



## **Table of Contents**

### **Body of the report**

#### **Annexes**

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| Annex I   | List of Participants  |
| Annex II  | Guidelines of the MCSD on the preparation of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD), submitted for attention to the Contracting Parties<br><br>Appendix I: Break-out session “Orientations” for a MSSD, as prepared by Ms. A. Mourmouris, Chair of the session |
| Annex III | Proposals for Recommendations concerning the MCSD Assessment and Prospects  |
| Annex IV  | List of Participants of Working Groups  |
| Annex V   | Agenda of the Meeting   |

## **Introduction**

1. In accordance with the decision taken at its Seventh Meeting (Antalya, 13-16 March, 2002) the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development held its Eighth Meeting at the Hotel Croatia, Cavtat (Croatia), from 14-16 May 2003, at the kind invitation of the Croatian Government.

## **Attendance**

2. The meeting was attended by the following 20 members of the Commission: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, European Commission, France, Greece, ICC/ MED (ICC Monaco-Italy-Turkey), Israel, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, MIO-ECSDE, MEDCITIES, Principality of Monaco, Municipality of Omisalj (Croatia), RAED, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia.

3. The following Regional Activity Centres and other components of MAP also attended the Meeting: MED POL, BP/RAC, CP/RAC, PAP/RAC, SPA/RAC, 100 Historic Sites.

4. The following United Nations specialized agencies, inter-governmental organizations and other partners attended the meeting as observers: CIESM (International Commission for the Scientific Exploration of the Mediterranean Sea