at the First meeting held in Split with PAP/RAC a number of alternatives had been suggested for the types of action to be proposed. He further indicated that some 70 cities could set up an observation network for topics in which they had the necessary capacity and for exchanges of data and experience, notably relating to good practice.

84. One participant underlined the need to involve all actors with urban development-related responsibilities or tasks and encouraged the Working Group to strengthen collaboration with the



other Groups.

85. Ms Mourmouris (European Commission) said that the European Union already had a communication on the issue and was at an advanced stage of preparing a manual for urban development and it was willing to share its experience with others. She added that the subject was so vast that the Working Group would have to focus on certain action-oriented aspects. She also requested the Group to ensure that the questionnaire it proposed to send called for information that the recipient was able to provide and that was relevant to the outcome sought.

86. Mr Parpal (MEDCITIES), responding to a question on the cities to be studied, said that it was proposed to study large cities, medium-sized cities that were rapidly expanding, and hot spots. The number would be limited by financial constraints.

87. The representative of ERS/RAC informed the meeting that the Centre was monitoring expansion of cities in Europe and offered its support to the Working Group.

88. The Commission endorsed the programme of work proposed by the Working Group.

#### **Agenda item 6: Method of work and follow-up of recommendations**

89. The Coordinator, introducing the Steering Committee's conclusions on method of work and follow-up of recommendations contained in Annex 1 to document UNEP(OCA)MED WG.156/3, said that the Steering Committee had called for further progress in three areas : the clearer identification and preparation of themes, improved planning of activities by objectives and better implementation and follow-up of recommendations. He pointed out that after three years of practical experience, more time was now available for the preparation of themes on the basis of added value and Mediterranean specificity. The task managers should state the main objectives of the activities and think in terms of execution and valorization, i.e. they should adopt an operational approach to implementation.

90. Some themes might lend themselves to strategic action programmes and it was also suggested that the Secretariat could help to propose ways in which the Contracting Parties might implement the recommendations. In addition, the Secretariat and the regional centres could develop the use of demonstration programmes. Lastly, it was suggested that greater visibility could be ensured by circulating information by all appropriate means.

91. Moreover, it would be important to take into account in MAP's budget actions and recommendations adopted by the Contracting Parties following proposals by the MCSD and to contribute as far as possible to their implementations.

92. While appreciating the quality of the Steering Committee's proposals, and bearing in mind the need to remain strictly within the mandate of the MCSD as an advisory body and also to avoid any confusion concerning roles, the participants agreed on the need to take into consideration the following points in relation to the three areas referred to above:

- C the proposers of new themes should make a thorough study of the available information, identify the possible value added, assess what results were to be expected and review the potential for funding;
- C a few themes, although not necessarily such a large set as when the MCSD had commenced its activities, should be selected and allowed to "mature" for one or two years before being taken up;
- C themes should be selected in the light of the concrete results they were expected to deliver;

- C for the sake of the credibility and visibility of the MCSD, the products of its activities needed to be concrete and promote new initiatives;
- C more emphasis should be placed on the social dimension;
- C smaller ad hoc groups could be set up for a limited period of time to deal with specific issues;
- C follow-up measures should be envisaged by the Contracting Parties when adopting proposals for action and recommendations put forward by the MCSD;
- C It was suggested in this connection that the Contracting Parties should adopt a system of reports on implementation and that these should be communicated to the MCSD;
- C there should be more systematic contacts with other bodies and more regular progress reports;
- C communication with the Contracting Parties and other partners should be improved, for example by use of the Internet and by drawing up an information and communication strategy, to ensure that the MCSD's activities benefited from a multiplier effect;
- C rather than strategic action programmes, a pilot-project approach should be adopted.

### **Agenda item 7: New subjects and selection criteria**

93. The Commission considered the criteria for the selection of new themes for its programme of work over the next two or three biennia on the basis of the information and matrix for new themes set out in Annex II of document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 156/3. Mr Hoballah explained that the limited responses to the questionnaire had shown that three of the proposed themes had received most support from those responding. These were local management and sustainable development; consumption patterns and waste management; and agriculture and rural development.

94. In the discussion on this issue, certain speakers expressed a preference for choosing one or more themes immediately so that preparations for work on them could begin in the near future. However, it was also pointed out that the MCSD still had a heavy workload for the next year or two with the themes on which it was continuing to work and the strategic review for the year 2000. Moreover, several speakers expressed interest in the other four themes on the matrix and the possibility was evoked of important new themes emerging in the next year or two. At the proposal of the Secretariat, it was therefore agreed that the Coordinating Unit would evaluate the feasibility of the seven proposed new themes, laying stress on waste and agricultural and rural development in order to assess for each of them the value added which could be expected from the MCSD and the work currently being carried out on each subject by other bodies. Three additional themes would also be covered by this preliminary appraisal namely natural disasters, poverty alleviation and international cooperation for sustainable development, on the understanding that new themes might emerge from the strategic review for the year 2000. The Coordinating Unit would enlist the help of the members of the Commission in carrying out the feasibility studies. It was noted in this respect that CREE had offered its assistance for the agriculture and rural development theme and WWF for the sustainable management of maritime natural resources, as well as for the desertification and deforestation aspects of agriculture and rural development. The purpose of this appraisal phase was to guide the selection of themes at the Sixth Meeting of the MCSD.

### **Agenda item 8: Strategic review for the year 2000**

95. The Coordinator recalled, that pursuant to the Commission's terms of reference, it was proposed to undertake a four-year strategic review of the implementation of the principles of the Agenda MED 21 programme by members and observers of the MCSD.

96. Mr. Hoballah, introducing the draft terms of reference for the strategic review for the year 2000 contained in Annex IV to document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/3, began by pointing out that the review was not concerned with the state of the Mediterranean environment, but with an assessment of the actions taken by all the partners concerned; it would cover such factors as decision-making, capacities and governance. The review would not be limited to the activities of MAP and the MCSD, but would briefly assess the work of other partners, including the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, METAP and CEDARE, as well as civil society. The review would be carried out at several levels : the Euro-Mediterranean level; the regional level, where MAP was the largest component, with an assessment of MAP II actions and MCSD activities; the national level, with an assessment of legal and regulatory reforms undertaken by governments and of the participation of the Contracting Parties in Mediterranean programmes; the local level, under Local Agenda 21 activities; and lastly the level of civil society and NGOs.

97. The Chairperson indicated that the underlying objective of the strategic review was to explore the sense of commitment of all partners at the local, national and regional levels, thus creating a whole new impetus. Her own country, in which the preparatory work for the MCSD had been initiated, had high hopes of the exercise and appealed to all participants to do their utmost to make the review a success.

98. In the ensuing discussion, strong support was expressed for the strategic review and the Tunisian Government was commended for its initiative. One representative considered that the review would constitute a high point in the work of MAP by offering an opportunity to all partners to reconfirm their commitment to a shared vision and brighter future for the Mediterranean. Another participant referred to the need for a new impulse and considered that the choice of the year 2000 was of great symbolic value. The representative of Tunisia, after recalling that his country was to host the next meeting of the MCSD, believed that the symbolic year 2000, five years after the adoption of Agenda MED 21, was an excellent occasion for a strategic review and appealed for a strong ministerial segment. Tunisia firmly intended to make every possible effort to ensure the success of the Sixth Meeting, which would be held in November 2000, to give more time for the preparation of this important strategic review.

99. The Meeting agreed on the following methodology:

1. The Working Group composed of Tunisia and Greece for the Contracting Parties and the City of Rome, EOAEN and MIO-ECSDE for the three categories would be responsible for:
  - a) preparing a model of the report to be provided by members and observers of the MCSD (see 2. below);
  - b) collecting and summarizing the reports provided;
  - c) circulating a preliminary synoptic report to members and observers of the MCSD two months before its Sixth Meeting;
2. Preparation by the members and observers of the MCSD of the report on the methods of implementing the principles of the Agenda MED 21 programme in their respective fields of competence.
3. In view of the timetable and methodology selected, the Secretariat would propose a draft budget to the Contracting Parties in Malta within the framework of the 2000-2001 programme budget.

The Contracting Parties were invited insofar as they were able to contribute to the financing of this exercise on a voluntary basis.

100. Taking into account the comments expressed during the discussions the President concluded that it has been agreed to finalize the "Strategic Review" in the year 2000, and to address potential donors a recommendation concerning funding in order to allow the elaboration of a consistent and detailed report.

**Agenda item 9: Cooperation and fund raising**

101. Due to lack of time, there was no discussion under this agenda item.

**Agenda item 10: Sixth meeting of the MCSD**

102. Tunisia confirmed its offer to host the Sixth Meeting of the MCSD to be held in

November 2000. In this connection, it was proposed to organize a meeting of the Steering Committee before the end of 1999 to make preparations for the next Meeting of the Commission, in particular its budget and the follow-up to ongoing activities, including the preparation of the strategic review and the outcome of the Meeting of the Contracting Parties in Malta.

**Agenda item 11: Any other matters**

103. There was no discussion under this agenda item.

**Agenda item 12: Adoption of the meeting's report**

104. The Meeting adopted the report prepared by the Secretariat after making a number of amendments.

**Agenda item 13: Closure of the meeting**

105. The Chairperson expressed her deep satisfaction at the quality and nature of the work carried out by the Meeting and, after the customary exchange of courtesies, declared the Meeting closed at 14.00 hours on Saturday, 3 July 1999.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**MCS D MEMBERS  
MEMBRES DE LA CMDD**

**ALBANIA - ALBANIE**

**Mr Maksim Deliana**

Chairman  
National Environment Agency  
Bulevardi Zhan D'Arc  
Tirana  
Albania

Tel: 355 42 30682, 65229  
Fax: 355 42 65229  
email: cep@cep.tirana.al

**ALGERIA - ALGERIE**

**M. Mohamed Si Youcef**

Directeur général  
Direction générale de l'environnement  
Ministère de l'intérieur, des collectivités locales, et  
de l'environnement  
Palais Mostapha Pacha  
blvd de l'indépendance  
16000 Alger  
Algérie

Tel: 213 2 652967  
Fax: 213 2 652802

**ASSOCIATION DE PROTECTION DE LA  
NATURE ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT DE  
KAIROUAN (APNEK)**

**M. Youssef Nouri**

Président fondateur de l'APNEK  
Chargé des Relations avec l'Extérieur  
Association pour la Protection de la Nature et  
de l'Environnement de Kairouan (APNEK)  
Lycée Abou Sofiène, Ksar Saïd II  
2009 Tunis  
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 515307  
Fax: 216 1 508361

**BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA  
BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE**

**Mr Tarik Kupusovic**

Special Advisor to the Minister of Physical  
Planning and Environment  
Hydro Engineering Institute  
71000 Sarajevo  
S. Tomica 1, B i H  
Bosnia and Herzegovina

Tel: 387 71207949  
Fax: 387 71207949  
Email: mapbh@bih.net.ba

**CENTRE DES REGIONS  
EUROMEDITERRANEENNES POUR  
L'ENVIRONNEMENT (CREE)**

**Mme Christina Daoussi**

Directrice Générale du C.R.E.E.

**Ms Chryssanthi Intzidou**

Collaborator

**Mr Evangelos Kyritsis**

Collaborator

13-15 rue Thrassyvoulou  
Plaka  
105 55 Athènes

Tel: 30 1 3242190/3352202/3  
Fax: 30 1 3239120  
Email: klepsydra@kepemep-cree.org

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

**M. Georges Giourgas**

Conseiller Affaires Européennes  
Chambers Group for the Development  
of Greek Islands (EOAEN)  
World Trade Centre, Bte 3  
162 Bd Emile Jacquart  
Bruxelles 1000 Belgique

Tel: 322 2030090  
Fax: 322 2031067

**CITY OF ROME  
VILLE DE ROME**

**Ms Loredana De Petris**  
Deputy Mayor for the Environment

**Ms Mirella Di Giovine**  
Director Environmental Department  
Tel: 3906 3207147  
Fax: 3906 3207129

**Ms Silvana Novelli**  
Director International Relations Department

**M. Bruno Salsedo**  
Comune di Roma  
Dipartimento Politiche Ambientali e Agricole  
Via Cola di Rienzo, 23  
00192 Roma  
Italy

Tel: 39 06 30007926  
Fax: 39 06 3207129  
Email: b.salsedo@comune.roma.it

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

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

**CROATIA - CROATIE**

**Mr Andrija Randic**  
Head  
State Directorate of Environment  
Office for the Adriatic - Rijeka  
Uzarska ulica 2/I  
51000 Rijeka  
Croatia

Tel: 385 51 213499  
Fax: 385 51 214324  
Email: arandic@duzo.tel.hr

**CYPRUS - CHYPRE**

**Mr Nikos Georgiades**  
Director for Environment  
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and  
Environment  
Tagmatarhou Poulou 17  
Ayios Andreas  
Nicosia 1100  
Cyprus

Tel: 357 2303883  
Fax: 357 2774945  
Email: rocperiv@cytanet.com.cy

**ECOMEDITERRANIA**

**M. Rafael Madueno**  
President  
Ecomediterrània  
Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 643, 3  
08010 Barcelona  
Espagne

Tel: 3493 4125599  
Fax: 3493 4124622  
Email: ecomed@pangea.org

**Mr Abbas Zahreddine**  
Ecomediterrania/Liban Nature Environment  
PB 114  
5144 Beyrouth  
Liban

Tel: 961 1 603328-9  
Fax: 961 1 836163  
Email: Ine@cyberia.net.lb

**EUROPEAN CHEMICAL INDUSTRY COUNCIL  
(EUROCHLOR/CEFIC)**

**Mr Arseen Seys**  
Director  
Avenue E. Van Nieuwenhuyse 4, Box 2  
B-1160 Brussels  
Belgium

Tel: 322 6767251  
Fax: 322 6767241  
Email: ase@cefic.be

**Mr Carlo Trobia**

Via Accademia 33  
Milano  
Italy

Tel: 39 02 26810224  
Fax: 39 02 26810311  
Email: carlo-trobia@hq.enichem.geis.com

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY  
COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPEENNE****M. Fernand Thurmes**

Directeur  
Direction affaires générales et  
internationales  
Direction générale de l'environnement,  
sécurité  
nucléaire et protection civile

Tel: 322 2955002  
Fax: 322 2963440

**Ms Athena Mourmouris**

Euro-Mediterranean Partnership  
DG XI A.4 TRMF 5/62

European Commission  
200 rue de la Loi  
B-1049 Bruxelles  
Belgique

Tel: 322 2963951  
Fax: 322 2963440  
Email: athina.mourmouris@dg11.cec.be

**FRANCE - FRANCE****M. Serge Antoine**

10, rue de la Fontaine  
91570 Bievres  
France

Tel: 33 1 69412056 - 42848421  
Fax: 33 1 42848420

**Mme Geneviève Besse**

Sous-Direction de l'Environnement  
et des Coopérations Sectorielles  
Direction des Affaires économiques et  
financières, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
37 Quai d'Orsay  
75007 Paris  
France

Tel: 33 1 43174413  
Fax: 33 1 43175745  
E-mail: genevieve.besse@diplomatie.fr

**M. Laurent Caplat**

Chargé de mission Méditerranée  
Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de  
l'environnement  
20 avenue de Ségur  
75320 Paris Cedex 07 SP  
France

Tel: 33 1 42191705  
Fax: 33 1 42191719  
Email: laurent.caplat@environnement.gouv.fr

**Mme Corinne Etaix**

Chef Bureau Coopération  
Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire et de  
l'environnement  
20 avenue de Ségur  
75320 Paris Cedex 07 SP  
France

Tel: 33 1 42191758  
Fax: 33 1 42191719  
Email: corinne.etaix@environnement.gouv.fr

**M. Philippe Le Lourd**

Commissariat Général du Plan  
5, rue Casimir Périer  
Paris 75007  
France

Tel: 33 1 45565303  
Fax: 33 1 45565178  
Email: plelourd@plan.gouv.fr



**GREECE - GRECE**

**Mr Giannis Vournas**

Director General of Environment  
Ministry of the Environment, Physical  
Planning  
and Public Works  
17 Amaliados Street  
115 23 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30 1 6410641

Fax: 30 1 6410641

**ISRAEL - ISRAEL**

**Ms Galia Ben-Shoham**

Head of E.I.A. Section  
Ministry of the Environment  
5 Kanfei Nesharim Str.  
Jerusalem  
Israel

Tel: 972 2 6553856

Fax: 972 2 6553853

Email: galia@environment.gov.il

**ITALY - ITALIE**

**Mr Valerio Calzolaio**

Undersecretary of State  
Ministry of Environment

**Mr Matteo Baradà**

Direttore Generale  
Ministero dell'Ambiente  
Istitutorato Generale per la Difesa del Mare

Tel: 39 06 57223429/30

Fax: 39 06 57223470

**Ms Barbara Castrucci**

Assistant to Mr Calzolaio  
Ministry of Environment  
V. Cristoforo Colombo, 44  
00100 Rome  
Italy

Tel: 39 06 57225706

Fax: 39 06 57225722

Email: barbaracastrucci@hotmail.com

**Mr Giovanni Guerrieri**

Expert  
Servizio Acqua, Rigiuti e Suolo  
Ministero dell'Ambiente  
Via C. Colombo, 144  
Roma, Italia

Tel: 39 06 57225250, 39 3392907600

Email: guerrieri@flashnet.it

**Mr Canio Loguercio**

Ministry of Environment

Tel: 3906 572256078

Fax: 3906 57225611

E-mail: canio@tin.it

**Mr Maurizio Sciortino**

ENEA  
Via Anguillarese 301  
00060 Rome

Tel: 390630484213

Fax: 390630483591

E-mail: sciortino@casaccia.enea.it

**Mr Gualtiero Bittini**

**ICRAM**

Researcher  
via di Casalotti 4.300  
Rome

Tel: 3906 61570411/2

E-mail: bittini@tin.it

**Mr Sergio Illuminato**

President  
Fondo Euro Mediterraneo

**Ms Ginella Vocca**

Director  
Fondo Euro Mediterraneo  
Piazza Dalmazia, 25  
00198 Roma  
Italy

Tel: 39 06 85354814

Fax: 39 06 8844719

Email: femssc@tin.it

**Ms Tiziana Vitolo**

Email: vitorio@irem.cnr.na.it

**Ms Ferragina Eugenia**

Email: ferragina@irem.na.cnr.it

IREM (Istituto di Ricerche sull'Economia  
MEDITERR) CNR  
v. Pietro Casteccino 111  
80131 Napoli, Italy

Tel: 39 081 5605486, 5605130

Fax: 39 081 5606540

**Mr Giuliano Fierro**

PAP Focal Point  
Università di Genova  
DIPTERIS  
Corso Europa 26  
16132 Genova  
Italy

Tel: 39 010 500794

Email: comett@dipteris.unige.it

**Ms Sonia Cantoni**

ANPA - del. Ministry of Environment  
Manager of the Integrated Strategies for  
Sustainable Dept.  
Via V. Brancati, 48  
00144 Rome  
Italy

Tel: 39 06 50072155

Fax: 39 06 50072258

Email: cantoni@anpa.it

**Ms Giovanna Rossi**

Ministero dell'Ambiente  
v. Ferratello in Laterano, 33  
00186 Roma  
Italia

Tel: 39 06 70362340

Fax: 39 06 77257008

Email: g.rossi@mfp-it.eionet.eu.int

**LEBANON - LIBAN**

**Ms Sana Sairawan**

Chief of Protection of Nature Service

Tel: 961 4 522222, 523161

Fax: 961 4 4524555

Email: s.sairawan@moe.gov.lb

**Mr Rami Abu Salman**

Technical Officer  
Capacity 21  
Ministry of Environment  
P.O. Box 70-1091  
Antelias  
Lebanon

Tel: 961 4 418911

Fax: 961 4 418911

Email: rsalman@moe.gov.lb

**LIBYA - LIBYE**

**Mr Abdul Fattah Boargob**

Head  
Department of Environmental Studies  
Technical Centre for Environment Protection  
Turkey Street - Eldhara  
P.O. Box 83618, Tripoli  
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Tel: 218 21 4448452

Fax: 218 21 3338098

**MALTA - MALTE**

**Mr Louis Vella**

Principal Environmental Expert  
Environment Protection Department  
Floriana CMR02  
Malta

Tel: 356 232022

Fax: 356 241378

Email: lovella@waldonet.net.mt

**MEDCITES NETWORK  
RESEAU MEDCITES**

**Mr Joan Parpal Marfà**

Secrtaire Général  
MedCités  
Mancomunitat de Municipis de l'Area  
Metropolitana de Barcelona  
C/ 62, Núm. 16/18 - Sector A, Zona Franca  
08040 Barcelona  
Spain

Tel: 34 93 2234169

Fax: 34 93 2235128

E-mail: desurb@amb.es

**MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION  
OFFICE FOR ENVIRONMENT  
CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT (MIO-ECSDE)**

**Mr Michael J. Scoullos**

President  
Mediterranean Information Office for  
Environment, Culture and Sustainable  
Development  
(MIO/ECSDE)  
28 Tripodon Street  
10558 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30 1 3247267 - 3247490  
Fax: 30 1 3225240  
email: mio.ee.ew@forthnet.gr

**Mr Imad Adly**

Co-chairman  
MIO-ECSDE  
Arab Office for Youth and Environment  
P.O. Box 2  
Magles le Shaab  
Cairo  
Egypt

Tel: 202 3041634 - 3059613  
Fax: 202 3041635  
Email: aoye@ritsec1.com.eg

**MONACO - MONACO**

**S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier**

Ministre Plénipotentiaire  
Chargé du suivi des questions  
d'environnement  
Direction des relations extérieures

Tel: 377 93158888  
Fax: 377 93158888  
Email: ramoge@dial-up.com

**M. Patrick Van Klaveren**

Conseiller Technique

Tel: 377 93158148  
Fax: 377 93154208  
Email: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

**M. Wilfrid Deri**

Administrateur

16 Villa Girasole, Bd. de Suisse  
MC 98000  
Principauté de Monaco

Tel: 377 97778901  
Fax: 377 93509591

**MOROCCO - MAROC**

**Mme Bani Layachi**

Directeur de l'observation, des études et  
de la coordination  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire,  
de l'Environnement,  
de l'Urbanisme et de l'Habitat  
SE d'Etat de l'Environnement  
125, Av. Ben Barka Ryad  
75, Rue du Sébou Agdal  
Rabat  
Maroc

Tel: 212 7 715477, D:212 7680741/40  
Fax: 212 7 680746

**MUNICIPALITY OF SILIFKE  
MUNICIPALITE DE SILIFKE**

**Mr Bayran Ali Öngel**

Mayor  
the Silifke Municipality  
Silifke  
Turkey

Tel: 90 324 7142137  
Fax: 90 324 7142186

**MEDITERRANEAN WATER NETWORK  
RED MEDITERRANEA DEL AQUA (RME)**

**Ms. Josefina Maestu**

Secretary General  
Red Mediterranea del Aqua-RME  
Modesto La fuente, 63-6EA  
28003 Madrid  
Spain

Tel: 34 91 5350640  
Fax: 34 91 5333663  
Email: 106173.2041@compuserve

**SLOVENIA - SLOVENIE****Mr Slavko Mezek**

Advisor to the Director  
Ministry of Environment and Spatial  
Planning  
Dunajska 47  
6000 Ljubljana  
Slovenia

Tel: 386 61 1787021  
Fax: 386 61 1787010  
Email: slavko.mezek@gov.sl

**SPAIN - ESPAGNE****Mme Amparo Rambla Gil**

Subdirectora General Adjunta Normativa y  
Cooperacion Institucional  
D.G de Calidad y Evaluación Ambiental

Ministerio de Medio Ambiente  
Plaza San Juan de la Cruz  
28071 Madrid, Espagne

Tel: 34 91 5976374  
Fax: 34 91 5975980  
Email: amparo.rambla@sgnci.mma.es

**TUNISIA - TUNISIE****S.E Mme Faiza Kefi**

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

**M. Khalil Attia**

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

Tel: 216 1 704000, 702779  
Fax: 216 1 238411  
Email: partenaires@rdd.tn

**M. Fethi Debbabi**

Chargé de l'information et de la presse  
au Cabinet du Ministre de l'Environnement  
et de l'Aménagement du Territoire  
Ministère de l'Environnement et  
de l'Aménagement du Territoire

Centre Urbain Nord  
B.P. 52  
2080 Ariana, Tunisie  
Tel: 216 1 704000

**M. Mohamed Ennabli**

Gestionnaire de Tâche  
Institut nationale de la recherche scientifique  
et technique  
Route Touristique Soliman  
Borj-Cedria  
B.P. 95  
2020 Hammam-lif - Tunis  
Tunisie  
Tel: 216 1 430215  
Fax: 216 1 430934

**Mr Beshir Ben Mansour**

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

**Mme Samia Arbi**

Conseiller  
Ambassade de Tunisie  
Rome  
Tel: 39 06 8603060

**TURKEY - TURQUIE****Ms Kumru Adanali**

Acting Head  
Email: kumrua@hotmail.com

**Ms Güzin Arat**

Environmental Engineer  
Email: guzinarat@yahoo.com

Foreign Relations Department  
Ministry of Environment  
Eskisehir Yolu 8 KM  
06100 Ankara  
Turkey  
Tel: 90 312 2851705  
Fax: 90 312 2853739

**WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE  
INTERNATIONAL  
FONDS INTERNATIONAL POUR  
LA NATURE (WWF)**

**Mr Leonardo Lacerda**

Director  
Mediterranean Programme Office  
Tel : 3906 84497381  
E-mail: llacerda@wwf.net.org

**Ms Alessandra Poggiani**

Head of Communications and  
external Relations  
Tel: 39 06 84497424  
Email: apoggiani@wwfnet.org

**Ms Giulietta Rak**

Coordinator of Advocacy  
Tel: 39 06 84497417  
Email: grak@wwf.net.org

**Ms Isabella Murandi**

Coordination of Programme Development  
Tel: 3906 84497417  
E-mail: imorandi@wwf.net.org

**Mr Pedro Regato**

Forest Officer  
E-mail: pregato@wwfnet.org  
World Wide Fund for Nature International  
(WWF) Via Garigliano, 57  
00198 Rome  
Italy  
Tel: 39 06 84497338  
Fax: 39 06 8413866

**OBSERVERS - OBSERVATEURS**

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

**UNEP / TECHNOLOGY, INDUSTRY AND  
ECONOMICS DIVISION (TIED)  
PNUE/DIVISION TECHNOLOGIES ,  
INDUSTRIE ET ECONOMIE (DTIE)**

**Ms. Helene . Genot**

PNUE/DTIE  
39-43 Quai André-Citröen  
75739 Paris

Tel: 33 1 44371450  
Fax 33 1 44371474  
Email: helene.genot@unep.fr

Deputy Regional Director  
UNEP/ROWA  
P.O.BOX. 10880  
Manama  
State of Bahrain

Tel: 973 276072  
Fax: 973 276075  
Email: hhunrowa@batelco.com.bh

**UNEP / REGIONAL OFFICE FOR WEST  
ASIA  
PNUE/ BUREAU REGIONAL POUR  
L'ASIE DE L'OUEST (ROWA)**

**Mr Habib el Habr**

**WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION  
(WHO)  
ORGANIZATION MONDIALE DE LA  
SANTE (OMS)**

**Mr George Kamizoulis**

Senior Scientist  
WHO/EURO Project Office  
Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean  
Action Plan  
46, Vassileos Konstantinou  
116 36 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 7273105  
Fax: 7253196 - 7  
Email: gkamiz@unepmap.gr

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES  
POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET  
L'AGRICULTURE (FAO)**

**Mr Manfredo Incisa Di Camerana**

via delle Terme di Caracalla  
Rome, Italy  
Tel: 30 06 57055357

**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL  
DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION  
(UNIDO/ICS)  
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES  
POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT  
INDUSTRIEL (ONUDI/ICS)**

**Mr Enrico Feoli**

Area Coordinator  
Area Science Park  
34127 Trieste  
Italy

Tel: 39 040 922108  
Fax: 39 040 922136  
Email: feoli@ics.trieste.it

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

**COUNCIL OF ARAB MINISTERS  
RESPONSIBLE FOR ENVIRONMENT, LEAGUE  
OF ARAB STATES  
CONSEIL DES MINISTRES ARABES CHARGES  
DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT, LIGUE DES ETATS  
ARABES (CAMRE/LAS)**

**Ms Dina Kamel**  
CAMRE/LAS  
Tahrir Square C.P. 11642  
Cairo  
Egypt

Tel: 202 5750511

Fax: 202 5740331

**Mr Khaldoun Roueiha**  
Counsellor  
Piazzale delle Belle Arti,6  
Rome

Tel: 39 06 3226752

**CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND  
DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ARAB REGION AND  
EUROPE  
CENTRE POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET LE  
DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA REGION ARABE ET  
L'EUROPE (CEDARE)**

**Mr Kamal A. Sabet**  
Executive Director

**Ms Samia Nemeh**  
Conference Affairs Officer  
Nile Tower Building, 13th floor  
P.O. Box 52 Orman  
21-23 Giza Street  
Giza, Cairo  
Egypt

Tel: 202 5702482

Fax: 202 5703242

Email: cedare@ritsec1.com.eg

**ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC  
COOPERATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT(OECD)  
ORGANISATION DE COOPERATION  
ET DE DEVELOPPEMENT  
ECONOMIQUES(OCDE)**

**Mr Christian Avérous**  
Head, State of the Environment Division  
OECD Environment Directorate  
2, rue André Pascal  
75016 Paris  
France

Tel: 33 1 45249819

Fax: 33 1 45247876

Email: christian.averous@oecd.org

**MEDITERRANEAN ENVIRONMENTAL  
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
PROGRAMME  
PROGRAMME D'ASSISTANCE  
TECHNIQUE POUR  
L'ENVIRONNEMENT  
DE LA MEDITERRANEE  
(METAP)**

**Mr Sherif Arif**  
Regional Environmental Coordinator  
METAP Coordinator  
Rural Development Water & Environment  
Department  
Middle East and North Africa Region  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20433, USA

Tel: 1 202 4737315

Fax: 1 202 4771374

Email: sarif@worldbank.org

**RAMOGE**

**Sylvie Tambutté**  
Secrétaire Exécutif  
Villa Girasole, 16, boulevard de Suisse  
MC 98000 Monaco  
Tel: 377 93154229  
Fax: 377 93509591  
Email: ramoge@dial-up.com

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

**UNEP/IMO REGIONAL MARINE  
POLLUTION EMERGENCY  
RESPONSIBLE CENTRE FOR THE  
MEDITERRANEAN SEA (REMPEC)  
CENTRE REGIONAL MEDITERRANEEN  
POUR L'INTERVENTION  
D'URGENCE CONTRE LA POLLUTION  
MARINE ACCIDENTELLE**

**Mr Roberto Patruno**

Director  
UNEP/IMO Regional Marine Pollution  
Emergency Response Centre for the  
Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC)  
Manoel Island GZR 03  
Malta

Tel: 356 337296-8  
Fax: 356 339951  
Email: rempecdirector@waldonet.net.mt

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

**M. Michel Batisse**

Président  
Plan Bleu  
c/o UNESCO-SC  
1 rue Miollis  
Paris 75732  
France

Tel: 33 1 45684051  
Fax: 33 1 45685804

**M. Guillaume Benoit**

Directeur  
Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre  
(BP/RAC)  
15 Avenue Beethoven  
Sophia Antipolis  
06560 Valbonne  
France

Tel: 33 492387130  
Fax: 33 492387131  
Email: planbleu@planbleu.org

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

**Mr Ivica Trumbic**

Director  
Priority Actions Programme/Regional Activity  
Centre (PAP/RAC)  
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana P.O Box 74  
21000 Split  
Croatia

Tel: 385 21 571171  
Fax: 385 21 361677  
email: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr

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

**M. Adel Hentati**

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

Tel: 216 1 795760  
Fax: 216 1 797349  
Email: car-asp@rac-spa.org.tn



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

**Mr Michele Raimondi**

Managing Director  
E-mail: michele.raimondi@ctmnet.it

**Monique Viel**

Technical Officer  
Regional Activity Centre for Environment  
Remote Sensing  
2 Via G. Giusti  
90144 Palermo, Italy

Tel: 39 91 308512 - 342368

Fax: 39 91 308512

E-mail: monique.viel@ctmnet.it

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

**Mr Victor Macià**

Director  
Cleaner Production/Regional Activity Centre

Travessera de Gràcia 56,1  
08013 Barcelona  
Espagne

Tel: 34 93 4147090

Fax: 34 93 4144582

E-mail: vmacia@cipn.es  
cleanpro@cipn.es

**MAP SECRETARIAT FOR 100  
MEDITERRANEAN HISTORIC SITES  
SECRETARIAT DU PAM DES  
100 SITES HISTORIQUES**

**M. Daniel Drocourt**

Coordonnateur  
"100 Sites historiques méditerranéens"  
du Plan d'action pour la Méditerranée  
Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville de Marseille  
10 Ter Square Belsunce  
13001 Marseille  
France

Tel: 33 491907874

Fax: 33 491561461

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

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

**Francesco-Saverio Civili**  
Senior Environmental Affairs Officer  
MEDPOL Programme Coordinator  
Tel: 30 1 7273106  
E-mail: fscivili@unepmap.gr

**Mr Lucien Chabason**  
Coordinator  
Tel: 30 1 7273101  
E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

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

**Mr Arab Hoballah**  
Deputy Coordinator  
Tel : 301 72573 126  
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

Greece  
Tel: 30 1 7273100  
Fax: 30 1 7253197  
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr

## ANNEX II Appendix I

### INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

#### Proposals

The Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, with the support of actors from civil society, are invited to set up on a voluntary basis a Mediterranean system of indicators for sustainable development for use by:

- C Mediterranean riparian States;
- C Actors in multilateral co-operation in the region ;
- C Actors from civil society (local authorities, companies, associations, ...).

1. **Adoption of a common set of indicators:** A first set of 130 basic indicators (of which 55 are more easy to calculate in view of the relevance and availability of data for an adequate number of countries) would be submitted to the Contracting Parties. Each country would compile them, where possible and on a voluntary basis, for the purposes of work at the Mediterranean level. This list may be changed in accordance with tests carried out in the countries,<sup>1</sup> and in accordance with guidance and requirements expressed by the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development.
2. **Complementary indicators:** The indicators selected in the common core set cannot alone make up an adequate framework for an in-depth examination of various subjects and for work on sustainable development policies on special fields or territories. MAP, the States and local authorities will endeavour to propose, test and record complementary pressure, state and response indicators.
3. **Harmonization and dissemination of indicators to facilitate work at the national level:** MAP will create a "glossary" which sets out definitions and the methods for drawing up indicators. MAP will also keep an up-to-date dossier illustrating all selected indicators, including a table of trends by country and at regional level from 1960 onwards with graphical illustrations, in addition to comments on difficulties in collection and possible interpretations. MAP will disseminate this work on the Internet.
4. **Mediterranean report:** The Contracting Parties are invited to contribute effectively to the production and publication by MAP of a report on sustainable development in the Mediterranean. The first report shall be drawn up in the year 2002. This report will be based in particular on indicators for sustainable development.

It will show the unity and diversity of situations in the region, current efforts towards sustainable development, difficulties encountered, good practices, etc.  
It will be submitted by the MAP to the Contracting Parties and the MCSD.

5. **National reports:** States are invited to supply MAP with the national reports prepared for the United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development, and to facilitate comparative studies on Mediterranean issues undertaken by Blue Plan (series of Mediterranean Country Profiles).

---

<sup>1</sup>To be specified.

These national summaries will indicate result-based goals in the medium and long term, which are clearly stated and adopted by States, as well as examples of good practice.

6. **Capacity Building:** The Contracting Parties are invited: to mobilize national statistical institutions and instruct environment and development observatories, or equivalent agencies, to monitor and enhance indicators at the national level; and to develop them into preferential links at the Mediterranean level.  
They are invited to develop appropriate programmes, possibly with regional financial support, to build their capacities:
  - C to promote the use of indicators for sustainable development;
  - C to harmonize environmental and socio-economic statistics; and
  - C to ensure coordination with all the institutions concerned
  
7. **Follow up:** MAP will follow up this work through the activities centres, and particularly the Blue Plan. It will supplement the work with new activities to examine specific themes in greater depth in collaboration with other competent national and international organizations. The MCSD will follow the work and, where necessary, will call on the task managers, who may propose the holding of the appropriate meetings.

**ANNEX II**  
**Appendix II**

**INFORMATION, PUBLIC AWARENESS, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION**

**Proposals**

(a) Framework conditions

- C The strengthening of the role of civil society requires the urgent and systematic review, amendment and revision of national and local legal and institutional frameworks in most of the Mediterranean countries.
- C The members concerned took note of the principles of the Aarhus Convention(1998);
- C Regional and local authorities, NGOs and other civil society organizations must be encouraged and supported. "Dialogue fora" should be promoted and participatory schemes with active involvement of NGOs should be introduced and/or enhanced. Such schemes may include the participation of NGOs in EIA procedures and in specific projects such as biotopes management, training, monitoring, etc. as well as in sustainability plans through Local Agendas 21 and similar initiatives. Funding provision for such activities should be included in the budget.

Public Awareness, information, participation and mobilization for the environment and sustainability, need to start at an early stage. Therefore relevant issues should be introduced in the curricula of schools and adequate time provision should be made; educators should be trained appropriately; suitable pedagogical material should be produced and disseminated; the media and the Internet could be used by establishing sites on education for the environment and sustainability, with links to other sites.

(b) Specific actions proposed:

- C A number of the specific actions recommended by the Thematic Group are closely linked with the planned MAP information and communication policy and the MAP Secretariat should, therefore, be encouraged to utilize the input of the Thematic Group, as appropriate.

Information:

1. A reliable cost assessment of the needed additional capital investment for infrastructure as well as for running costs etc. for the achievement of comparable, reliable information throughout the Mediterranean.
2. A 2-year state-of-the-art exhibition, held in each Mediterranean country in the national language, which will remain in the country. The information will be provided for the most part by UNEP/MAP and EEA and will focus on the state of the Mediterranean environment as well as the means and mechanisms that are either in place or are needed for its improvement and for the promotion of a truly sustainable development. Part of each exhibition will be dedicated to the respective country in which it is taking place. The exhibitions will be handled by partnership between Governments and NGOs.

Awareness:

3. Organization of a systematic opinion poll and statistically sound assessment of the awareness views, perceptions behaviour and aspirations of the Mediterranean public in the areas of environment and sustainable development, in a mode compatible with the one employed by "Eurobarometer" for Europe.
4. Invitation to the Contracting Parties to develop and implement national strategies and action plans for awareness, as integral components of their national sustainability plans, in collaboration with NGOs, in order to enhance the efficiency and credibility of the information provided. The Secretariat, eventually with the input of the Thematic Group, may provide an "Information and Awareness Strategy Framework" as a support for the work of the Contracting Parties.

Education:

5. Strengthening of the Mediterranean network of environmental educators and relevant Mediterranean networks on education for environment and sustainability.
6. Assessment of the resources needed for the training of 50 per cent of Mediterranean educators of primary schools in the most productive alternative schemes and 30 per cent of those of secondary schools by the year 2004.
7. Encouragement for the establishment of a Mediterranean register with Internet links on teaching materials, particularly audiovisual.

Participation:

8. Invitation to the Contracting Parties to identify at least one pilot participatory and mobilization project per country with the active involvement of the public. These projects at national or local level will be studied, monitored and documented in order to be publicized as possible examples of good practice. Invitation also to States to collaborate with local authorities.
9. Publication and translation of a series of manuals in various Mediterranean languages on the following issues:
  - (a). participation practices and techniques
  - (b). consensus-building methodologies
  - (c). already existing "success stories" in the area of public participation and mobilization.

**Speech by Dr Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP  
at the Fifth meeting of the  
Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development  
Rome, 1 July 1999**

Excellencies,  
Distinguished Delegates,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am really pleased and honoured to address this important meeting through MAP.

This is indeed an extraordinary assembly of governments, local authorities, business leaders, and representatives of non-governmental organizations from throughout the Mediterranean region.

My contribution here on behalf of the United Nations Environment Programme must be taken as its commitment to the shared vision of the Mediterranean region as peaceful, economically vibrant and ecologically healthy region.

The Mediterranean region has a powerful historic legacy. The Mediterranean Sea and its adjacent bodies of water have been an inviting passageway to the movement of people. The Myccad, Dorian and Scythian tribes, the Egyptian, Greek and Persian civilizations, the Roman Empire, and successive waves of Germanic and Slavic peoples, Arabas, Mongols and Turks - all moved toward the Mediterranean. They sought to use its waters and coastal plains to extend the range of cultural influence, economic activity and political domination.

For nearly a thousand years, the Mediterranean region has been a fertile ground of ideas and concepts that has guided us to this very day. We can find in this region historic notions of a common space, common concerns and a common heritage. There is enough commonality in the region to make dialogue and cooperation an effort worth undertaking.

Ladies and gentlemen,

There is no doubt that the issues dominating the Mediterranean region are changing. They require a refocus on the elements that constitute the overall security policy of the region. It is a security policy that takes into account the developments in the economic, social, ecological, cultural, and humanitarian spheres.

The current economic trends indicate that the Mediterranean will become even more important than ever as a channel for the movement of vital resources. The trends also indicate that the region is on the way to becoming an integrated advanced economy, with potentials for large investment inflows in the coming decades.

All these economic forecasts and initiatives require an overall sense of ecological stability in the Mediterranean within an overall framework of sustainable development. Massive investment in the area go forward with a sense of long-term security of the ecological resources in the area.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Since its establishment in 1972 UNEP has given prime consideration to the maintenance of the ecological integrity of the Regional Seas. The Mediterranean was UNEP's first regional seas programme. And I am proud to say its most successful one.

We need not look far to ascertain the reasons for the success of the Mediterranean Regional Seas programme. The countries bordering the Mediterranean together with European Commission realised very early the need for regional cooperation for protecting the sea against pollution and for paving the way to sustainable development. It was due to the willingness and commitments of concerned partners, that UNEP's Mediterranean Action Plan has become an example for other regions and programmes.

There were other reasons as well for its success. First, the dynamic institutional structure with UNEP's Regional Coordinating Unit and the Various Regional Activity Centres. These institutions covered a wide range of important issues from observation and evaluation to management of resources and capacity building.

Also with time, this regional seas programme evolved from monitoring, assessment and prevention of marine pollution to the use and management of natural resources in coastal regions. Its overall aim has always been a virtuous integration of social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

The revision and revitalization of Barcelona Convention, its Protocols and the Action Plan have also aided in this process. They have given due consideration to the major environmental initiatives, actions and changes at the global and regional levels, especially the various Multilateral Environment Agreements. I must mention here the adaptation of Agenda 21 to the Mediterranean context, at the initiative of Tunisia, immediately after the Earth Summit in 1992, and the preparation of Agenda MED 21.

You will agree with me when I say that the establishment of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development was also part of this process of evolution. As a regional forum for dialogue and a think tank for strategic issues, the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development constitutes a bridge between global and regional impetus and decisions and the efforts of countries at the national and local levels.

It definitely represents a promising framework for the definition of a genuinely Mediterranean sustainable development strategy.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the framework of the revitalization of the Regional Seas, UNEP will continue to provide full support to the activities of the Mediterranean Action Plan. We will do this by enhancing their scope and achievements. We will promote them not only within UNEP's Family but also with all concerned partners including UN Agencies and UNCSD. I am sure that other regions and institutions will doubtless benefit from this UNEP/MAP experience and expertise.

For this, we will require an efficient information and communication strategy. This will,



in return give a new impetus to MAP-s activities and improve MAP-s visibility. UNEP-s experience, expertise and networks are at the Mediterranean Region-s disposal not only for enhancing information dissemination but also for strengthening cooperation.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am convinced that UNEP-s Mediterranean Action Plan and its Commission on Sustainable Development have, probably more than ever before, a crucial role in protecting the environment and promoting sustainable development to build a peaceful and prosperous Region.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Finally I would like to express my deep gratitude to the Mayor of the Comune di Roma for organizing this meeting and to the Italian government for its continuous support to MAP.

**Speech given by H.E. Mrs. Faiza Kefi, President of the MCSD,  
at the opening of the fifth meeting of the MCSD  
Rome, 1-3 July, 1999**

Secretary of State for the Environment for the Italian Government,  
Representative of the City of Rome,  
Representative of FAO,  
Secretary General,  
Members of the MCSD,  
Representatives of partner institutions and those supporting cooperation for the Mediterranean,  
Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

My pleasure at being here with you is equaled only by the honour I feel at taking part in and leading the work of this, the fifth meeting of the MCSD.

I take particular pleasure in congratulating the City of Rome on its initiative, this Mediterranean capital with 27 centuries of history behind it, which is today playing host to our meeting, and in expressing special thanks to Mr. Francesco Rutelli, whose commitment to the environmental cause is known to us all.

Thanks to him, the cities of the Mediterranean are actively subscribing to the MCSD process. I am sure that the other members and partners of the Commission will follow his lead in order to strengthen the MCSD and MAP, so that, with the support of UNEP, all of us together, governments and civil society, may successfully achieve our ambitious aim of sustainable development for the Mediterranean within the framework of the Agenda MED 21 programme.

I would also like to pay tribute to those who with such tirelessness are working so selflessly in order to build an effective and methodical basis for our activities. Here I would mention Mr. Chabason and the MAP Secretariat team.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The fact that the MCSD is today holding its fifth meeting since being set up in 1995 bears witness to its relevance, and shows just how solidly it is anchored in the system of MAP and the Barcelona Convention. The smooth running of this Commission, which involves all those affected by questions related to the environment and development in the Mediterranean at regional, national and local level, has greatly contributed to the creation of a forum for concertation and constructive dialogue. In spite of the constraints and the many difficulties encountered in the search for a difficult compromise between the legitimate needs of development and the delicate environmental balances in our region, and thanks to the participation of everyone concerned, the Commission has managed to produce serious, in-depth analyses and thinking, and operational recommendations and proposals for action on such sensitive and crucial themes as water demand management and the sustainable management of coastal areas. The active participation of the various MCSD members, particularly the representatives of local authorities, socio-economic groups and NGOs in the work of the

Commission and its thematic groups has played a major role in achieving these results.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The rich and varied agenda before us here in Rome bears witness to the Commission's will to forge ahead.

During its meeting last March, which Tunisia had the honour of hosting, the Steering Committee looked at many aspects of our activity. The results of this study are now before us, faithfully transcribed into the documents of our meeting by the MAP Secretariat.

We will be discussing some practical proposals, particularly those related to working methods, and the follow-up and implementation of the recommendations with the aim of reaching agreement on appropriate ways of ensuring that the Commission functions correctly within MAP.

We will be called upon to examine the recommendations for action proposed by the groups responsible for the themes of indicators of sustainable development, tourism and sustainable development, information, and public participation and awareness-raising, with an eye to their adoption.

We will also be studying the proposals from the groups responsible for continuing examination of the following themes: industry and sustainable development, free trade and the environment, and sustainable urban development.

Finally, we will be debating the terms of reference and the working framework for the strategic assessment for the year 2000.

The drawing-up of this assessment, which will inform us about the implementation of sustainable development in the region, is strategic for our countries as well as for MAP. The choice made to draw up the assessment and have it presented in the year 2000 is significant in more than one respect, and we hope that this important event can effectively be staged in the year 2000.

Conscious as I am of the difficulties involved in completing the assessment on target, I would appeal to all members and partners to support the MAP Secretariat and the MCSD in order to release the means needed to complete this project.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The last few years have been marked by many important events in our region. The Euromediterranean and GEF projects, which are gaining ever more momentum, are providing genuine possibilities for cooperation. These should be seized and used to their best effect to the benefit of the implementation of the regional, national and local programmes within the framework of the MCSD's recommendations.

Before concluding, I would like to stress what great store Tunisia lays by the recommendations of the Commission, and their realization within the framework of the national development

programmes. I would like to stress the importance of regional solidarity in achieving the aims of sustainable development. Allow me once again on your behalf to thank the organizers for all the effort they have put in, as well as the City of Rome, which has provided the best possible working conditions for our meeting, to which I wish every success.

**ADDRESS BY THE MAYOR OF ROME AT THE OPENING CEREMONY OF THE 5<sup>TH</sup>  
MEETING OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT, Capitol, Rome, 1 July 1999**

The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development has above all acted as a forum where all the interests and social concerns of the Mediterranean region can come together and be confronted.

The Mediterranean is both rich and vulnerable and needs pragmatic policies and measures for sustainable development that are understood, accepted and implemented by all actors, whether institutions or not, public or private.

This is not an easy task in a region that is not characterized by a high degree of cohesion, but it is inescapable if it is hoped to orient the profound transformation of the development model according to sustainability criteria.

This is the nucleus of our task and our work. We must be able to find the point where we can come together, the common factors that will allow our communities to move towards the objective of social, economic and of course environmental development. This is sustainable development.

The countries, regions, cities, public authorities, NGOs and the private sector are here to work together, using their experience, and above all their commitment to put into effect the strategies we will formulate together within their fields of competence and activity.

As one of my predecessors said in this same hall, may God help us.

It is particularly apt that the Commission on Sustainable Development should include cities, their networks and local authorities among its members.

Moreover, this recognition is above all the result of the responsibilities these bodies have deemed it their duty to assume and the ongoing efforts made in recent years, notably in the Mediterranean, which have promoted and encouraged a large number of measures.

The commitment to sustainable development by cities and local authorities, particularly since the Rio Conference, has at the same time accentuated their awareness and their action and this has had an impact both at the local and global levels.

It is with some pride that I can draw attention to the effective contribution made by Rome, which has taken part in all the major initiatives and in some cases has taken on the responsibility for directly promoting them.

I take the opportunity to mention some of the measures taken by the city I represent, albeit briefly.

At the global level:

Participation in the *Cities for Climate Protection* Campaign for the implementation of the Convention on Climate Change, and the follow-up to all the five objectives and the commitments

assumed by countries taking part in the Campaign, reaffirmed in the Nagoya Declaration of 28 November 1997.

Together with the UNCCD and IFAD, promotion and organization of the 1<sup>st</sup> Forum of Mayors of Cities against Desertification, in parallel with the Conference of the Parties to ratify the Convention against Desertification, 3-4 October 1997, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Forum held on 11 and 12 June last in Bonn.

At the Mediterranean level:

Support for the promotion and dissemination of Local Agenda 21 in the Mediterranean, with particular emphasis on cities in the southern and eastern Mediterranean, through participation in the programmes and projects of the European Union and other international organizations and institutions, the organization of international conferences and the formulation of partnership agreements and initiatives such as those with the city of Tunis and the Tunisian Ministry of the Environment. In collaboration with UNEP/TIED, preparation of the 1<sup>st</sup> report on cleaner production in the Mediterranean region in 1995 and of the 2<sup>nd</sup> report, which you have received, with the participation of the National Environmental Protection Agency (ANPA). Membership of Medcities, the only permanent network of cities in the Mediterranean aimed at promoting sustainable development, of which I presently have the honour to be President. The establishment of an operational instrument such as the Ecomed Agency, which has assisted and supported all these initiatives in recent years.

In Europe:

Accession to the Alborg Charter and to the European Sustainable Cities Campaign, participation in the preparatory committees for the Lisbon and Seville conferences promoted by the Campaign.

In Rome:

The initiation and strengthening of the Local Agenda 21 process. In your files, you will find the essential information and a progress report. In this connection, I should just like to mention one politico-administrative act that is particularly relevant in my view, namely, the establishment of the Office for Citizen Participation.

The City Council has approved a Plan that sets aside 64 per cent of communal land as protected areas.

Rome has breathing space of 82,000 hectares of green zones, comprising agricultural land, protected nature reserves, parks and historical villas.

The creation of Roma Natura, the body which administers 20 of the parks and nature reserves totalling 51,000 hectares.

All the above underlines the commitment of Rome and its authorities to the promotion of global processes to orient urban development towards sustainability and has led to a new definition of development and urban management policies.

**Speech of Mr Valerio Calzolaio, Under-secretary of State for the Environment of Italy at the opening of the fifth meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, Rome 1-3 July 1999.**

Good morning to all the representatives of the Governments, of the Councils, of the non-governmental organisations and of the social forces.

In the last few years the rhythm of the launch of the International Conventions on the Environment has slowed down. Till 1971 there were 58 of them. Between 1972 (with the novelty of the 1st Conference and the birth of UNEP) and 1992 they got to 171, an average of 5-6 a year.

In 1998 we reached 175 and the "last" are perhaps the most important ones for the future; biodiversity, climatic changes, desertification, intimately connected, with "global" implications, impossible to be carried out without an ecological re-conversion of the development pattern of the North and the exchange reasons of the South.

At the Summit of Rio in '92 the Conventions on climatic changes and on biodiversity were signed. There started the negotiations for the Convention on the fight against desertification (signed in Paris in 1994) and new impulse was given to the Mediterranean Action Plan and to the Convention of Barcelona – eventually ratified by Italy in its new version, with the relative protocols– thus stimulating the preparation of the Agenda 21 for the Mediterranean, the creation of this Mediterranean Committee for Sustainable Development.

As we know, the existence of a Convention does not guarantee that national relations and undersigned commitments will be respected in form, in terms and in substance; or that sanctions will be applied to transgressors. Yet, they induce dialectics, they set us to concentrate and to verify, they allow us to ask Governments to account for their actions.

For the last few months, with the new Government, the Ministry of Environment has decided to give more relevance, and in a more complete and organic way, to the protection of the Mediterranean and to the relative national and international set of laws. I myself verified the existence of multiple political and institutional pertanances, administrative offices, scientific and research institutes, often not well co-ordinated among them.

For this reason we entrusted the ICRAM and the ENEA with a survey on the degree of application of the principal conventions for the protection of the Mediterranean and on the principal instruments of international collaboration, premises of a proposal of a unitary political and administrative trend.

The survey made by the ENEA and the ICRAM does not pretend to be exhaustive ; it intends to allow a joined evaluation of some significant aspects on the subject of protection of the Mediterranean marine and coastal environment, subjected to a traditional fragmentation of national and international laws as well as of technical, administrative and organisational competencies to their realization. The task will need to be verified, enlarged and gradually updated. Only a deep knowledge of the available instruments, of their strength and weakness, can allow us to accomplish a better national preparation for a more organic and incisive presence in the different international seats, where programmes are decided and launched and so are the practical tools for the environment and sustainable development. We must think of

a unique direction seat for “marine” policies, both for national policy and for the Italian contribution to the international policy.

Italy and the other Mediterranean countries fall into a framework of environmental crisis with problems linked to climatic variations with prolonged periods of drought, to the presence of grounds with a marked tendency to erosion, to the high frequency of forest fires with destruction of the forestry resources, to the conditions of crisis of traditional agriculture and the consequent desertion of vast areas that become marginal, to the excessive exploitation of water resources and to the massive concentration of the economical activities along the coastline, to the strong aggregations of urban areas, to tourism and to intensive agriculture with negative consequences that are reflected on all the “Mediterranean ecosystem” that meanwhile suffers from a process of “tropicalization”.

In the Mediterranean the “greenhouse effect” and “ desertification effect” become the same. Both in a certain way specular effects, triggered off by multiple causes which are linked to energy production and consumption as well as to the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources. In the years to come the update of the MAP (Mediterranean Action Plan) and the definition of the PAND (Program of the National Action for the fight against desertification) will allow a better coordination of the governmental and interministerial policy.

I hope that this precious preliminary work will be useful to identify concrete measures, to support the realization of national and regional programmes for the sustainable management of the natural resources of the Mediterranean basin as well as to develop suitable community and co-operation policies.

Valerio Calzolaio  
Under-secretary  
Ministry of Environment





**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.156/3  
1st June 1999

ENGLISH

---

---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

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

Rome, 1-3 July 1999

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE  
MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT  
(November 1998 - July 1999)**

## Table of Contents

### Introduction and opening

#### **I. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COMMISSION**

- A) First meeting of the Commission
- B) Second meeting of the Commission
- C) Third meeting of the Commission
- D) Contracting Parties Meeting
- E) Technical consultation between MCSD Task Managers
- F) Fourth Meeting of the Commission

#### **II. GENERAL INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES SINCE THE FOURTH MCSD MEETING:**

- A) Second meeting of the Steering Committee
- B) Intersessional Activities and Working Groups

#### **III. METHOD OF WORK AND FOLLOW-UP OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **IV. NEW SUBJECTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

#### **V. STRATEGIC REVIEW FOR THE YEAR 2000**

### **ANNEXES**

- Annex I Summary of conclusions of the work of the Steering Committee of the MCSD
- Annex II Criteria for selection of new themes for MCSD programme of work over the next 2 or 3 bienniums (until 2005)  
MCSD Thematic Selection Matrix
- Annex III MCSD Intersessional Working Groups  
Provisional Agenda of meetings in the MCSD framework
- Annex IV Strategic review for the year 2000- Draft terms of reference
- Annex V Thematic Working Groups

## **Introduction and opening:**

The present progress report is submitted by the Secretariat of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development in compliance with the Terms of Reference of the MCSD. It covers progress achieved and problems encountered in the implementation of the various decisions taken during previous meetings of the Commission (Rabat, 16-18 December 1996, Palma de Majorca, 6-8 May 1997, Sophia Antipolis, 28-30 October 1997 and Monaco, 20-22 October 1998).

Moreover, this progress report is largely based on discussions and conclusions of the second meeting of the Steering Committee (Tunis, 8-9 March 1999), mainly for agenda items 6, 7 and 8. The report of this Steering Committee meeting was distributed to all MCSD members in April 1999.

In this context, the following points should be noted:

- the mandate of the present members of the MCSD will run until the next meeting of the Contracting Parties (Malta, October 1999)
- according to its Rules of Procedure, a new Steering Committee is to be elected at the beginning of the fifth meeting of the MCSD. Its mandate will run until the next MCSD meeting.

## **I. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE MCSD**

1. The post-Rio era was an important period in the history of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) during which the Governments of the Mediterranean region and the European Community started the process of translating and adapting UNCED principles to the Mediterranean context through the preparation of Agenda MED 21, reorientation of MAP, the Barcelona Convention and its protocols and the creation of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD).
2. The MCSD was established in 1995 within the framework of MAP, as an advisory body with the following mandate<sup>1</sup>:
  - to identify, evaluate and examine major economic, ecological and social problems set out in Agenda MED 21, make appropriate proposals thereon to the meetings of the Contracting Parties, evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of decisions taken by the Contracting Parties and facilitate the exchange of information among institutions implementing activities related to sustainable development in the Mediterranean;
  - to enhance regional cooperation and rationalize the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean basin for the integration of environment and development issues.

---

<sup>1</sup>UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.5/16, annex XIII (IV-a)

3. At their Extraordinary Meeting (Montpellier, 1-4 July 1996), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted the Terms of Reference and the Composition of the Commission<sup>2</sup>. According to the Terms of Reference, the Commission is composed of 36 members, consisting of high-level representatives from each of the Contracting Parties (21), representatives of local authorities, socio-economic actors and non-governmental organizations (15), working in the fields of environment and sustainable development. Strongly believing that the role of the local authorities, socio-economic actors and NGOs is very important during this new era of MAP, the meeting of the Contracting Parties approved a new dimension in MAP relations with these three groups by accepting that they shall participate in the work of the Commission as fully-fledged members on an equal footing with representatives of the Contracting Parties.

**A) First Meeting of the Commission**

4. During its first meeting (Rabat, 16-18 December 1996), the Commission agreed on a programme built around short-term (sustainable management of coastal regions and management of water demand as sufficient work had already been undertaken) and medium-term (sustainable development indicators, tourism, information, awareness and participation, free trade and environment, industry and sustainable development, management of urban and rural development) activities corresponding to some of the priority needs of the Mediterranean region.
5. In order to implement efficiently and usefully these activities and to ensure greater participation, the Commission designated Task Managers and Thematic Working Groups to deal with each selected theme. The MAP funds allocated to the MCSD will be considered as seed money since the task managers and support centres are expected to look for the necessary additional human and financial resources and expertise for the activities of the thematic working groups.

**B) Second Meeting of the Commission**

6. The second meeting of the Commission was held in Palma de Majorca, Spain, from 6-8 May 1997. The Commission reviewed progress achieved and problems encountered since its first meeting.
7. The Meeting also reviewed the composition of the Thematic Working Groups, and decided to add a few other members upon their request.
8. With regard to the draft rules of procedure of the Commission, after a brief discussion and due to time limitation, the meeting decided to defer the decision on the draft Rules of Procedure to its third meeting.

**C) Third Meeting of the Commission**

9. The third meeting of the Commission was held in Sophia Antipolis, France, from 28-30 October 1997. The Commission examined the progress made by the eight working groups, as well as at the MCSD's draft rules of procedure.
10. On the short-term themes, i.e. water demand management and the sustainable management of coastal zones, the Commission examined the analyses drawn up and the recommendations proposed for submission to the Contracting Parties at their tenth ordinary meeting in Tunis in November 1997. As for the other working groups, the Commission examined progress made and noted the various planned experts meetings and workshops.

---

<sup>2</sup>UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.8/7, annexes V and VI

11. The discussions about the other activities of the various groups provided the opportunity to review the working method, underlining the fact that the MCSD risked becoming a “research institute” rather than a “consultative task force”; furthermore, it was the duty of the task managers to draft in experts in their respective themes as well as representatives of the public and private sectors. It was, however, noted that the MCSD, which allows MAP’s activities to be extended into the field of sustainable development, works with a marginal additional budget, to be used more like seed capital, additional funding needing to be drummed up elsewhere.
12. An ad hoc group was set up in order to complete the preparation of the MCSD’s rules of procedure, and its proposal was adopted by the members of the Commission before submitting it to the Contracting Parties.

**D) Contracting Parties Meeting**

13. The Contracting Parties held their Tenth Ordinary Meeting from 18 to 21 November 1997 in Tunis and approved the recommendations concerning the management of water demand and the sustainable management of Coastal Zones. The Rules of Procedure of the MCSD, with a Steering Committee, of seven members, four representing the Contracting Parties, including ex officio the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties and one from each of the three categories foreseen by the Terms of Reference of the MCSD.
14. The meeting considered that the Task Managers and their Working Groups as well as the Secretariat should induce countries to implement these recommendations and translate the strategical lines of action of the MCSD into proposals for concrete action, set within a time frame. It was also pointed out that major partners of the civil society should be involved in the implementation and follow-up of priority projects and activities. Moreover, it was decided to extend the present membership of the Commission until next meeting of the Contracting parties (Malta, October 1999).
15. Moreover, the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Tunis, 28 March 1998) designated the remaining four MCSD members out of various proposed candidates.

**E) Technical consultation between MCSD Task Managers**

16. In order to coordinating and streamlining the works of the Task Managers and the Thematic Working Groups, based on the experience gained during the first year of work, a Consultation Meeting was held in Athens, on 5 February 1998 (the report of the meeting was issued as document UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 141/2) on Secretariat’s initiative, and with the participation of RAC’s directors.
17. Some major points were discussed including:
  - some coordination gap between the Task Managers and the Support Centers;
  - the need to regularly inform, and as far as possible involve, all members of the Thematic Group;
  - the need to exchange information and develop cooperation between the Thematic Groups;
  - the need to involve competent experts in the preparatory activities and in the meetings along with the officially designated ones.
  - the programme of activity of each working group with agenda of meetings and expected outputs.

**F) Fourth Meeting of the Commission**

18. The fourth meeting of the MCSD was held in Monaco from 20-22 October 1998. The Commission examined the progress made by the six "medium-term" thematic working groups, as well as issues related to follow-up of recommendations, new themes, method of work and cooperation with UN agencies and other partners.
19. In conformity with the MCSD's rules of procedure, a new Steering Committee was elected with Tunisia as President, Monaco as Rapporteur and EOAEN, Cyprus, MIO-ECSDE, Municipality of Silifke and Spain as Vice-Presidents.
20. In view of the fifth MCSD meeting and then the next Contracting Parties meeting (27-30 October 1999), the working groups concerned with "Indicators", "Tourism" and "Information" themes were generally requested to review their proposals by defining more realistic, feasible and practical recommendations and actions, whereas the other working groups were requested to set realistic objectives and define a practical programme of work in view of final proposals for the MCSD and Contracting Parties meetings in 2001.
21. Concerning the other important issues on the agenda, (follow-up, new themes, method of work and cooperation), the Secretariat was requested to analyze further related questions raised during the discussions and present its views and proposals to the next meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD, in addition to the preparatory steps for the Strategic review for the year 2000 as mentioned in the MCSD terms of reference.
22. The fourth MCSD meeting has been the occasion for a large participation of UN agencies and other partners that showed great interest in the work of the MCSD. The meeting requested the MCSD and its Secretariat to strengthen cooperation with concerned bodies, particularly UN-CSD.

**II. GENERAL INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES SINCE THE FOURTH MCSD MEETING:**

**A) Second meeting of the Steering Committee**

23. The second meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD was held from 8 to 9 March 1999 in Tunis. As requested by the fourth meeting of the MCSD, the Secretariat prepared a report encompassing mainly issues related to the method of work and follow-up of recommendations, new subjects and selection criteria, preparation of the Strategic review for the year 2000, as well as cooperation with UN and National Commissions on Sustainable Development. These issues were examined by the Steering Committee that has finally agreed upon a series of conclusions to be considered for and by the fifth MCSD meeting ("Conclusions" attached as annex I)
24. The report of the Secretariat (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.155/2) and the report of the Steering Committee (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG 155/3) were both sent to all MCSD members by mail and/or electronic mail in April 1999.

25. In conformity with the conclusions of the Steering Committee, the Secretariat has reworked the matrix of proposed new subjects together with the set of criteria for their selection that were presented in a brief questionnaire through specific questions related to importance, appraisal, feasibility and methodology. Reviewed matrix and detailed questionnaire were sent to all MCSD members and Support Centres by mid May requesting their comments and inputs for mid-June, leaving then about a week for the Secretariat to analyze and synthesize collected information (Matrix and questionnaire on Selection criteria are attached as annex II)
26. As the Steering Committee met recently and reviewed important questions that are down on the agenda of the fifth MCSD meeting, related and relevant outcomes and conclusions will be taken again in appropriate sections of this report, mainly corresponding to agenda items 6, 7 and 8.
27. The MCSD members might wish to consider the inputs for and outputs from the Steering Committee meeting and advise for the preparation of further meetings of the Steering Committee.

#### **B) Intersessional Activities and Working Groups**

28. In order to improve information and ensure better participation to the various thematic Working Groups, a provisional agenda of meetings in the MCSD framework or of interest for MCSD in 1999 was prepared by the Secretariat and sent to all MCSD members and other partners in March 1999. The actual agenda of the MCSD working group meetings is attached as annex III. As it can be noticed in this table, three of the working groups were held between 7 and 4 weeks before the fifth MCSD meeting. The time left is obviously too short for preparing a consistent report by the Secretariat in two languages and sending it to the MCSD members and other participants to the meeting more than two weeks before the meeting.
29. All the meetings of the thematic working groups took place and their major conclusions/proposals are included in a separated report dedicated to the outputs of the Task Managers and Support Centres thematic activities. It should be recalled at this stage that for the "Indicators", "Tourism" and "Information" themes, recommendations/proposals for action are expected to be reviewed, finalized and adopted before their submission to the next Contracting Parties meeting, whereas for the "Free-Trade", "Industry" and "Urban" themes relevant programmes of work are expected to be reviewed, finalized and adopted in view of final proposals in 2001.
30. The MCSD members are requested to review and approve proposed recommendations/proposals for action and programme of work, as presented in respective thematic sections of the "task managers and support centres report" (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 156/4)

### **III. METHOD OF WORK AND FOLLOW-UP OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

31. Well aware of the importance of this issue, for the revitalization of the MCSD and enhancement of its efficiency, the Secretariat prepared a rather critical analysis that was presented to the Steering Committee meeting (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.155/2). It mainly refers to :
  - lack of consistency in the MCSD meetings and discussions, partly due to the various subjects considered and the short time allocated, thus some important issues are just skimmed over;
  - lack of sufficiently practical recommendations and programme of actions with a clear operational dimension;

- unclear implementation and follow-up process of adopted recommendations/proposals for action;
  - need for a more systematic approach when handling a theme with due consideration to terms of reference, organization of activities, partners, working period and funding.
  - need for better visibility, more political support and adequate information and communication strategy.
32. Sharing the concerns of the Secretariat, throughout an intense discussion, the members of the Steering Committee agreed upon a series of conclusions to be submitted to the fifth MCSD meeting for review and adoption of a final set of relevant proposals. Conclusions referred to are attached as annex I section 1.
33. Meanwhile, one of the MCSD members, namely APNEK, provided the Secretariat with a series of comments related to this issue where were mainly highlighted the need for a cost/benefit analysis of proposed actions, the integration of the recommendations in the programme of work of MAP that would then ensure and report on the follow-up and evaluation of their implementation, as well as the need for a regular reporting mechanism by the Contracting Parties.
34. The MCSD members are expected to discuss the conclusions agreed upon by the Steering Committee and adopt a final set of relevant proposals. They might also advise the Secretariat on the best approach to follow related issues.

#### **IV. NEW SUBJECTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

35. Considering the progress made in activities of the eight thematic working groups and that on-going related activities are expected to be completed in 2001, it was necessary to initiate preparations for new subjects; in order to improve feasibility and implementation, lessons should be drawn from experiences in previous and actual MCSD activities.
36. By cross-checking MAP priority activities together with partners programmes for the Mediterranean, a dozen of themes were identified for the next three bienniums, until 2005, and were proposed for the Steering Committee's consideration. Moreover, to ensure satisfactory and realistic preparation with relevant technical and financial support, a series of criteria were identified for proper selection.
37. The matrix for themes' selection together with the criteria were reviewed by the Steering Committee that proposed to present the themes in 7 clusters and the selection criteria in 4 sub-groups related to importance of the theme, appraisal, feasibility and methodology, as shown in annex II.
38. The members of the Steering Committee agreed also on a series of conclusions to be submitted for MCSD members' consideration. Such conclusions are attached in annex I section 2.



39. However, it should be noted that, in principle, the MCSD will still have to complete the activities related to "Free-trade", "Industry" and "Urban" themes in the next biennium (2000-2001) together with the preparation of the "Strategic Review for the year 2000" in conformity with the MCSD terms of reference. Therefore, we should avoid overloading the MCSD programme and mainly Support Centres in relation to technical and financial support, unless partners could take a substantial responsibility for implementation. Otherwise, only some preliminary work could be planned for a couple of new themes in the next bienniums, giving more time for a better preparation.
40. The revised matrix was sent to all MCSD members together with a detailed questionnaire on the selection criteria. Collected information will then be analyzed and synthesized and results presented by the Secretariat at the MCSD meeting, if a reasonable number of questionnaires are filled in and sent back by mid-June 1999. A sample of this questionnaire is also attached in annex II.
41. The MCSD members are expected to review related conclusions from the Steering Committee and approve a list of new themes to be considered over the next three bienniums. They might also wish to plan related activities over this period and identify task managers, support centres, major outputs and financial support.

## **V. STRATEGIC REVIEW FOR THE YEAR 2000**

42. As agreed upon at the fourth MCSD meeting and in conformity with the Commission's terms of reference, it is proposed to "undertake a four-year strategic assessment and evaluation of the implementation by the Contracting Parties of Agenda MED 21 and decisions of the meetings of the Contracting Parties and of actions by the Contracting Parties relevant to sustainable development in the Mediterranean region and propose relevant recommendations thereon; the first strategic review should be undertaken for the year 2000 (with ministerial participation), with the objective of achieving an integrated overview of the implementation of Agenda MED 21, examining emerging policy issues and providing the necessary political impetus." (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 140/Inf.4 page 8, (g)).
43. To that end, the Secretariat, in consultation with some experts, has prepared draft terms of reference for undertaking this strategic review. Proposed terms of reference submitted for the fifth MCSD consideration are attached in annex IV.
44. Considering the dates of the next Contracting Parties meetings (October 1999 and 2001), it is proposed to undertake the first Strategic Review for the year 2001, with a draft to be presented and reviewed at the sixth MCSD meeting, foreseen for June/July 2000. This would leave some time for necessary fund harvesting.

As the Strategic Review concerns the Mediterranean region as a whole, it will not be limited to the activities of MAP and MCSD; it will also include a brief assessment of the activities of other regional partners and programmes such as Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, METAP, CEDARE, etc. in view of identifying complementarities, limiting duplication and promoting synergy. This review will also assess the activities at national and local levels, in order to identify the progress towards Sustainable Development together with the germs of change.
45. It is expected that this Strategic review, in addition to assessment and evaluation of progress of activities in the framework of Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean region, will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the Mediterranean system, notably of MAP, the gaps and constraints that affect its efficiency; it will also suggest a set of relevant recommendations and proposals for action for promoting, improving and strengthening:

- preparation of programmes of activities;
- implementation of related activities by concerned institutions (regional and national);
- implementation of recommendations and proposals for actions;
- synergy among regional and national partners;
- strategic actions towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean region.

46. The Strategic review would be undertaken by a task force under the coordination of the Secretariat and with the support of 3 to 5 MCSD members and 3 independent experts. Throughout the period of work (September 1999-April 2001), the task force would hold three technical meeting (launching, mid-term review/follow-up, finalization) and a regional workshop would be useful, even necessary, in early 2001. The budget for this Strategic review, including regional and national experts fees and costs of meetings, would amount for US \$ 150,000 to 200,000.
47. The MCSD members are requested to discuss proposed terms of reference for this Strategic review, advise the Secretariat on the best approach to be followed in relation with coordination, implementation and fund raising.

## **VI. COOPERATION AND FUND RAISING**

48. In conformity with its terms of reference, the MCSD has developed and strengthened its relations and cooperation with UNEP and other UN Agencies, in particular UN-CSD, through its Secretariat as well as several of its members.
49. In relation with the fourth MCSD request addressed to UNEP to encourage the exchange of information and direct cooperation between MCSD and other Secretariats as well as the UN-CSD, the twentieth Governing Council of UNEP has recognized the originality and importance of the MCSD and recommended the development of similar initiatives in other regions. During this important meeting, information on the MCSD was given and support to this experience and activities was requested by several representatives of the Mediterranean Countries and partners (Tunisia, Monaco, Turkey, Spain, European Commission, etc.)
50. Moreover, the MAP-MCSD Secretariat has participated, as member of UNEP's delegation, to the ad-hoc Intersessional Working Group of the UN-CSD with a presentation on Regional Seas and MCSD at a side event. The Secretariat has also participated to the Seventh UN-CSD session where the report of Antalya Workshop on "MCSD Tourism and Sustainable Development" was widely distributed, together with a presentation at a side event.
51. Regarding the proposed joint UN-CSD/MCSD meeting on national sustainable development strategies in the Mediterranean, it seems preferable to connect it to the preparation of the "Strategic review for the year 2000" by organizing such a meeting briefly after launching this review. It would be a good opportunity to collect useful information for the strategic review and provide the participants with methodological issues and results from success stories so as to promote and induce elaboration of national sustainable strategies at national and local levels.
52. Information on MCSD experience and activities were also disseminated at several Mediterranean and European meetings not only by the Secretariat but also by various MCSD members (country and EC representatives and other partners, EOAE, MIO-ECSDE, Ecomediterranea, APNEK, WWF, according to our information).

53. Concerning the thematic activities and related meetings, the task managers, the working groups and support centres have benefitted from various technical and financial supports, MAP limited budget being generally considered as seed money. However, there has not been a systematic strategy for fund raising enough in advance, and related activities were mainly undertaken with MAP limited budget. Such deficiency will be and is being, overcome as specific projects have been prepared and others will follow soon and be submitted to fund raising from partners (mainly the European Commission, by far the main supporting body) and countries (mainly regarding organization of meetings).

54. As a matter of fact, support for the following activities since the fourth MCSD meeting was provided mainly from :

- “Indicators”: MAP (BP/RAC-other indicators projects), France and Tunisia (national test).
- “Information”: MAP(MEDU), CREE and MIO-ECSDE (who devoted a lot of their time with limited financial support from MAP).
- “Free-Trade”: MAP (MEDU,BP/RAC and CP/RAC), Lebanon (national case study) France
- “Industry”: MAP (MEDPOL, CP/RAC), UNIDO-ICS, UNEP-DTIE.
- “Urban”: MAP (PAP/RAC, BP/RAC), MEDCITIES.

In broad terms and without including the cost of time spent for related activities by MAP staff and partners experts (from MCSD members and other regional partners), the annual average cost for a MCSD thematic activity is about US\$ 30,000-40,000 (obviously more availability of funds would certainly extend the work, get more in depth analysis and result in more realistic proposals); a group of experts would cost about US\$ 15,000, a meeting of the working group US\$ 20,000-30,000, a workshop extended to all MCSD members US\$ 50,000 and a MCSD meeting needs for US\$ 80,000 to 100,000. And the actual one, the fifth MCSD meeting, is fully covered by the City of Rome.

55. It is important to recall here that, as agreed upon in the first meeting of the MCSD, “the task managers would be responsible for obtaining the necessary additional human and financial resources and expertise for the activities of the thematic working groups”, obviously in cooperation with the Secretariat and concerned Support Centres.

56. In the short and medium term, a more systematic cooperation will be looked for and built up between MCSD and European Commission, UNEP concerned divisions and regional offices, UN-CSD, METAP, CEDARE as well as other institutions concerned with the new themes to be selected (FAO, UNDP/CAP 21, UNCCD, WHO, etc.)

57. Finally, considering MAP available limited budget and the increasing interesting and challenging MCSD related coordination duties, it would be very helpful if qualified junior persons could be seconded to the MCSD Secretariat for periods of 1 to 2 years, either directly from the countries or through a specific funding mechanism that would allow for 1 to 2 years appointment of junior qualified persons from third countries that cannot afford covering their expenses in seconding them. This would provide inspiration, boost and support to the Secretariat and MCSD activities as well as on-the-job training for concerned staff. This question of required additional support and secondments was considered by the last meeting of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (29-30 April 1999) where views were expressed but without coming up with a final proposal.

58. The MCSD members are expected to discuss issues related to cooperation and fund raising; they might wish to advise the Secretariat on the best way to strengthen cooperation and improve fund raising; they might also wish to request the task managers and other MCSD members and partners to look for and provide more support to MCSD activities.

## **SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS OF THE WORK OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.**

### **1. Method of work and follow-up of recommendations**

The Steering Committee praised the quality of the Commission's work. These achievements should be used as a basis for further progress, with the emphasis in future work being placed on the three following areas, without bringing the basic structure into question (working group, task managers):

- a) clearer identification and preparation of themes (approach based on participation, specific nature of the Mediterranean, added value, etc.);
  - b) improved planning of thematic activities by objectives;
  - c) implementation and follow-up of recommendations (execution, valorization, information/communication, financing).
- It shall be the duty of each working group to take due account of these three areas in carrying out their activities.
  - On implementation, it could give rise to strategic actions programmes (SAPs), with certain themes being particularly suited to this approach because of the importance of the issue they raise for the Mediterranean.
  - The Secretariat in conjunction with the task managers shall work to finalise recommendations to render them more operational before they are presented to the Contracting Parties.
  - More effective follow-up shall be achieved by using demonstration programmes, amongst others.
  - Greater visibility for the Commission and broader circulation of its results amongst all the actors involved are a crucial objective which means that the emphasis must be placed on using all available channels to circulate recommendations and information to all partners. The best possible use shall also be made of new communication technologies. In this context, the work and activities of the MCSD shall be presented on the MAP website, which should be made easily accessible via the UNEP site and vice versa, both sites being regularly updated.

### **II. New Themes and their Selection Criteria**

- The matrix presented by the Secretariat for selecting new themes needs to be rationalised to make it more operational:
  - a) by tightening up criteria (on notions of priority, squaring with regional/international programmes, and feasibility) and by defining them more clearly;

b) by regrouping themes, even if it entails clarifying their characteristics and sub-themes. The new themes put forward would then cover:

1. Local management and sustainable development (with the emphasis on the specific points of wetlands, islands, mountainous or desert regions);
  2. Sustainable management of natural marine resources (including fisheries);
  3. Energy and transport and sustainable development;
  4. Employment and training;
  5. Agriculture and the rural environment (including land use, erosion and desertification);
  6. Consumption patterns and waste management;
  7. Health and the environment.
- The Secretariat shall rework the matrix to take account of comments made by the meeting and shall send out the new version to all MCSD members for them to fill in as far as possible. A synthesis shall be presented to the forthcoming MCSD meeting so that the new themes may be selected.

### **III. Strategic Review for the year 2000**

- The strategic review foreseen by the Commission's terms of reference is crucially important in that it will provide the opportunity for drawing up an "inventory" of sustainable development in the Mediterranean, five years after the Contracting Parties adopted the Agenda MED 21 Programme.
- In the interests of clarity and objectivity, this assessment shall preferably be drawn up by a team of seven members made up of: three independent experts, three members of the Commission (one representing a State, one for the "NGO/socio-economic" actors, and one "local authority" representative), and a representative of the Coordinating Unit.
- The Secretariat shall prepare a specific remit for this review to be drawn up, for presentation to the forthcoming MCSD meeting.
- With an eye to this review, Tunisia reiterated its proposal to host the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MCSD in the year 2000, which will be the opportunity for a "MED 21+5" and should also involve a ministerial component. Funds will have to be mobilised for this event.

### **IV. Cooperation with the United Nations and national CSDs**

- The Secretariat shall draw up of list of all existing national CSDs or similar bodies; it shall then seek a mutual exchange of information and, if needs be, shall establish cooperation with them. The increasing number of activities (Agenda 21s) at both national and local level could act as an incentive for other countries or regions.

- A joint meeting co-financed by the MCSD and the UN/CSD on national sustainable development strategies shall be organised in late 1999 in a Mediterranean country.
- As far as cooperation with the UN/CSD is concerned, it shall be the responsibility of MCSD member countries taking part in CSD sessions, and particularly the Commission President, to make known the Commission's work and achievements, to underscore its exemplary nature, one of the objectives being in the long term to open the way for the MCSD's accreditation as an autonomous observer, to be requested by the President. An informal meeting of Mediterranean delegations on the sidelines of each session would usefully assist this "alliance" of riparian states.
- As well as a panel on the regional seas to be held during CSD 7, it is foreseen that a specific panel for the presentation of the MCSD shall be organised during CSD 8.
- Furthermore, it is foreseen that a major conference on sustainable development in the Mediterranean be organised, to which competent international agencies, universities and other interested parties shall be invited. This conference, to coincide with "Rio+10"(2002), would provide the opportunity to take stock of "MCSD+5".

#### **V. Intersession MCSD thematic activities**

- MCSD members should play a more dynamic and effective role in the working groups.
- The agenda of meetings, which is deemed to be very useful, should be completed and regularly updated in order to keep MCSD members informed, and encourage their participation. It would also be useful to indicate meetings which have already been organised, which would be of great interest to ongoing work.

#### **VI. Provisional agenda for the 5<sup>th</sup> MCSD.**

- In the interests of clarity, the "Rules of Procedure" should not be included as an agenda item. The "Remit for preparing the strategic assessment for the year 2000" should, however, be added.
- Concerning the organisation of work, drafting committees should be set up for all working groups rounding off their activities at the 5<sup>th</sup> MCSD, particularly for the "Tourism and sustainable development" and "Indicators of sustainable development" themes.
- With an eye to the financing of MCSD meetings, it is proposed that the host country should bear a substantial share of the costs, without ruling out external contributions.
- Finally, the NGOs should be encouraged to take part in the organisation of MCSD meetings, a role which the Secretariat will work to boost.

**Criteria for selection of new themes for MCSD programme of work  
over the next 2 or 3 bienniums (until 2005)**

**PROPOSED THEME:** .....

<b>CRITERIA AND RELATED QUESTIONS</b>	<b>BRIEF RESPONSES</b>
<b>IMPORTANCE</b> <i>Is the theme and/or its components considered as:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>MED 21/MAP Priority</u> : (to be done by the Secretariat but any input is welcome) <i>a priority in MED 21 and/or MAP?</i></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>MED 21/Partners Priority:</u> (to be done by the Secretariat but any input is welcome) <i>a priority in partners programmes (METAP, CEDARE, SMAP, NGO networks, etc.)</i></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>National / local Priority:</u> <i>a priority in your national/local, organisation strategies and action plans?</i></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>UN-CSD programme:</u> <i>a priority in UN-CSD programme of work (past, present, future)?</i></li> </ul>	
<b>APPRAISAL</b> <i>For this theme and/or its components, what is/are, in your opinion :</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Stakes and Risks:</u> <i>the major stakes and main short, medium and long term risks at local, national and Mediterranean levels.</i></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Added value by MCSD:</u> <i>the specific added value you would expect from the MCSD?</i></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sustainable Development Dimension:</u> <i>the sustainable development dimension(s) the MCSD should focus on? aspects of long term strategy, inter-relation and integration with other themes, etc.</i></li> </ul>	

CRITERIA AND RELATED QUESTIONS	BRIEF RESPONSES
<b>FEASIBILITY</b> For this theme and/or its components	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>MAP Capacity/Expertise:</u>                (to be done by the Secretariat but any input is welcome)  <i>Does MAP, through its Coordinating Unit and Regional Activity Centres and Programmes, has the capacity and expertise to work on this subject;</i> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Knowledge:</u>  <i>Do you think that the subject is rather extensively studied (not only within MAP) or intensive assessment preparatory work would be required?</i> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Co Partners:</u>  <i>Which partners (non-MCSD members) would you associate considering expertise, synergy, support and impact parameters?</i> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Funding Opportunities:</u>  <i>Identify some potential and accessible funding sources (local, national, euro-mediterranean, private, civil society, etc.) for related activities and meetings?</i> </li> </ul>	
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Working Group or Group of experts:</u>  <i>Do you think that this theme should be dealt with by a classical working group of some MCSD designated experts or by a small group of "independent" experts?</i> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Period of work:</u>  <i>Considering the already available knowledge on this subject and the expected added value, do you consider that this theme should be dealt with in one, two or four years period?</i> </li> </ul>	



**MCS D THEMATIC SELECTION MATRIX**

CRITERIA	Importance				Appraisal			Feasibility				Methodology			
	MED21/MAP priority	MED partners priority	National / local priority	UN-CSD programme	Stakes and risks	Added value by MCS D	SD dimension	M/AP capacity/expertise	Knowledge	Co-partners	Funding opportunities	Working Groups or Group of Experts	Period of work	M/AP support centre or partners co-support centre	
Themes to be considered by MCS D															
Local Management and Sustainable Development (Wetlands, islands, mountain and desert areas, etc.)															
Sustainable management of maritime natural resources (fishing, etc)															
Energy, transport and sustainable development															
Employment, training and environment															
Agriculture and rural environment (agricultural policies, land use, erosion, desertification, etc)															
Consumption patterns and waste management															
Health and environment															

N.B. Themes handled by the MCS D with adoption dates and recommendations :

-Sustainable management of Coastal Regions (completed in 1997)

-Sustainable development indicators (to be completed in 1999)

-Free trade and environment (to be completed in 2001)

-Management of Water Demand (completed in 1997)

-Tourism and Sustainable Development (to be completed in 1999)

-Industry and sustainable development (to be completed in 2001)

-Information, awareness and participation

-Management of urban development (to be completed in 2001)

<b>MCS D INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUPS</b>		
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Dates and venue</b>	<b>Responsible persons/bodies and support</b>
Group of Experts meeting MCS D Free Trade and Environment	3 February Geneva	Lebanon, BP/MEDU
Management of Urban Development	Experts meeting , 26-27 April 1999 Split	Egypt-Med Cities- Turkey- PAP-BP-ERS
Tourism and Sustainable Development,	Working Group, 6-7 May 1999, Split	Spain-EOAEN-Egypt- BP-PAP
Sustainable Development Indicators	Workshop, 10 -11May 1999, Sophia Antipolis	France-Tunisia-BP
Industry and Sustainable Development	Working Group 16-17 May 1999 Masa Carrara	Italy-Algeria-FID-MED POL-CP/RAC
Information, Awareness and Participation	Working Group, 24-25 May 1999, Athens	MIO-ECSDE - CREE - Med Unit
Free Trade and Environment	Working Group, 4-5 June 1999 Barcelona	Lebanon-BP-Med Unit-CP/RAC

<b>Agenda of Meetings in the MCSD framework or of interest for MAP and MCSD 1999</b>		
<b>Item and organisers</b>	<b>Dates and venue</b>	<b>Concerned persons/bodies</b>
Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Sustainable Cities. World Federation of United Cities and the Municipality of Seville.	21-23 January, Seville	MEDU/PAP/BP MCSD members
High level policy dialogue: "Trade Policy and Sustainability the Regional Approach". ICTSD	1-2 February, Geneva	MEDU/BP
20 <sup>th</sup> Session of UNEP Governing Council. UNEP	1-5 February, Nairobi	MAP/Contracting Parties
UN - CSD Ad-Hoc Intersessional Working Groups (22-27 February - Tourism and Consumption Patterns 1-5 March Oceans and SIDS) UN-CSD Secretariat	22 Febr. - 5 March, New York	MCSD members MAP/MED Unit
MCSD Steering Committee MAP- Med Unit/ MCSD Secretariat	8-9 March, Tunis	Committee members MAP/MED Unit
Environmental Civil Forum Integration of the Environment in the Euro-Med Process Heinrich Boll Foundation ,EC/DGI	13- 15 April, Stuttgart	BP/MED Unit/ NGOs
UN - CSD - 7 - 19-21/4 - Tourism 21-23/4 - High level Segment 26/4 - National presentations 27-30/4 - Drafting groups. UN-CSD Secretariat	19-30 April, New York	MCSD members MAP/MED Unit
Bureau of the Contracting Parties MAP-Med Unit	29-30 April, Athens	Bureau members MAP/MED Unit
5 th MCSD MAP-Med Unit/MCSD Secretariat	1-3 July, Rome	MCSD members MAP/Others
MAP National Focal Points MAP-Med Unit	6-9 September, Athens	Contracting Parties /MAP/Observers
11th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties MAP-Med Unit	27-30 October, Malta	Contracting Parties /MAP/Observers

## **“STRATEGIC REVIEW FOR THE YEAR 2000”** **Draft terms of reference**

### **A. Introduction and rationale**

According to the terms of reference of the MCSD, it is proposed to: “undertake a four-year strategic assessment and evaluation of the implementation by the Contracting Parties of Agenda MED 21 and decisions of the meetings of the Contracting Parties and of actions by the Contracting Parties relevant to sustainable development in the Mediterranean region and propose relevant recommendations thereon; the first strategic review should be undertaken for the year 2000 (with ministerial participation), with the objective of achieving an integrated overview of the implementation of Agenda MED 21, examining emerging policy issues and providing the necessary political impetus.” (UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 140/Inf.4 page 8, (g)).

Considering the dates of the next Contracting Parties meetings (October 1999 and 2001), it is proposed to undertake the first Strategic Review for the year 2001, with a draft to be presented and reviewed at the sixth MCSD meeting, foreseen for June/July 2000. This would leave some time for necessary fund harvesting.

As the Strategic review concerns the Mediterranean region as a whole, it will not be limited to the activities of MAP and MCSD; it will also include a brief assessment of the activities of other regional partners and programmes such as Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, METAP, CEDARE, etc. in view of identifying complementarities, limiting duplication and promoting synergy. This review will also assess the activities at national and local levels, in order to identify the progress towards Sustainable Development together with the germs of change.

It is expected that this Strategic review, in addition to assessment and evaluation of progress of activities in the framework of Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean region, will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the Mediterranean system, notably of MAP, the gaps and constraints that affect its efficiency; it will also suggest a set of relevant recommendations and proposals for action for promoting, improving and strengthening:

- preparation of programmes of activities;
- implementation of related activities by concerned institutions (regional and national);
- implementation of recommendations and proposals for actions;
- synergy among regional and national partners;
- strategic actions towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean region.

### **B. Background and objective**

Microcosm of the world, the Mediterranean is an eco-region that could be considered as an excellent regional case as bridge between global and national levels for sustainable development concerns. Aware of their specific context, bordering countries have decided to cooperate and join efforts in caring about their common future and tackling related issues at regional, national and local levels.

Following the Rio Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, the Mediterranean partners have decided to give more and better consideration to sustainable development by adapting Agenda 21 to the Mediterranean context. As a result, an Agenda 21 for the Mediterranean was prepared (Agenda MED 21), MAP programme was reviewed and updated, and Barcelona Convention was revised accordingly. It was also decided to establish a Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development to prepare and propose to the Contracting Parties and Mediterranean Partners strategic recommendations and proposals for action for a more coherent integration of environment and development, a better management of environmental resources and problems in conformity with sustainable development, a strengthening of regional cooperation and re-enforcement of intergovernmental decision making capacities. In order to get more realistic results, all concerned actors are involved in MCSD activities (government representatives, local authorities, private sectors and civil society/NGOs).

Various initiatives related to major economic, environmental and social issues and stakes have been taken since 1995 at local and national levels as well as regional and euro-mediterranean levels. It would be important to assess those initiatives (mainly concerning MAP, MED 21 and MCSD), their implementation process, related activities, outputs and impacts, five years after; then relevant recommendations and proposals for actions will be elaborated in relation with gaps, constraints and efficiency for a satisfactory management and integration of environment and development towards the building up of sustainable development in the Mediterranean region, as well as for MAP and MCSD strengthening and visibility.

This strategic assessment would encompass the review of relevant ministerial general policy issues and actions so as to address the decision making process and insufflate to MAP and MCSD the necessary and required political boost.

Finally, the objective of this Strategic review will be to assess the steps undertaken by the Mediterranean Community and relevant partners towards sustainable development, with reference to mainly the recommendations and decisions taken by the Contracting Parties and related activities. This strategic review concerns the assessment of implementation and effectiveness of recommendations and decisions. It will not provide, directly, a view of the state of the environment and development in the region. It concerns primarily the decision making process, capacity and governance.

### **C. Specific objectives and related activities**

#### Euro-Mediterranean Level

- brief assessment of euro-Mediterranean partnership, notably in MAP II and MCSD priority areas, including scope of projects funding by MEDA;

#### Regional Mediterranean Level/partners

- brief assessment of METAP programme, particularly in relation with capacity building;
- brief assessment of CEDARE programme, notably in relation with capacity building and information;

Regional Mediterranean Level/MAP

- assessment of MAP II actions, in particular the ones related to priority fields that take into account Agenda MED 21:
  - < integration of environment and development;
  - < integrated management of natural resources;
  - < integrated management of coastal zones;
  - < waste management;
  - < agriculture;
  - < industry and energy;
  - < transport;
  - < tourism;
  - < urban development and environment;
  - < information;
  - < marine pollution assessment and control;
  - < conservation of nature, landscapes and sites.

This review will mainly concern the activities undertaken by MAP components (RACs and Programmes) and their impact on the decision making process:

- assessment of the activity of MAP, Coordinating Unit, Programmes and RACs in the legal field regarding preparation, revision and follow-up of Barcelona Convention and protocols.
- assessment of MAP actions in relation with the implementation of recommendations as proposed for the regional level in Agenda MED 21.

Regional Mediterranean Level/MCSD:

- assessment of MCSD activities, in particular as related to selected eight priority themes:
  - < management of water demand;
  - < sustainable management of coastal regions;
  - < sustainable development indicators;
  - < tourism;
  - < information, awareness, environmental education and participation;
  - < free trade and environment;
  - < industry;
  - < urban development;

This review will mainly look for the capacity of MCSD to catalyse team work and to collect ad hoc financial means and expertise with MAP support centres, and propose to the Contracting Parties strategic practical recommendations and realistic and feasible proposals for action.

It could also review the method of work and follow-up of recommendations.

National Level:

- assessment of legal and regulatory institutional reforms and actions undertaken by the Governments in view of integrating environment and development, notably as related to :
  - < creation of institution (ministry, agency, department) and necessary structures in charge of environmental issues;
  - < National Commissions for sustainable development or similar catalysing /coordinating institutions;
  - < ratification of global and relevant Conventions;
  - < ratification of the Barcelona Convention and protocols;
  - < promulgation of legal documents for the protection of the environment.
  
- assessment of national actions towards sustainable development:
  - < preparation and adoption of a national strategy for sustainable development;
  - < preparation of national Agenda 21;
  - < preparation and implementation of National Environmental Action Plan;
  - < integration of environmental education in primary and general education programmes;
  - < elaboration of national programmes of action for the sustainable management of natural resources, desertification and pollution;
  - < incentive to and mobilisation of civil society for environment and sustainable development.
  
- assessment of Contracting Parties participation to Mediterranean programmes:
  - < institutional support to MAP II priority fields in national plans;
  - < consideration given to MCSD recommendations and proposals for action;
  - < implementation of Agenda MED 21 recommendations at national level;
  - < coordination between various regional programmes (MAP, SMAP, METAP, CEDARE, etc.).

Local Level:

- assessment of actions related to preparation and implementation of local Agenda 21 and practical activities towards sustainable development

Civil Society/NGOs:

- assessment of actions towards sustainable development.

#### **D. Methodology**

Referring to background documents (Convention, MAP II, MCSD, etc.) and their guiding principles, this strategic review would be undertaken by a task force under the coordination of the Secretariat and with the support of 3 to 5 MCSD members and 3 independent experts. Throughout the period of work (September 1999-April 2001), the task force would hold three technical meetings (launching, mid-term review/follow-up, finalization) and a regional workshop would be useful, even necessary, in early 2001. The budget for this Strategic review, including regional and national experts fees and costs of meetings, would amount for US \$ 150,000 to 200,000.

Using all relevant reports from MAP, UNCSD (national reports), local/national Agenda 21, action plans, partners (METAP, SMAP/Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, CEDARE, etc.), Civil Society and NGOs, the knowledge and analytical phase could be completed by a brief questionnaire addressed to government bodies and other partners. This complementary information, if it turns out to be necessary, could be collected and analyzed by national/local consultants.

The final output would consist of :

- a critical, exhaustive and retrospective assessment of actions mainly undertaken in the framework of MAP since 1995;
- a set of gaps and deficiencies detrimental to MAP efficiency;
- a set of relevant recommendations to overcome those deficiencies, improve efficiency and strengthen the strategic aspects of their implementation by MAP, the Contracting Parties and all concerned partners.



## THEMATIC WORKING GROUPS

Themes	Task managers	Members of the group	Support from MAP*
Short-term (over about a one-year period)			
- Sustainable management of coastal zones (completed)	Morocco and MEDCITIES	CREE, European Community, Greece, City of Rome, Spain, EcoMediterrania, Monaco, WWF, Italy, EOAEN, Cyprus, France, Tunisia, MIO-ECSDE, Egypt, Malta, Albania, Lebanon, Algeria, FIS	RAC/PAP, RAC/BP, RAC/ERS and RAC/SPA
- Management of water demand (completed)	Tunisia and Morocco	Libya, WWF, APNEK, European Community, Egypt, Italy, France, CEFIC, MIO-ECSDE, Malta, Spain, EcoMediterrania, CEDARE, Cyprus, Israel, Algeria, Turkey, Bosnia & Herzegovina	RAC/BP and RAC/PAP
Medium-term (until 1999 Contracting Parties meeting and beyond)			
- Sustainable development indicators (to be completed in 1999)	France and Tunisia	European Community, Morocco, EcoMediterranean, Greece, Israel, Spain, Slovenia, Turkey, Lebanon, Algeria, Municipality of Silifke	RAC/BP
- Tourism and Sustainable Development (to be completed in 1999)	Spain, EOAEN and Egypt	Malta, Monaco, Cyprus, Croatia, European Community, Greece, EcoMediterrania, WWF MIO-ECSDE, ASCAME, Slovenia, Libya, Turkey, Lebanon	RAC/BP and RAC/PAP
- Information, awareness and participation (to be completed in 1999)	MIO-ECSDE and CREE	European Community, WWF, France, APNEK, Croatia, Egypt, Morocco, MEDCITIES, EcoMediterrania, Albania, Algeria, Libya, Lebanon	MED Coordinating Unit
- Free trade and environment in the Euromediterranean context (strategic impact assessment) (to be completed in 2001)	Lebanon	Tunisia, France, European Community, APNEK, Morocco, MIO-ECSDE, Algeria, ASCAME, FIS, Bosnia & Herzegovina, WWF	RAC/ BP MED Coordinating Unit
- Industry and sustainable development (cultural, economic, technical and financial aspects of progressive elimination of land-based pollution) (to be completed in 2001)	Italy, Algeria, F.I.D	WWF, Israel, EOAEN, ASCAME, CEFIC, Spain, European Community, Turkey, Tunisia, RME MIO-ECSDE	MED POL, RAC/CP
- Management of urban development (to be completed in 2001)	Egypt, MEDCITIES, Turkey	FIS, MIO-ECSDE, Spain, Morocco, France, Malta, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Algeria, CEDARE, EC, Slovenia, Cyprus, RME	RAC/PAP and RAC/BP

\* The Coordinating Unit and the Regional Activity Centres will each provide the necessary support to the different working groups according to their respective expertise.



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



UNEP(OCA)/MED WG. 156/4  
10 June 1999

ENGLISH

---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

Fifth Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission  
on Sustainable Development (MCSD)  
Rome, 1-3 July 1999

**REPORT OF THE THEMATIC WORKING GROUPS BY TASK  
MANAGERS AND SUPPORT CENTRES**

# **REPORT OF THE THEMATIC WORKING GROUPS BY TASK MANAGERS AND SUPPORT CENTRES**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INDICATORS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN	1
TOURISM AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN	11
INFORMATION, AWARENESS, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	18
FREE TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT	27
INDUSTRY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	34
URBAN MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	39

## INDICATORS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

### Recommendations and proposals for action for review and adoption

#### I. CONTEXT AND PROGRESS:

Since the Rio Conference, in 1992, and in accordance with its agenda 21, it is expected that States and civil society will set up indicator systems for monitoring major changes (social, economic and environmental ones) and for assisting decision-making in sustainable development policies.

In this perspective, the Mediterranean region, as an “eco-region”, is about to take an initiative which will come within the Barcelona Convention, the Mediterranean Action Plan and Agenda MED 21 and which will consistently extend them. The activity “Indicators for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean” had been registered as a medium term activity during the first meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) at Rabat in December 1996. At the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the MCSD in May at Majorca, the task managers (Tunisia and France) presented a preliminary report [doc UNEP (OCA)/MED WG 124/inf 3], which set out the general context of the activity, its field and extend of application, and the working methods to be favoured.

Blue Plan organised a meeting in July 97 at Sophia-Antipolis which brought together the main institutions involved in developing indicators, including UN-CSD, the World Bank, UNDP, the OECD, the EEA, Eurostat, SCOPE and IFEN. During this meeting, the work carried out at international level under the aegis of the United Nations CSD was recalled and it was established that priority should be given to those indicators currently used by international organisations but also to those which specially denote the Mediterranean region and those which bring a long-term prospective dimension.

A 2<sup>nd</sup> report on progress with this activity was presented to the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development in October 97 in Sophia-Antipolis [doc UNEP (OCA) MED LOG 134/3]. This report put forward a structure for the working group report in addition to a thematic framework which suggested registering indicators accorded into six chapters.

Blue Plan then worked on a list of almost 250 indicators classed and indexed in accordance with the Pressure - State - Response framework in an attempt to assess (on the face of the matter) the relevance and the availability of data in Mediterranean countries. This work was presented during an initial workshop of experts, instituted by the working group, which was held in Tunis on the 9th and 10th of June 1998.

The 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MCSD, in Monaco in October 1998 adopted the principle of the workshop results (a first common core set of indicators and a first recommendations proposal) and asked for work to be deepened on several points.

Tests were carried out at regional and national levels, in Tunisia and Slovenia, so as to measure the feasibility of the initially selected indicators and some new indicators. A second workshop, organised in Sophia-Antipolis in May 1999 (with a large participation and substantial contribution from members of the group and RACs), allowed a new common set of 130 indicators to be drawn up, of which 55 indicators should be calculable in the short term and 75 indicators whose definition is still to be refined and whose availability must be checked. 40 indicators feature in the list of those selected by the United Nations. A revised formulation of proposals has been adopted and lastly it was decided to present the results of the first calculated indicators over a long period.

The report of this meeting will probably be available during the next MCSD in Rome.

## II. PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

### A Drawing up a System of Mediterranean Indicators

The Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention in addition to actors from civil society are invited to set up a Mediterranean system of indicators for sustainable development for use by:

- Mediterranean riparian States;
- Actors in multi-lateral co-operation in the region ;
- Actors from civil society (local authorities, companies, associations, ...).

1. **Adoption of a common set of indicators:** A first set of 130 basic indicators has been adopted by the Contracting Parties. This common core set takes into account the list adopted by the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, the special features of the Mediterranean basin, and the relevance and availability of data for an adequate number of countries.

The goal of continuity is vital, since what is required is the ability to measure over time the changes in each indicator and assist in assessing progress towards sustainable development. However, this list which includes 55 easily calculable indicators at this stage and other which are more difficult to measure may be changed in accordance with tests carried out in the countries, and in accordance with steering and requirements expressed by the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development.

2. **Complementary indicators:** The indicators selected in the common core set cannot alone make up an adequate framework for an in-depth examination of various subjects and for work on sustainable development policies on special fields or territories.

The Contracting Parties are therefore invited to complete to this list of basic indicators with specific indicators suited to various subjects and to various geographical contexts. States and local authorities will in particular develop indicators suited to their national context in addition to closer defined territories (provinces, metropolitan areas, rural areas, tourist destinations, industrial - port areas, natural areas, etc....).

In accordance with the results of various Mediterranean work and especially those initiated by the MCSD, MAP will busy itself with putting forward, testing and recording specific batteries of indicators, in addition to the common set.

3. **Data mobilisation:** Mediterranean States will undertake to put national environment and development observatories, or equivalent agencies, statistical bodies and other technical entities concerned with the collection and processing of data to work. These will be concerned, with assistance from MAP, with identifying and filling gaps in the data needed to calculate indicators.
4. **Indicators harmonisation and dissemination:** At regional level, the MAP Centres will take care of harmonising methods and the dissemination of results. In particular, MAP shall create a "glossary" which sets out definitions and the methods for drawing indicators up. MAP will also keep an up to date dossier illustrating all indicators selected, including a table of changes by country and at regional level from 1960 onwards, and their graphical illustration, in addition to comments on precautions, difficulties in collection and possible interpretations.
5. **Capacity Building:** The Contracting Parties will be concerned with promoting appropriate capacity building programmes at national and regional levels and mobilising funding sources in this direction.

Programmes and training aimed at drawing up and harmonising vital statistics will be set up in the countries, and especially for environmental (water, soils, waste, air, ...), and socio-cultural statistics, etc..

## **B Implementation of the Indicators System for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean**

The Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention are invited to widely use and enhance the Mediterranean system of indicators for sustainable development for analysis and assisting with decision making, especially in order to:

- Allow an improved assessment of the situation and the main trends for change in the Mediterranean region, in itself and in relation to the rest of the world;
- Assist Mediterranean States, local authorities, economic and association actors, to measure the results from efforts made, and to forecast, anticipate and prepare their decisions;
- To improve the steering of multilateral co-operation in the Mediterranean, and especially the future work of MCSD.

6. **Mediterranean report** : They are invited to contribute effectively to MAP's drawing up a report on sustainable development in the Mediterranean to be made public every 5 years. The first report shall be drawn up in the year 2002.

This report will be based on indicators for sustainable development and on regional and national analyses referring to Agenda MED 21 and PAM 2 orientation in addition to the work of the MCSD. It shall rely especially on the retrospective and prospective work by Blue Plan, other MAP Centres or other institutions.

This report will show the unity and diversity of situations in the region, current efforts towards sustainable development and difficulties encountered. It will set out a certain number of good practises in the use of indicators and in the implementation of sustainable development initiatives.

It will be presented by the MCSD to Contracting Parties who will ensure wide distribution on various media. For its part, MAP will publish the indicators on the Internet accompanied by the glossary.

7. **National reports**: States are invited to contribute actively to regional and national analyses by supplying MAP with national reports prepared for the United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development, and by facilitating comparative studies on Mediterranean stakes initiated by Blue Plan (series of Mediterranean Country Profiles).

These national summaries will indicate result-based goals, when available, in the medium and long term, which are clearly stated and adopted by States. These will present the sustainable development policies undertaken (prevention, response, and integration policies) and will identify a few examples of good practice in the use of indicators and the application of sustainable development initiatives.

8. **National Observatories function**: States are invited to instruct national environment and development observatories, or equivalent agencies, to monitor and to enhance indicators at national level and to make them into preferential links at Mediterranean level. The observatories will carry out co-ordination with all the institutions concerned, including national statistical bodies.

9. **Capacity building**: The Contracting Parties are invited to develop action programmes and especially training aimed at:

- Promoting the widest possible use of indicators for sustainable development and especially with planning and development actors;
- Carrying out retrospective and prospective studies and analyses;
- Strengthening institutional capabilities for the various actors undertaking sustainable development processes.

They will concern themselves with mobilising, in this direction, various funding sources.

### III. PROPOSED LIST OF INDICATORS

#### Summary of the indicators selection :

130 indicators including 40 issued from the UN-CSD list:

Availability = 4	55 indicators including 4 information sheets
Availability = 3	57 indicators including 3 information sheets
Availability = 2	18 indicators including 4 information sheets
<b>Total</b>	<b>130 indicators including 11 information sheets</b>

**Note:** Among the proposed numbered indicators, The 134 first are those issued from the UN-CSD list:

The (relevance, availability) values are shown after each indicator

#### **Relevance:**

- 1 = Not relevant
- 2 = Quite relevant
- 3 = Relevant
- 4 = Very relevant

#### **Availability:**

- 1 = Not (or never) available
- 2 = Available in short term (not already collected)
- 3 = Available in short term (collected)
- 4 = Available

**INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION**

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
<b>1 POPULATION AND SOCIETY</b>			
1.1 Demography and population	7. Population growth rate (4,4)		9. Total fertility rate (4,4)
1.2 Standard of life, employment, social inequities, poverty, unemployment		20. Women per hundred men in the labour force (4,4)	322. Employment rate (4,4)
		228. Social disparity index (4,3)	
1.3 Culture, education, training, awareness improvement	229. School enrolment ratio (net) (4,4)	19. Difference between male and female school enrolment ratios (4,4)	324. Share of private and public finance allocated to the professional training (4,3)
		323. Production of cultural goods (books, films, music records) (4,4)	325. Public expenditure on conservation and value enhancement of natural, cultural and historical assets (4,3)
1.4 Health, public health		24. Life expectancy at birth (4,4)	23. access to safe drinking water (4,3)
		26. Infant mortality rate (4,4)	
1.5 Consumption and production patterns	47. Annual energy consumption (4,4)	129. Main telephone lines per 100 inhabitants (4,4)	
	213. Number of passenger cars per 100 inhabitants (4,4)	326. Food consumption distribution per income decile (4,3)	
<b>2 LANDS AND AREAS</b>			
2.1 Habitat and urban systems	34. Urban population growth rate (4,4)	37. Urbanisation rate (4,4)	
	206. Loss of arable land due to the urbanisation (4,2)	39. Floor area per person (4,3)	
2.2 Rural and dry areas, mountains and hinterland	84. Population change in mountain areas (4,4)		208. Existence of program concerning the less favoured rural zones (4,4) (sheet)
2.3 Forests	94. Wood harvesting intensity (4,3)	95. Forest area change (4,4)	97. Protected forest area as a percent of total forest area (4,4)



	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
2.4 Littoral and "littoralisation"	137. Artificialized coast line / total coastline (4,3)	72. Population growth in coastal areas (4,4)	212. Protected coastal area (4,3)
	205. Number of tourists per km of coastline (4,4)	209. Population density on the littoral (4,4)	
	327. Number of berths in yachting harbours (4,3)	230. Coastline erosion (4,3) (sheet)	
2.5 Sea	346. Oil tanker traffic (4,4)	347. Global quality of coastal waters (4,2)	351. Protection of specific ecosystems (4,3)
		348. Density of the solid waste disposed in the sea (4,2)	352. Rate of monitoring (4,3)
		349. Coastal waters quality in some main "hot spots" (4,2)	353. Wastewater treatment rate before sea release for coastal agglomerations over 100 000 inhabitants (4,3)
		350. Bio-physical quality: phanerogam area / infra-coastal area (4,2)	354. Harbour equipment ratio in unballasting facilities(4,3)
<b>3 ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>			
3.1 Global economy	246. Distribution of GDP (Agriculture, Industry, Services) (4,4)	57. External debt / GDP (4,4)	
	328. Foreign Direct Investment (4,4)	231. Saving / investment (4,3)	
		329. Public deficit / GDP (4,4)	
		330. Current payments deficit / GDP (4,4)	
		331. Employment distribution (Agriculture, Industry, Services) (4,4)	
3.2 Agriculture	88. Use of fertilisers per hectare of arable land (4,3)	91. Arable land per capita (4,4)	275. Water use efficiency for irrigation (4,2)
	89. Share of irrigated arable land (4,4)	232. Rate of agricultural food dependence (4,3)	
	138. Agriculture water demand per irrigated area (4,3)	332. Annual average of wheat yield (4,4)	
3.3 Fisheries, aquaculture	333. Average value of catches (per broad species group) at constant prices (4,3)	217. Fishing production per broad species groups (4,4)	334. Expenditure on stock monitoring (4,3)
	368. Number and average power of fishing boats (4,4)	218. Production of aquaculture (4,4)	

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
3.4 Mines, industry	172. Industrial Releases into water (4,2)	52. Intensity of material use (4,3)	151. Share of industrial wastewater with treatment (4,2)
			233. Number of mines and quarries rehabilitated after working-out (4,2) (sheet)
3.5 Services and commerce		335. Turnover distribution of commerce according to the number of employees (4,3)	371. Existence of legislation on the hypermarket set-up restriction (4,4) (sheet)
		336. Share of merchant services to the enterprises (4,3)	
3.6 Energy	234. Energy intensity (4,4)		54. Share of consumption of renewable energy resources (4,3)
	235. Energy balance (4,4)		
3.7 Transports	223. Average annual distance covered per passenger car (4,4)	236. Structure of transport by mode (4,4)	224. Share of collective transport (4,4)
		237. Density of the road network (4,4)	
3.8 Tourism	337. Number of nights per inhabitant (total and during the peak period) (4,4)	341. Share of tourism receipts in the exportations (4,4)	343. Public expenditure on tourist site conservation and tourist diversification (4,2)
	338. Number of secondary homes over total number of dwellings (4,3)	342. Currency balance due to tourist activities (4,3)	
	339. Number of bed-places per accommodation mode and per inhabitant (4,4)		
	340. Public expenditures on tourism development (4,3)		
	370. Number of international tourists per inhabitant (4,4)		

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
<b>4 ENVIRONMENT</b>			
4.1 Freshwater et waste water	65. Annual withdrawals of renewable ground and surface water (exploitation index) (4,3)	149. Share of distributed water not conform to quality standards (4,2)	70. Wastewater treatment coverage: Share of collected and treated wastewater (4,3)
	344. Non-sustainable water production index: share of total water withdrawals produced from fossil aquifers and/or from overdraft (4,3)	282. Water global quality index (4,2)	345. share of Industrial wastewater treated (4,3)
			279. Drinking water use efficiency (4,3)
			154. Existence of economic tools to recover water costs in various sectors (4,3)
4.2 Soils, vegetation and desertification	242. Ratio of land exploitation (4,4)	77. Land use change (4,3)	
		186. Arable land losses in percentage of the total (4,3)	
4.3 Biological diversity, ecosystems	355. Wetland area (4,4)	98. Threatened species (4,3)	358. Total expenditure on protected areas management (4,3)
	356. Number of turtles caught per year (4,3)		
	357. Share of fishing fleet using barges (4,3)		
4.4 Solid, industrial and hazardous waste	108. Generation and municipal solid waste (4,3)	117. Area of land contaminated by hazardous wastes (4,2) (sheet)	245. Minimisation of waste production (4,3)
	115. Generation of hazardous wastes (according the definition of Basle Convention) (4,2) (sheet)	244.waste distribution (4,3)	281. Cost recovery rate (4,3)
	116. Imports and exports of hazardous wastes (according the definition of Basle Convention) (4,2) (sheet)		359. Destination of municipal solid wastes (recycling and reuse per type and share of municipal solid wates treated in sanitary landfills) (4,3)

4.4 Solid, industrial and hazardous waste (continuing)	247. Generation of industrial solid waste (4,3)		360. Collection rate of municipal solid wastes (in volume) (4,3)
4.5 Air quality	102. Emissions of greenhouse gasses (4,3)	268. Frequency of excess over air standard (ozone) (4,3)	107. Expenditures on air pollution abatement (international and national) (4,3) (sheet)
	103. Emissions of sulphur oxides (4,3)		270. Share of clean fuel consumption in total motor fuel consumption (4,4)
	104. Emissions of nitrogen oxides (4,3)		361. Share of agglomerations over 100 000 inhabitants equipped with a air pollution monitoring network (4,4)
	105. Consumption of ozone depleting substances (4,2)		
4.6 Natural and technological risks	362. Share of companies with high risk (highest category) (4,3)	363. Economic impact of natural disasters (4,3)	365. Existence of intervention plans (4,4) (sheet)
		364. Burnt area per year (4,4)	
<b>5 THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: ACTORS AND POLICIES</b>			
5.1 Actors of the sustainable development			221. Number of jobs connected with the environment (direct and indirect) (4,2)
			369. Number of associations involved in environment and/or sustainable development (4,3)
			372. Number of companies engaged in "quality" certification processes (4,3)
5.2 Policies and strategies of the sustainable development			59. Public expenditure on environmental fields as a percent of GDP (4,2)
			120. Existence of environment national plans and/or sustainable development strategies (published) (4,3) (sheet)
			366. Number of Agendas 21 adopted by local authorities (4,4)

	PRESSURE	STATE	RESPONSE
<b>6 EXCHANGES AND COOPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN</b>			
6.1 International trade, Free trade zone and environment	44. Sum of exports and imports as a percent of GDP (4,4)		
6.2 Others Mediterranean exchanges	8. Net migration rate (4,4)		
6.3 Mediterranean cooperation in the fields of environment and sustainable development			367. Financial transfers from abroad (Public Aid and private transfers) (4,3)

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

### **Recommendations and proposals for action for review and adoption**

#### **I. CONTEXT**

Tourism in the Mediterranean has primordial significance for its present and future effect on society, on the economy and on the environment in the region. The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) has made it one of its main themes, with the goal of preparing recommendations by inviting the various parties concerned to promote the ways and means to allow reconciling tourism and sustainable development in the Mediterranean in the best possible way. This is particularly the case for riparian countries and the European Commission, as Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention.

In this objective, the MCSD has set up a working group in order to examine in-depth the subject « Tourism and sustainable development in the Mediterranean », and to present proposals for actions or recommendations to the MCSD meeting in 1999. The working method was based on the drawing up questionnaires sent to riparian States, NGOs and tourism professionals, on cases studies identification (21 ones were proposed), and on the organisation of a 3-days workshop (Antalya, Turkey, 17-19 Sept. 1998) with about sixty participants. Throughout this activity a participatory approach was privileged. The substantial work and specific reports achieved for and by the previous Antalya workshop have been put together and are expected to be published soon in MAP Technical Reports Series. The workshop's results provided an assessment and a first draft of proposals. Then, a restricted meeting of experts (6-7 May 1999, Split, Croatia) was held in order to detail these proposals and to draw up the final version (see below). The report of this meeting will probably be available during the next MCSD in Rome.

As a result to the discussions related to questionnaires' feed back, the recommendations and proposals for action were structured in five clusters for which an operational method was identified in relation with timetable and executing centres/partners. These clusters concern:

- Strengthening political and institutional capacities
- Setting up networks
- Knowledge, information and awareness raising
- Specific tools
- Feasibility study for creating a Mediterranean body

#### **II. ASSESSMENT**

##### ***1. Tourism, an unavoidable sector of the economy in the Mediterranean***

The Mediterranean countries receive **30% of international tourism** (175 million tourists). The 135 million international and national tourists who visited only the coastal regions of the Mediterranean in 1990 could become 235 to 350 million by 2025 (Blue Plan scenarios). Through its economic and social weight, its contribution to the balance of trade, and its potential for development, tourism has become an unavoidable issue for most countries. **No riparian state can do without this sector.**

For certain less developed areas (island regions, hinterland), tourism would appear to be the only activity capable of counter-balancing the decline in traditional economies and stabilising the population, possibly even **reversing migratory trends**. Tourism also often provides the **opportunity to improve the infrastructure** to the benefit of the whole population.

The **detailed assessment of the impacts** of tourism on the environment, the economy and local society is **still far from adequate**. There could be a huge increase in the positive effects (using craft, agriculture, the natural and cultural heritage).

## ***2. Massive awakening to the impact of tourism on the environment***

Even if tourism often seems preferable to other more polluting industries, the case studies also show that tourism is seen as an **important source of negative effects on the environment** and for society.

The major difficulties relate to the **deterioration of coastal landscapes and natural areas** as a result of tourist urbanisation, the problems of **water** and **waste**, direct or indirect (illegal trade) damage to protected fauna and flora and the fact that areas are evolving towards vulnerable **economic monoactivity**, the highly seasonal nature of which causes social problems. These difficulties are even more acute because of **the speed at which changes** can take place. The case of the Balearic Islands is an example of that phenomenon.

## ***3. International tourists are increasingly demanding environmental quality***

Environmental awareness amongst tourists is growing with time and experience. **Tourism professionals** are striving to adapt to these changes. This is particularly true of the tour operators in Northern European countries who are introducing assessment scales for the environmental quality of their destinations and installations. The **market forces** can therefore **act as a powerful vector for evolution** towards tourism taking more in account sustainable development. At the moment, however, there is no concertation and interplay between the professional actors and their public counterparts at Mediterranean level.

## ***4. The highly diverse tourist situations in the Mediterranean***

First and foremost there is **regional disparity** between the coast and the hinterland and between the countries on the north-western rim (Spain, France, Italy : 80% of international tourist flows and revenue in the Mediterranean) and the other Mediterranean countries.

**Tourism, however, could develop very quickly in the countries or regions in the south and east which have long coastlines** and are of easy access. The number of tourists in Turkey rose from 1.5 million in the 80s to 9.6 million in 1997. In regions such as Antalya, Djerba, Cyprus, Malta, Rhodes or the Balearic Islands, and in island regions and southern and eastern countries more generally where access is usually by plane, tour operators hold quite some sway. **Other coastal regions** (e.g. Albania, Algeria, Libya, some of Morocco's Mediterranean coasts) could see development on the same scale in the future.

The Mediterranean also has many less easily accessible areas or with a lesser potential (islands, hinterland) where tourism could play a major role in economic revival, alongside other activities. If the development of tourism could be better channelled towards these regions, and Mediterranean tourist products diversified by making better use of the natural and cultural heritage, this would aid sustainable development throughout the entire region. In Morocco, for example, tourism is now recognised as a development alternative in the rural areas and forests (pilot activities running in the High Atlas and being introduced in the Rif).

### **5. Economic pressure is such that examples of successful channelling are few and far between**

The various case studies show how **difficult it is to channel change and to stick to the pre-established objectives** for quantitative and qualitative development.

In Turkey the Antalya-South project aimed at a 25,000 bed capacity. The original plan had to be modified and increased to 65,000 beds under the pressure of investors and speculators. The same situation exists in all destinations where there is strong pressure. In Albania where tourism is still on the drawing board, foreign investors have got building permits for structures which do not respect the «strategy of tourist development». In Djerba (Tunisia), local populations are asking for the tourist zone to be extended beyond the limit judged suitable and established by the government.

Examples of successful channelling are few and far between and tend to concern those destinations where tourist pressure has remained within reason and where the local population has got organised (Luberon Natural Park in France and the Cres Losing Archipelago in Croatia) or destinations which have benefited from strong planning activity.

In older destinations, awareness of the need to regain control of development has greatly increased and has made it possible for some difficult decisions to be taken (legislation in the Balearic Islands particularly after 1998 and rehabilitation of destination ; introduction of a local Agenda 21 in Calvià ;...).

### **6. To integrate tourism with sustainable development presupposes means adapted to the various situations.**

There are many of conventions, framework agreements, procedures and protocols involving national or regional authorities for tourism and the environment (Greece, Spain, France, Malta, Slovenia, Croatia, Turkey, Libya, Morocco). However, **little information is provided as to the results** and effectiveness of these measures. They are showing the need to define strategies and methods for integrating tourism with sustainable development. In Cyprus, a group of public and professional actors has been entrusted with developing a «vision of tourism» and a «code of environmental behaviour in tourism». In Tunisia, studies on the impact of tourist activity require the approval of the Ministry of the Environment.

**Financial mechanisms** aiming at better integrating tourism with sustainable development exist or are under study: taxes for the environment (tax on 1% of tourist turnover in Tunisia, tax on access to Port-Cros in France, project being studied in the Balearic Islands); requirement to reinvest profit in regions with tourist installations (e.g. the casinos in Slovenia); subsidies for the environmental upgrading of facilities (Cyprus, Spain...); etc. However, the feeling is that the means do not match up to the needs.

**Technical assistance** for public, professional and local actors appears to be a determining factor in the successful integration of tourism with sustainable development and the involvement of the population concerned (e.g. Parc du Luberon). Such means of assistance still tend to be inadequate.

Controlling the development of tourism and retaining the desired balance between development and protection demands **strong means of land use action**. Protective laws, planning directives and town planning rules are unavoidable instruments. Only very determined action has made it possible to spur the necessary development whilst at the same time avoiding uncontrolled tourist urbanisation (Djerba, Antalya, Languedoc...).

Instruments for **real estate control**, be it the provision of land for investors (e.g. Belek, Antalya...) or the protection of coastal sites against speculation are also very important although still too few in number (France: Coastal Conservatory since 1975; Tunisia: Agency for the Protection and Planning of the Coast (APAL) and Tourist Real Estate Agency; Algeria: planning to set up a Coastal



Conservatory).

**7. Integration of Mediterranean tourism with sustainable development demands major efforts on training, awareness raising and exchange of experience.**

The Mediterranean is still not very organised to exchange its experiences, act effectively to better raise the awareness of everyone concerned (tourists, public and professional actors, local populations) and promote the right approach to sustainable development.

NGOs are working on this type of thing. The tourist professionals and States are also striving to increase information to tourists on environmental and heritage matters. During the last years, many seminars and conferences provided charters, declarations, guidelines and codes of conduct such as Calvià Declaration (April 1997), Berlin Declaration (March 1997), Mediterranean Tourism Charter (Casablanca, Sept. 1995), Euro-Mediterranean Tourism Declaration (Hyères-Les-Palmiers, Sept. 1993). These efforts are not enough and are done on a piecemeal basis, not allowing enough scope, if any at all, for the exchange of experience, the value of which was shown by the Antalya Workshop.

**8. Integration of the island regions in the sustainable development by tourism**

Tourism and islands make a pair which it is difficult to break up. It is essential to introduce new methods. If tourism does not diversify and continues to be the only source of income for island economies, it could well implode, carrying with it the economic development which it has caused, or making shakier the island economies, characterised as they often are by monoactivity based on tourism. Tourism policies should be drawn up for diversification (cultural tourism, green tourism, archaeological tourism, youth tourism, sports tourism, educational tourism, fishing tourism, etc.) and for spreading tourist visits over the year.

Endogenous development is fundamentally important to check emigration, particularly amongst young people. To develop local small and medium sized enterprises, to facilitate their access to capital markets, to provide them on the spot computer and management support, would help to get things going again.

**III. OBJECTIVES**

**Tourism must become one of, if not the, major vector for sustainable development in the Mediterranean.**

Better and more than many other sectors it can in fact contribute to:

- the economic wealth of local populations and social and cultural development;
- the protection, safeguarding and correct exploitation of the natural and cultural heritage,

to the benefit of the greatest possible number of Mediterranean areas, be they mainland (coastal or hinterland) or island.

To achieve this, its development must be guided by a planned approach which is integrated with other economic and social sectors, respecting the environment and cultures. But the aims of action differ according to the situation type:

- In the **older destinations**, the main aim must be **to restore the quality of the area** and to revamp and diversify what is already available.
- In **destinations in the full swing of development**, people must be taught to anticipate in order to avoid the economic or environmental crises which the older destinations have faced. This means **really managing supply in both quantitative and qualitative terms and respecting**

**pre-established objectives drawn up on the basis of carrying capacity.**

- In the **less developed destinations** (some island regions, hinterland, coasts which have still not been built up) the main aim must be **to think up, give life to and channel those forms of tourist development which will make these areas successful examples of sustainable development**:
  - by offering the local populations concerned the possibility of staying or coming back to the country thanks to a rewarding economic activity for other sectors of activity as well;
  - by making the natural and cultural heritage and exchange between visitors and hosts a central element in the destination and by thus contributing in the long term to guaranteeing the preservation of Mediterranean identities and showing them to their best advantage.

#### **IV. PROPOSALS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention deem that the improved integration of tourism with sustainable development is a major stake to be met for the future in the Mediterranean. This stake requires wilful policies that are more affirmative at overall Mediterranean, national, regional and local levels.

##### **1. Strengthening Political and Institutional Capacities**

Riparian countries along the Mediterranean are invited to continually **strengthen**, at national and at local level, **land planning policies and institutional, legislative, technical and financial tools** and public participation which will allow a better harmonisation of tourism and sustainable development. These tools especially cover the following areas:

Prospective and strategies, planning for and the management of integrating tourism into sustainable development,

The protection of natural environment, the coastline and the cultural heritage from the negative effects of tourism;

Assessing the impact of tourist projects and programs;

Combating pollution and the waste of natural resources by tourism, promoting renewable energies and clean technologies;

Rehabilitating mature destinations; limiting the supply to defined accommodation capacity; encouraging diversification (cultural tourism, agri-tourism, etc.); assisting local actors, especially in inland areas and less developed islands, so that they can become tourist entrepreneurs as an adjunct to other economic activity.

Mediterranean States should pay closer attention to:

Setting-up **observatories for the impact of tourism** on the economy, on society, on the environment and on the cultural heritage at overall Mediterranean, national, regional, and local levels.

Promoting internationally recognised **quality initiatives**: local Agenda 21s in tourist destinations, EMAS, ISO 14000 ... for facilities. Consideration should be given to any set-up for awarding local Mediterranean Eco-labels, which is to be undertaken in the context of proposal 2.2 below.

Developing all the resources that can contribute to **extending the tourist season over the year**.

Setting-up **in-depth confrontation/negotiation methods** between tourist authorities, environment authorities and the actors concerned so as to specify and manage the policies for integrating tourism into sustainable development.

Developing **technical assistance capacities** to be made available to public, professional

and local actors.

**Involving the actors concerned**, and especially the local population, in **setting the goals for tourist development** at destinations.

## **2. Setting Up Networks**

The Contracting Parties have agreed on the usefulness of developing networked initiatives at regional level, which could exert powerful leverage towards an improved integration of tourism into sustainable development.

Riparian States especially deem that the Mediterranean, which has the benefit of both a lengthy tourist past and of structured co-operation in the fields of the environment and of sustainable development, should take an active part in international initiatives in this field. It should also be recognised as an example for regional co-operation on the relationship between tourism / sustainable development and should put in practise a regional program of experience sharing between local destinations.

They have given MAP a mandate to carry out the following three priority initiatives in the short term:

### *2.1 Mediterranean Tourist Professionals Network.*

The set-up of a network involving the main Mediterranean tourist professionals in order to stimulate a strong initiative for reflection and awareness raising at the level of the entire Mediterranean basin, is desirable.

Initially, MAP shall contact UNEP-IE (Industry-Environment) which started the "Tour Operators Initiative" the principles of which were decided by the United Nations Sustainable Development Commission. The goal is to make the Mediterranean a priority region for the application of this agreement.

### *2.2 Setting Up a Pilot Tourist Destinations Network: Applying a Regional Experience-Sharing Programme.*

Setting up a regional programme for the sharing of experience amongst tourist destinations in the Mediterranean is deemed to be a priority initiative in order to accelerate and publicise the adjustment of sustainable tourist development tools. This programme may cover certain case studies presented at Antalya or other destinations put forward by States. It shall take special care of setting-up observatories for tourism impacts, for identifying and promoting quality initiatives, and involving the actors concerned in order to set the goals for tourist development.

MAP shall draw up a project in the context of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (SMAP) and shall be based, for the project assembly, on special bodies like AFIT (France) for example.

### *2.3 Integrating the Islands within existing programs and the Pilot Tourist Destinations Network to be set-up.*

MAP shall contact UNEP-IE and WTO in order to make the Mediterranean into a priority application area for the Lanzarote Conference monitoring programme (Sustainable Tourism in Small Islands, Developing States and Other Islands, Oct. 1998). This may be done possibly by associating specialist bodies such as for example the network of Island Chambers of Commerce in the European Union. In addition, MAP shall take care to ensure that islands are largely represented in the regional experience-sharing programme (Euro-Mediterranean project referred to under 2.2 above).

## **3. Knowledge, Information and Awareness Raising**

Integrating tourism into sustainable development largely depends from an increased awareness of

the size of the stakes in question, the errors to be avoided and the measures to be applied. This requires continued efforts for knowledge, for information and awareness raising, bearing in mind the results of the MCSDD "Information, Awareness-Raising and Participation" working group. In the first stage, MAP has been given a mandate to carry out in the medium terms the following two information and awareness raising initiatives, which have been deemed to have priority.

### *3.1 "White Paper" on Tourism and Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean.*

This "White Paper" has the goal of establishing an improved knowledge of the situation, the problems faced and the measures to be taken regarding Mediterranean tourism in relation to sustainable development.

This reference document shall be drawn up under the aegis of MAP, with the participation of all Mediterranean States and the main parties concerned. A regional workshop shall be held in 2001 to present the document.

### *3.2 Guidelines for Good Environmental Practise in the Tourist Sector*

Map has been asked to list the existing examples of same in the Mediterranean and outside the Mediterranean, to identify any adaptations required, any gaps to be filled and any bridging to be done. It shall contact UNEP-IE to carry out this initiative.

## **4. Specific tools**

The improved integration of tourism into sustainable development requires the application of various specific tools (prospective studies, determining accommodation capacities, impact studies, local steering systems, etc.).

Amongst these instruments, the set-up of **financial mechanisms** which allow the effective contribution from the tourist sector to the protection and management of Mediterranean sites and to study initiatives and events which might enlighten decision taking in this field, is a priority matter for consideration.

Initially MAP, taking advantage of the experience of such bodies as AFIT (France) and the WWF, shall list existing examples in the World and shall commence considerations on the development options to be put forward for the Mediterranean.

## **5. Feasibility Study for Creating a Mediterranean Body**

Setting up a regional technical body to organise, over time, the observation, the sharing of experience and information and assistance in favour of improved integration of tourism into sustainable development could turn out to be useful and facilitate the long term running of all the initiatives put forward above.

A precise assessment of what its assignments, resources for intervention and its make-up would be useful, bearing in mind other existing bodies or institutions.

The Contracting Parties have agreed on the usefulness that such a body could have and have given a mandate to MAP to carry out a feasibility study over the medium term.

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

### **Recommendations and proposals for action for review and adoption**

#### **I. PROGRESS REPORT**

Since the 4th MCSD Meeting in October 1998, the Task Managers and the Working Group carried out the following activities:

- MIO-ECSDE published with the support of UNEP/MAP a bilingual (English and French) publication entitled “**Public Participation: Guidelines for the Organisation of Round Table Discussions**”. The aim of the publication is to promote dialogue between Mediterranean environmental NGOs and all other relevant partners in order to strengthen the public participation procedures on environmental issues in the Mediterranean region.
- On the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> of December 1998, a Mediterranean Workshop on the *Promotion of Education and Public Awareness for Environment and Sustainability in the Mediterranean* was organised, in Athens, and attended by approximately 75 persons from 18 Mediterranean countries. The workshop was the Mediterranean follow-up of the UNESCO Thessaloniki Conference, held one year before. The most conclusive outcome of the meeting was the need for the development of a network of educators in the Mediterranean with nuclei of educators in each country. The participants proposed that the coordinating role of such a network could be undertaken by MIO-ECSDE.
- KEPEMEP-CREE prepared a questionnaire on « Information, Awareness and Participation of the Public on Environmental Issues”, divided in three parts and proceeded to send it to numerous recipients in nineteen Mediterranean countries. A different questionnaire was constructed for each country according to the country's administrative organisation and administrative territorial division. The administrative organisation and administrative territorial division of each country were chosen after consultation with the responsible National Ministry of each country and the embassies, as well as national bibliography and the official government Web sites of each country.

All legal authorities representing all levels of administration of each country were addressed by the questionnaire. It was sent to all levels of administration, non-governmental environmental organisations and citizens' forums in all the Mediterranean Countries. It was also sent to international organisations such as: the European Commission, OCDE, Ramsar, etc.

- The progress of the activities of this group was presented at several international meetings.
- The Consultation Meeting of the MCSD Thematic Group on Information, Public Awareness, Environmental Education and Participation was organised by MIO-ECSDE and CREE with the support of UNEP/MAP, in Athens on 24 and 25 May 1999.

The thematic group considered the background document prepared by MIO-ECSDE as a valuable input not only for the work of the Group and the MCSD, but also as a reference for the overall work on related issues in the Mediterranean and elsewhere and asked the authors to refine and supplement it and seek its publication and wide distribution.

They also encouraged CREE to complete its report based on a reasonably large base of data from national, regional and local authorities (inputs – replies to the questionnaire sent out). The report will allow a more clear assessment of the existing legal and practical provisions for participatory procedures in the various Mediterranean Countries and will help in the formulation of more specific information and participation strategies.

The thematic group has proposed the creation of a network of focal points on information nominated within the administration of each Mediterranean country, actually also proposed by the Bureau of the Contracting Parties in the framework of a MAP Information Strategy.

The report of the meeting will probably be available during next the MCSD in Rome.

## II. PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. Preamble, General Positions

While the Thematic Group considers **that it has completed its task as per its main objective**, which was to identify and elaborate on the frameworks and appropriate actions and means to promote environmental information, public awareness, environmental education and involvement of the public in order to facilitate the process toward sustainability, it was considered as **crucial to propose the continuation of the work of the Thematic Group** for two (2) years, because its theme is recognised as an important component of all other Thematic Groups with which the present group has already interacted, but not to the extent and depth necessary.

If it is decided that the Thematic Group continues its work, its working programme will include, *inter alia*:

1. to revisit its recommendations in view of the results of the other Thematic Groups, since its task is horizontally related to all other MCSD Thematic Group,
2. to provide a forum for exchange of experiences on methodologies and programmes related to its task,
3. to focus and supervise work on the development and experimental (pilot) application of indicators on information, awareness, sensitization, environmental education and participation,
4. to focus and/or supervise work on the economic cost/benefits related to participatory procedures,
5. to spread the message of the "win-win" approach based on clear and concrete cases,
6. to continue to follow and integrate in its work new developments (e.g. in environmental education methodologies),

The Thematic Group wishes to underline that the formation, very existence and work of MCSD, is considered as one of the few and most promising examples of participatory procedures in place. The TG expresses the wish of its members to see the role and work of the MCSD upgraded toward more essential and substantial recommendations.

The Thematic Group also considers as positive development the establishment and functioning of National Commissions of Sustainable Development and wishes to strongly encourage all Mediterranean countries to establish and, where existing, to strengthening the National Commissions of Sustainable Development. In some countries existing bodies functioning in a comparable fashion can be reformulated accordingly to serve this purpose.

The Thematic Group applauds the efforts made by the national, regional and local authorities of Spain in the trend of investing up to 0.7% of their budgets, following the UN (Agenda 21) recommendations for the support of NGO projects and programmes, and strongly encourage all Mediterranean countries to follow this example (see also table: Overall Recommendations, number 4).

### 2. List of recommendations:

The recommendations proposed by the Thematic Group are listed in the following tables; it is important to note that, thanks to CREE network, various territorial (regional and local) administrations are being indirectly associated to this activity, the NGO system being already associated through MIO-ECSDE in this group. If necessary cooperation with those territorial authorities can be strengthened through CREE, with its related experience and technical expertise.

Similarly, as key actors they will be involved in the implementation of proposed recommendations.

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROPOSED ACTIVITIES OF THE MCSD THEMATIC GROUP ON INFORMATION, AWARENESS, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION</b>			
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Actors</b>		
	<b>Short term</b>	<b>Medium term</b>	<b>Long term</b>
<p><b>OVERALL:</b></p> <p>1. Signing and ratification <b>of the Aarhus Convention</b> (1998) by those Mediterranean countries, including non-European ones, which have not done so to date, in parallel with related awareness campaigns in the various countries about its content and opportunities provided for the civil society.</p> <p>2. Review, amendment and revision of national regional and local frameworks, to allow for better informing the public, increasing public awareness on environmental issues, strengthening environmental education and participatory processes. When action 1 is adopted this follows automatically.</p> <p>3. Identification, collection, documentation and dissemination, through publications, audio-visual means and internet, of information about success stories, good practices, positive experiences concerning information, awareness, environmental education and participation, by various actors and networks.</p> <p>4. Follow the example of Spain in investing <b>0.7 of the GNP</b> for the support of NGO projects to implement Agenda 21, MED Agenda 21, Local Agendas 21.</p>	Governments (signature)  for the campaigns: Governments and other partners	Governments (ratification)  for the campaigns: Governments and other partners	Full application and enhancement
	Governments and local authorities in consultation with civil societies	Governments and local authorities in consultation with civil societies	Governments and local authorities in consultation with civil societies
	All involved	All involved	All involved
	Governments and other partners	Governments and other partners	Governments and other partners



INFORMATION	Actors		
	Short term	Medium term	Long term
1. Improve the diversification of information sources, assure quality and expand coverage of coordinated and comparable information on the State of the Environment in the Mediterranean provided by various actors.	Governments, local authorities and civil society	Governments, local authorities and civil society	Governments, local authorities and civil society
2. For the implementation of 1, reliable cost assessment of needed investment, infrastructure, etc. for the achievement of comparable situations throughout the Mediterranean. This recommendation might be at least partly fulfilled by the MEDSTAT project of Blue Plan whereas the EEA should also be advised.	Governments MEDSTAT, EEA	Governments MEDSTAT, EEA	
3. Improve the flow of useful and timely information on the opportunities and programmes, which could promote sustainable development.	Governments, local authorities, civil society and media		
4. Development of efficient means of communication of information through:			
a. specific publications, CDs and other audio-visual means on the State of the Environment and also on other related issues such as on information, participation practices and techniques, success stories, consensus-building techniques, presentation of problems-solutions by sector, etc.	Governments, EU, UNEP/MAP, EEA, regional and local authorities, NGOs, media	Governments, EU, UNEP/MAP, EEA, regional and local authorities, NGOs, media	
b. a 2-year state-of-the-art exhibition, held in each Mediterranean country in the national language which will remain in the country. The information will be provided in the most part by UNEP/MAP and EEA and will focus on the state of the Mediterranean environment as well as about the means and mechanisms that are either in place or are needed for its improvement and for the promotion of a truly sustainable development. Part of each exhibition will be dedicated to the respective country in which it is taking place. The exhibitions will be handled by partnership between Governments and NGOs.			
c. the internet, with specific sites and links to other related sites.			

<p>5. Identification, development and application of procedures, techniques, methods, etc. (e.g. eco-labelling, the media) particularly suitable for informing the public on sustainable development options.</p>	<p>Governments, local authorities, civil society, media</p>	<p>Governments, local authorities, civil society, media</p>	
<p>6. Nomination of focal points in each administration to become contact points on information of a Mediterranean network open to all actors of the civil society. Support of the network for its operation.</p>	<p>Governments, local authorities and civil society</p>	<p>Governments, local authorities and civil society</p>	<p>Governments, local authorities and civil society</p>

<b>AWARENESS</b>	<b>Actors</b>		
	<b>Short term</b>	<b>Medium term</b>	<b>Long term</b>
1. Encouragement of establishment and support of the role of regional/local authorities as well as regional and national NGOs, as applicable.	Civil society, regional and national intergovernmental organisations and Governments		
2. Develop opinion polls and statistically sound assessments and monitoring of views, perceptions, behaviors and aspirations of the public in the areas of the environment and sustainable development (in a mode compatible with the one employed by Eurobarometer in Europe).	Media, NGOs, local authorities (possibly in cooperation with Eurobarometer)		
3. Development and implementation of National Strategies for Information and Awareness, e.g. National Awareness Action Plans (NAAPs) as integral components of national, regional and local Sustainability Plans.	Governments in consultation with other actors	Governments in consultation with other actors	Governments in consultation with other actors
4. Develop a manual on how to organise, at local level, successful campaigns on environmental issues based on tested experiences.	NGOs	NGOs	

EDUCATION	Actors		
	Short term	Medium term	Long term
1. Strengthening of a network of environmental educators with nuclei within each country for the enhancement of links between educators, administrating educators and NGOs, exchange of pedagogical experiences, etc.	MIO-ECSDE, other NGOs and relevant authorities	MIO-ECSDE, other NGOs and relevant authorities	
2. Promotion of Education and Public Awareness for Environment and Sustainability in the Mediterranean and in particular: a. introduction of relative issues and provision of time into the school curricula; b. training of educators; c. organisation of seminars; d. production and dissemination of suitable pedagogical material; e. assessment of the products and results;	Governments and all other actors	Governments and all other actors	Governments and all other actors
3. Strengthening of education through the media and internet by establishing sites on EE with links to other sites.	Government in consultation with civil society	Government in consultation with civil society	

<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>Actors</b>		
	<b>Short term</b>	<b>Medium Term</b>	<b>Long Term</b>
1. Promotion of "dialogue fora" particularly at regional and local levels.	Governments in consultation with local authorities and civil society	Governments in consultation with local authorities and civil society	
2. Dissemination of information on existing participation tools, procedures, methodologies and techniques for information, organisation of related regional training seminars and production of a manual on "good participation practices".	All		
3. Development and implementation of programmes of public participation (at Mediterranean, national, inter-regional, etc. levels) on policy formulation, EIAs, monitoring of internationally supported environmental and sustainable development projects, funding tools, etc., as is the case, already, in some Mediterranean countries.	Various administrative levels	Various administrative levels	Various administrative levels
4. Identification and/or development of a number of pilot participatory projects by the various countries. These projects will be followed, studied and monitored based on the developed indicators in order to strengthen relative strategies.	Governments in consultation with local authorities and civil society	Governments in consultation with local authorities and civil society	
5. Establishment and/or strengthening and support to Local Agendas 21 and to the participatory processes therein.	Governments in cooperation with all relevant actors	Governments in cooperation with all relevant actors	
6. Introduction and/or enhancement of participatory schemes and processes and active involvement of NGOs in specific projects such as biotopes management, training schemes, monitoring, etc.	All	All	

## **FREE TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN PROCESS**

### **Progress report and programme of work**

**(original French)**

The very great complexity of the relationship between free trade and the environment has been stressed during the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) (Monaco, 20<sup>th</sup> - 22<sup>nd</sup> Oct. 1998). This meeting requested that the group in charge of the subject prepare a schedule of activities to allow a better identification of the nature:

- of possible impacts (positive or negative) of free trade on the environment in the Mediterranean;
- of policies to be applied so that the Euro-Mediterranean area may, in this field, be put together in the best possible conditions.

### **A. INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE AND SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES**

In accordance with expectations expressed by the MCSD in Monaco, the schedule of activities decided by the work group includes 2 stages and several sections which are complementary to each other.

It aims especially, in stage 1 (June 1999-June 2000), to draw on the practical lessons of certain regional and national experiences and to analyse in depth a few key sectors for the Mediterranean in the context of the interaction between trade and the environment. This programme, presented below, has been decided on by the group given charge of the topic during the Barcelona meeting (4<sup>th</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> June 1999), based on work carried out over the last few months by the Ministry for the Environment in Lebanon and by Blue Plan, the topic support centre.

Stage 2 (July 2000-June 2001) will mainly be concerned with an examination of institutional aspects and the drafting of a range of proposals.

#### ***1. Taking the environment into account along with the trade-environment relationship in the partnership agreements between the European Union and the Eastern and Southern Mediterranean countries.***

The Euro-Mediterranean partnership, from which one of the major effects expected is the creation of an area of joint prosperity, is the main foreseeable structural process in the relationship between free trade and the environment for most of the riparian countries along the Mediterranean.

At present it concerns the European Union and 12 Eastern and Southern Mediterranean countries. Partnership agreements have already been signed between the Union and 5 non-member Mediterranean countries. These agreements, which parallel the MEDA national and regional programs, lead to the gradual set-up of a Euro-Mediterranean free trade zone (target date: 2010), but may also include several other measures, including environmental conservation.

What is the present level at which environmental stakes have been taken into account in these agreements and what are the expected effects of these agreements on the trade - environment relationship? An assessment of the agreements already made, using environmental performance indicators, from this viewpoint, will allow an initial analysis to be drawn up and pathways towards proposals to be prepared. The goal targeted is an improved integration of the environmental dimension into future agreements or on

revising current agreements. This aspect has been selected for stage 1 of the activity schedule.

## **2. *Lessons from Other Regional Experiences***

- Participation in the Geneva "Dialogue"

Several group members had taken part in the Dialogue on "Free Trade and Sustainability: Regional Experience" which was organised in early February 1999 in Geneva. The select meeting of experts which followed was devoted to drawing the first practical lessons for the Mediterranean and to defining the main lines for the group's activity schedule.

The case of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which came into force on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1994 awakened a special interest with the Mediterranean people present. In fact, it concerned countries with unequal development levels (Mexico, the United States and Canada) and was the subject of an official assessment report on environmental impact. This report, drawn up by the Environmental Co-operation Commission (ECC) for NAFTA, focused on three areas of activity (including maize and electricity). It has just been made public.

The experience presented during the Dialogue and the NAFTA impact assessments have shown in particular that:

- Optimistic forecasts made by studies prior to signing agreements can be largely contradicted by actual developments,
  - The territorial, economic, social and environmental impacts on setting-up a free trade area amongst countries with unequal levels of development can be significant,
  - The environmental dimension is still taken into account very rarely. When this happens, it is not integrated with economic and commercial strategies, which are the main subjects of the agreement, but it is juxtaposed as a side-issue,
  - The juxtaposition of commercial and environmental arrangements seems to turn out to be of little relevance from an environmental point of view,
  - The range of fields covered by the free trade agreement, the speed of transition, the nature and size of accompanying policies are major points both in terms of their effects in sustainable development terms and for the environment.
- Cautionary Note
- This observation, corroborated by the opinion of several experts, has led the group to issue a cautionary note:
- The set-up of a free-trade zone between countries with unequal development levels can lead, if it is too widespread, too sudden or badly supported, to unforeseeable effects which can severely impact environment, trade balance and society (risk of increasing poverty). It is therefore necessary, especially in the light of other regional experience, to carefully assess the various possible effects and to identify the conditions for progress towards positive changes.

- The need for a systemic approach towards Sustainable Development

The issue of the relationship between trade and the environment cannot therefore be reduced to that of studying the impact of environmental standards on trade or the desirable levels for such standards.

A systemic approach to sustainable development seems unavoidable to assist decision-makers to seek out the conditions for a positive synergy between international trade, economic development and environmental conservation. This type of approach is, by definition, much more complex since it involves an analysis of the dynamics of local systems of production and consumption in the relation to foreign trade, and necessarily, the issue of production and distribution resources and processes, with that of the direct and indirect impact on the environment, from changes brought about by opening up trade. It also includes social considerations such as employment or the impact on territories and must concern itself with the issue of the environmental capabilities in Mediterranean riparian countries to face up to possible effects.

This approach, which meets the MCSD's general mandate, is important in the Mediterranean because of the high pressure already brought to bear by economic activity on limited and at risk resources, natural environment, and areas.

- The schedule of activities on regional experiences

The schedule of activities selected by the group at Barcelona, on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> June 1999, proposes a deeper study of lessons to be drawn for the Mediterranean from NAFTA and European Union experiences.

For NAFTA, it is appropriate to draw the main lessons from the changes observed, to understand by an "ex-post" approach on the basis of some significant sectors, the reasons for the errors in forecast assessments made beforehand and to assess the repercussions of environmental and social decisions supporting the free trade agreement.

The lessons from integrating certain countries into the European Union can also be of great interest to other Mediterranean countries, bearing in mind the situation in those countries prior to integration and changes observed since then. A retrospective approach on Spain, Greece and Portugal will allow to detect conditions for a positive progression of the relationship between free-trade opening - development - environment. The case of Poland, a candidate for membership is also deemed to be interesting for the Mediterranean, bearing in mind the situation in this country and especially the nature of its farming (the weight of peasant-farming), changes observed as a result of current opening-up, measures to accompany the transition and considerations arising from this example.

### ***3. Sectoral analyses at Mediterranean regional level***

Following prior meetings of experts, the group decided to focus on 3 key sectors in the free trade- environment relationship in the Mediterranean. These are agriculture, industry and consumption patterns.

Agriculture is currently outside the Euro-Mediterranean free trade zone project, but product by product measures are included in the agreements and the issue of any extension of free trade to this sector has been the subject of discussions. At world level, the next multi-lateral negotiations which will take place in November 1999 in Seattle (the "millennium round") will focus especially on the agriculture domain. Now, as the NAFTA example or that of Poland show, this issue is a key issue on the relationship between free trade, the environment and sustainable development.



A sudden and full application in the Mediterranean could in particular condemn entire agriculture sectors in southern and eastern countries (SEMCs) to disappear, especially grain-agriculture and herding, with major territorial, environmental and social impact.

For these various reasons, Mediterranean States must have a better understanding of the stakes and prepare for the next round of regional and multilateral talks by integrating social, environmental and food safety criteria.

Industry is another key sector, which will have to be “upgraded” following the dismantling of tariff barriers in countries to the South and East. In the context of overall upgrading, environmental upgrading runs the risk of being felt as an extra restriction. But environmental excellence is also an advantage and a factor in export competitiveness. What then should supporting mechanisms be in order to avoid an “environmental impasse” and to promote a “win-win” scenario? National case studies carried out with environmental evaluation patterns allow these problems to be illustrated but also a more general regional analysis appears to be required.

In the field of consumption patterns, and their corollary, product distribution, free trade can lead to major environmental disturbance, sometimes irreversible, which negatively impacts local space and resources. It is the urban environment especially which is at risk from the possible effects of liberalising trade in goods and services, especially in certain sectors (motor transport, changes to packaging and product distribution systems). This point is worth careful assessment with the goal of identifying those measures to be promoted to be able to face any possible harmful effects.

#### **4. Case Study for Lebanon and National Sectoral Studies, and the issue of environmental standards**

##### a) Case study for Lebanon

The Ministry for the Environment in Lebanon, the group task manager, has taken direct part in the group activity by financing and carrying out, with the assistance of the UNDP Capacity 21 programme, a national case study on two industrial export sectors: the production of phosphate fertilisers and agro food industry (jam-making industry). These two sectors have an export potential. Current impact on the environment, and changes arising from free-trade have been assessed with the companies in question. The study has also allowed observing the lack of information within companies (ignorance in particular of free-trade agreements signed or being negotiated and their possible effects), the lack of synergy between the administrations in charge of the environment and of economic development and the inadequacy of relevant environmental strategies at government and company levels to make a success of the link between free trade and the environment and development.

Lastly, it allowed recommendations to be made to strengthen this governance.

##### b) Set-up of Other Studies

Other studies of the same type shall be set up in the framework of the group activity schedule (phase 1). A methodology taking account of the Lebanese experience, which is most useful, shall be defined to this end. However, the budget collected will not allow all the studies wished for by the group to be carried out (textiles in Egypt, Tunisia and Turkey, fruit and vegetables in Morocco and Syria, energy in Algeria, an industrial sector to be defined in

Bosnia Herzegovina, consumption patterns in Morocco, ...). The group therefore appeals to the countries concerned to contribute, if need be.

c) The issue of environmental standards

Within the various international institutions (ICRP, WHO, etc..) health care and environmental standards are drawn up. Their interaction with trade are then discussed at the WTO "Trade-Environment" Committee. Stage 1 of the proposed programme will assess the process content and the role played by the Mediterranean countries.

These practical approaches have the advantage of mobilising both administrations and industry. Past experience of the integration of Spain, Portugal and Greece, shows the major role which can be and should be played by Chambers of Commerce and Industry in these transitional periods: an information, advisory and training role, but also a "bridging" role between the administration and industry. Their effects in time can be very significant for the environment. The latter, which was often initially thought of as a "restriction" vector, can later be perceived as a major source of "competitiveness". The group therefore wishes to see the powerful involvement of ASCAME and its partners.

### ***5. Stage 2 in the Schedule of Activity***

Work in stage 2 will be defined according to the results in stage 1.

The goal sought for is arriving at recommendation proposals which are up to the level of the stakes revealed.

As of now, one can already consider that stage 2 should, whilst completing the analyses from stage 1 if required, mainly focus on institutional aspects at national and Euro-Mediterranean regional levels.

## **B. TIMETABLE AND SYNERGY WITH OTHER STUDY PROGRAMMES**

### ***1. Synergy with Other Study Programmes***

The European Commission considers starting a study programme in addition to the MCSD one. Group discussions in Barcelona allowed several subjects to be identified which deserved further study, especially: knowledge of the environmental policies in the 12 third-party Mediterranean countries (TMCs) (especially concerning free trade), investment on the environment, the possible impact of various current and future European protocols, directives and standards, the production sectors likely to be most affected by free trade when the agreement come in force, changes in environmental directives in TMCs arising from the set-up of the free trade area, data categories available and desirable, consultation mechanisms between companies and the administration and the capacity for environmental governance on these issues in each country.

The group stressed the need for synergy between the MCSD schedule of activities, that of the European Commission and that of METAP. A meeting at the end of stage 1 (around February 2000) to report the initial results of the European Commission study and the work by the MCSD, would be especially useful.

### ***2. Timetable***

- Preparatory Stage: 1998 - June 1999: initial data collection, identifying the major stakes, an initial examination of regional experience, seeking of additional financing, carrying out a case study in the Lebanon and defining a methodology, and setting out

the activity programme for the group.

- Stage 1: June 1999 - June 2000 :
  - carrying out regional and sectoral analyses, national studies and examining partnership agreements, initial summary (June 1999-February 2000),
  - meeting of experts to examine the result of various work and to prepare stage 2 (February 2000),
  - presenting initial results and proposal guidelines to the MCSD (June 2000).
- Stage 2 : June 2000 - June 2001 :
  - additional topical analyses, institutional analyses, considering possible proposals (June 2000-February 2001),
  - organising a Mediterranean workshop on free trade, the environment and sustainable development, drafting a summary and proposal guidelines (March 2001),
  - approving observations, goals and proposals to be put to the Contract Parties from the 7<sup>th</sup> MCSD (June 2001).

## INDUSTRY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

### Proposed Programme of Work

#### I. CONTEXT

1. Since the fourth Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development, held in Monaco last October, the Thematic Group, under the coordination of Algeria, Fédération des Industries Diverses (FID) Morocco and Italy, and with a significant support of the MEDPOL Program and CP/RAC, has focused its work on the preparation of a work plan in accordance with the specific initiatives of the Group itself and the suggestions of the experts.

The overall objective was to analyse the implications of the entering into force of the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities and of its Strategic Action Program within the framework of a sustainable development. On this purpose, special attention was reserved to the identification on the one hand of the practicable actions for reducing pollutant loads and, on the other hand, of the means to stimulate the Governments and local Authorities for launching policies which would encourage domestic private enterprises and economy-wide competitiveness.

The Group was aware that this could be achieved by improving infrastructure and educational, financial and legal institutions, by facilitating exports and liberalisation of markets, and by stimulating partnership, but also by establishing environmental management system, by eliminating barriers to technology and knowledge transfer.

A second aim, but not less important, was to identify credible motivations for small and medium enterprises to invest in changing and re-organizing their production management, to face-out the polluting inputs into the Mediterranean Sea, without undermining productivity and employment.

The Group also agreed on the necessity to analyse the status and the related trend of the industrial sector in the different countries in terms of evolution, trade, employment, compliance and enforcement, but also of implementation of voluntary initiatives.

For accomplishing these goals, the Group has used the expertise of MED POL, RAC/CP, UNEP/P&C, and UNIDO/ICS in order to ensure more substantive contents to the entire activity.

The Group pointed out the following points as very important:

a). Industry outreach by:

- developing a two-way dialogue with key industrial associations in countries
- preparing a regional assessment which summarizes the existing knowledge of industrial pollution

b). Exchange of information by:

- a regional internet information system of key contacts and information sources regarding industrial pollution prevention, eco-efficiency and energy saving.
- collating national case studies of cleaner production and good environmental management in order to share experiences at the regional level.

c). Capacity-building for “actors for improvement” through:

- training workshop for organizations that manage large industrial zones

- seminar for engineering faculties in key universities
- seminars and workshops to train trainers
- round-tables.

The above issues had been presented at the last MCSD Meeting. The Group also considered that:

- the work of the Thematic Group should be planned in a long term perspective and proposals and recommendations should be prepared in time for the 12<sup>o</sup> Contracting Parties meeting of the year 2001
- the following aspects should be better explored:
  - multinational strategies
  - modernization processes of enterprises
  - financing of capacity building
  - authorization systems

The report of the meeting held in Masa Carrara (16-17 May 1999) will probably be available during the next MCSD in Rome.

## II. WORK PLAN

2. The above mentioned issues, pointed out at the 4<sup>o</sup> MCSD Meeting, are herebelow analysed with the aim of establishing who can implement them and of checking their feasibility in the short- and medium term.

### 2.1. Exchange of information

2.1.1 Establishment of a regional assessment concerning the status and trend of the industrial sector in the different countries in terms of typology and importance of environment impact, evolution, modernization, trade, employment, etc. The assessment will be prepared on the basis of an agreed questionnaire

Project Manager: *CP/RAC*

Project Partners: *Task Managers, Country designated experts*

Expected output: *finalization of the questionnaire under the advice of some experts cooperating with CP/RAC, elaboration of the collected data*

Timetable: *finalization of the questionnaire: July 1999, launching of the questionnaire: September 1999, data retrieval: December 1999*

2.1.2 Development of a regional internet information system of key contacts and information sources regarding industrial pollution prevention, eco-efficiency and energy saving, sustainable development indicators, but also some specific issues on existing opportunities in training, incentives, financial support and access to available technologies. A collation of national case studies of cleaner production and good environmental management should be also included. The information system should be easily connected with other international systems, e.g. UNEP, UNIDO and EU., in order to create a network that regional experts and stakeholders to ease the search of information.

Project Manager: *UNIDO/ICS*

Project Partners: *Task Managers, UNEP/P&C, CP/RAC, CP National Focal Points, MIO-ECSDE.*

Expected output: *regional internet information system connected with other international systems*

Timetable: *draft information system project: September 1999, data input: September 2000.*

## 2.2. Industry outreach

2.2.1 Development of a two-way dialogue with key industrial associations belonging to different countries with the aim to discuss their role in encouraging industries to adopt prevention and eco-efficiency approaches, and to diffuse environmental information to members in a view of the implementation of LBS Protocol and SAP. This dialogue should initially be developed by making use of existing meetings and forums, and then be further expanded country by country and at the regional level according to the needs, and it should include the promotion of the precautionary approach and voluntary initiatives, including EMS.

Project Manager: *MEDPOL*

Project Partners: *Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Dodecanese, National Institutions and Organizations*

Expected output: *1) inventory of the existing work, 2) lay down a plan for the new work in particular by identifying the relevant associations to involve.*

Timetable: *October 1999*

2.2.2 On the basis of SAP, preparation of a document on regional assessment by summarizing existing knowledge of industrial pollution related to the importance of land-based sources versus direct pollution

Project Manager: *MEDPOL*

Expected output: *regional assessment classified per category of activities*

Timetable: *December 1999*

- Qualitative and quantitative inventory of TPBs substances which have the most negative impact on the Mediterranean marine environment

Project Manager: *MEDPOL*

Expected output: *regional assessment*

Timetable: *December 1999.*

- Strategies for remediation of polluted industrial zone and guidelines for recovering the left off industrial zones

Project Manager: *CP/RAC*

Project Partners: *UNEP/C&P, CEFIC/EUROCLOR*

Expected output: *production of guidelines, collation of relevant national case studies*

Timetable: *December 1999.*

- Importance of SMEs vis-a-vis large companies

Project Manager: *MEDPOL*

Project Partners: *UNIDO/ICS*

Expected output: *Review of the existing interconnections between SMEs and large companies on the production taking into account the economic, social, environmental aspects*

Timetable: *December 1999.*

2.2.3 Promotion of the **International Declaration on Cleaner Production** (Annex 5) by regional and national organizations, including sponsoring signing ceremonies, and following the implementation by the major signatories.

Project Manager: *MEDPOL, UNEP/P&C*

Project Partners: *CP/RAC, CEFIC/EUROCLOR, CP National Focal Points*

Expected output: *special session at the 5° MCSD Meeting and/or at the 12° Contracting Parties Meeting*

Timetable: *July 1999, and October 1999*

### 2.3. Capacity-building for “actors for improvement”

2.3.1 Training workshop for organizations/associations managing large industrial zones to focus on their role in promoting the application of environmental management and decision support systems at their local level.

Project Manager: *UNIDO/ICS*

Project Partners: *UNEP/P&C, CP/RAC, CEFIC/EUROCLOR*

Expected output: *project included in the UNIDO/ICS activities*

Timetable: *September 1999*

2.3.2 Seminar for engineering faculties in key universities to encourage them to integrate sustainable development, eco-efficiency and cleaner production into the training of their graduates.

Project Manager: *UNIDO/ICS*

Project Partners: *UNEP/P&C, MIO/ECSDE.*

Expected output: *draft project included in the UNIDO/ICS activities*

Timetable: *September 1999*

2.3.3 Initiating through local partners, at national level, seminars and workshops to train trainers on:

- eco-efficiency and environmental management systems  
Project Manager: *UNIDO/ICS*  
Project Partners: *Task Managers*  
Expected output: *draft guidelines*  
Timetable: *September 1999*
- decision support systems for industrial sustainable development in relation to the establishment and management of large industrial areas;  
Project Manager: *UNIDO/ICS*  
Project Partners: *UNEP/P&C*  
Expected output: *project included in the UNIDO/ICS activities*  
Timetable: *September 1999*
- how to develop a mix of regulatory and voluntary initiatives concerning industry;  
Project Manager: *Italy (Task Manager)*  
Project Partners: *FID, UNEP/P&C, CEFIC/EUROCLOR*  
Expected output: *guidelines*  
Timetable: *September 1999*
- sustainable consumption concept and approach.  
Project Manager: *MEDPOL*  
Project Partners: *UNEP/P&C*  
Expected output: *guidelines*  
Timetable: *September 1999*

All the above mentioned documents and projects concerning the specific issues will be presented, at the proposed date, by the Project Managers to the Task Managers and sent to the members of the Thematic Group for the final approval. The majority of the above projects will be inserted in the consultation system through access to web pages, already described at point 2.1.2 of the Work Plan.

## **URBAN MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

### **Proposed programme of work:**

#### **1 Introduction**

The Working Group on Sustainable Development and Urban Management was, within its present mandate, established at the Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development in Monaco (20-22 October 1998). The task managers of the Group are Egypt, MEDCITIES and Turkey, while the members of the Group are FEI, MIO-ECSDE, Spain, Morocco, France, Malta, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Algeria, CEDARE, European Union, Slovenia, Cyprus and RME. The Group is supported by the Priority Actions Programme and the Blue Plan Regional Activity Centres of MAP. The meeting also decided that the Group will concentrate its work on the issues of urban development and sustainable management and leave the issues of rural development (as it has been decided at an earlier meeting) for later considerations.

#### **2 Context**

Growth of urban settlements and the accompanying urbanisation rate in the Mediterranean region in last four decades far surpasses the population growth rate. As a consequence, there is a relatively large number of big urban agglomerations spreading around the region (in 1995, more than 30% of the total population lived in cities above 1 million inhabitants). That indicator doesn't have to be negative enough if we wouldn't be faced with the situation that majority of these cities are located in less developed parts of the region, and where economic growth could not effectively sustain so fast and expansive urban growth. As a consequence, there is a rapid deterioration of urban, as well as periurban and rural natural resource systems, an unsustainable consumption of space for the urban expansion, and a non-adequate provision of urban environmental services, all of that resulting in a low quality of life of the urban population.

Coupled with the above, we often witness the situation that cities have not established effective institutional arrangements for urban management, that consensual and collaborative planning systems are not being introduced, that all major stakeholders important for an effective urban planning and management are not always involved, and that there is not adequate financial provisions for the implementation of the urban management tasks.

On the other hand, in the region there is a number of examples of good urban management practices. These experiences could be exchanged and utilised for the betterment of the less fortunate urban agglomerations in the Mediterranean. What is missing is an effective forum and mechanism to facilitate this exchange of experiences, as well as to promote and catalyse direct interventions in the most endangered areas.

#### **3 Progress**

In the period since the Monaco meeting, the Group has had a number of activities which were mainly concentrated on the identification of the subjects it will deal with, and on the definition of its tasks and method of work. In this regard a number of expert meetings have been organised:

- A meeting of experts on the occasion of the Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Sustainable Cities in Sevilla (22 January 1999);
- A meeting of experts in Split (26-27 April 1999); and



- A meeting of BP, PAP and MEDCITIES in Sophia Antipolis (4 June 1999).

### 3.1. Initial experts' meeting in Sevilla

The meeting was attended by MEDU, PAP, BP, and MEDCITIES. The participants indicated major themes to be tackled by the Group and agreed that although it will have to deal with some priority issues of the urban management and sustainable development, but that it would not lose sight of the global aspects of the urban sustainable development. In this respect the participants concluded that the priority axes of the Group's work would be:

- Control of the urban development, particularly in the fast growing cities, which will take into consideration the policies of territorial development;
- Consideration of the problems of sustainable urban development (housing, water, waste, transport) including the evaluation of the existing situation (effects on the environment and health), evaluation of the costs and raising of the adequate resources (cost of services, taxes, ecotaxing, etc.), and proposals for the appropriate institutional arrangements (agglomerations, groups of communities, etc.); and
- Establishment of the intra-Mediterranean and Euro-Mediterranean co-operation and development of tools to facilitate it (training, good practices, indicators, exchange of urban technologies, etc.).

The participants also proposed that an extended expert meeting be held in Split in April 1999. The meeting would be attended by members of the MCSD, if possible, some mayors of the Mediterranean cities, as well as by some relevant NGOs and other institutions and some reputed experts in the field of urban management and development.

### 3.2. The first expert meeting in Split

The objective of the meeting was to define several major working themes which could be proposed to the MCSD for an "in-depth" analysis and for which precise proposals for action will be made. The agenda of the meeting consisted of the following items:

- Initial roundtable discussion to identify main urban management issues in the region (experiences of other MCSD working groups, general urban development trends in the Mediterranean, Habitat II summary);
- Elaboration on the issues of the sustainable urban management (urban audits, experiences of the cities present at the meeting, country experiences);
- Inter-Mediterranean and Euro-Mediterranean co-operation (Medcities);
- Urban indicators (Blue Plan indicators' activity, remote sensing, Respect);
- Preparation of the draft workplan and timetable; and
- Conclusions and recommendations.

For the meeting a number of documents have been prepared in advance, namely:

- Sustainable Development of the Cities in the Mediterranean-Habitat II;
- Cost Recovery, Public/Private Partnership and Financing of Municipal Actions;
- Analysis of Ten MEDCITIES' Towns Environment Audits and Strategies;
- Urban Development and Sustainable Management for the Mediterranean Towns (Turkey);
- Urban Development and Sustainable Management for the Mediterranean Towns (Greece);
- Support to Management of Urban Development in the Mediterranean-Note by ERS/RAC; and
- Management of Urban Development-City of Dubrovnik.

After a specific analysis of urban environmental audits in the Mediterranean cities (undertaken by MEDCITIES) the participants concluded that the significant issues to be analysed and resolved for the sustainable urban development are: rapid urban growth, and non-adequate economic and institutional development. They have also identified constraints for effective urban sustainability in the region, which could be summarised under a following headings: demographic, socio-economic, environmental, housing, planning, and institutional. They have also proposed that a network of the Mediterranean local actors for sustainable urban development could be established, and which could perform the following tasks: establish an action fund for the Mediterranean, develop a training programme for the sustainable urban development, organise an urban observation system, identify and promote the exchange of good practices in urban management, provide help in obtaining financial resources for urban management, and facilitate the exchange of information. All the above ideas and proposals will be taken in consideration in the future work of the Group. The participants were also presented the experiences, issues and problems of the cities of Sarajevo, Rome, Marakech and Dubrovnik.

The participants discussed the feasibility of future actions to be proposed to the MCSD for approval. They have specifically concluded the following:

- That the discussion has identified the major issues in sustainable management and urban development which could be prioritised and proposed to be dealt with by the Group in the period 2000-01;
  - That a questionnaire be prepared to be sent to national and local urban administrations;
  - That a selection of cities to which the questionnaires will be sent be prepared on the basis of the criteria such as size, level of environmental problems, rate of economic growth, level of sustainability, state of institutional systems, development and natural risks confronted, etc.;
  - That the method of work will follow those implemented in the previous tasks of the working groups, i.e. that a number of expert meetings and regional workshops will precede the final formulation of proposals to be recommended to the MCSD for validation and to Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention for adoption; and
  - That a small meeting be organised in the near future to outline a detailed proposal to the MCSD.

The report of this meeting will probably be available during the next MCSD in Rome.

### 3.3. The consolidation meeting in Sophia Antipolis

The BP, PAP and MEDCITIES experts agreed that the following proposals be made to the MCSD:

- The establishment of the Steering Committee of the Group consisting of the reputed experts in the field of sustainable urban management proposed by the task managers (Turkey, Egypt and MEDCITIES), supporting MAP Centres (PAP and BP) and 2-3 reputed experts from other MCSD members. This body could effectively guide the Group's work and significantly reduce costs;
- Propose the budget for the Group's work in the biennium 2000-01; and
- Target the results of the Group's work towards the major meetings of the MCSD and Contracting Parties keeping the visibility of the Group's activities very high.

The experts proposed the timetable, workplan and budget, which are contained in the accompanying table.

WORKPLAN, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET FOR THE MCSD WORKING GROUP ON URBAN MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

DATE	EVENT	PARTICIPANTS	OUTPUTS	COST (US\$)
July 1999	Meeting of the MCSD in Rome	MCSD members	Adoption of the proposed Workplan and Timetable	
October 1999	Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention in Malta	Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention	Adoption of the proposed Workplan, Timetable and Budget	
November 1999	Meeting of the Steering Committee	Task Managers, Supporting Centres, 2-3 experts	Terms of Reference for national reports on urban development policies, and for the questionnaire on urban management at a local level, selection of experts, indicators, bibliography	7,000
December 1999	Distribution of questionnaires and TOR for national reports	National and local selected experts	Contracts with the national and local experts	15,000
April 2000	Finalisation of the national reports and questionnaires	National and local selected experts	Completed national reports and questionnaires	
May 2000	Analysis of the questionnaires and national reports	2 regional experts	Synthetic studies on the results and findings of the national reports and questionnaires	5,000
May 2000	Meeting of the Steering Committee	Task Managers, Supporting Centres, 2-3 experts	Working Group Interim Report, Workshop scenario, selection of "in-depth case studies", selection of experts	7,000
June 2000	Sixth Meeting of the MCSD	MCSD members	Adoption of the Interim Report of the Working Group	
October 2000	Completion of case studies	Local/National experts	Completed "in-depth" case studies	5,000
December 2000	Regional Workshop on Sustainable Development and Urban Management	MCSD members, countries' local and national experts, MAP, METAP, CEDARE and other relevant organisations and institutions	Validation of studies on national reports and questionnaires, indicators on Mediterranean urban sustainable development, case studies, draft proposals	60,000
February 2001	Meeting of the Steering Committee	Task Managers, Supporting Centres, 2-3 experts	Final draft of the proposals for recommendation	7,000
June 2001	Seventh Meeting of the MCSD (tentative)	MCSD members	Adoption of the proposals for the recommendation	
October 2001	Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention	Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention	Adoption of the recommendations	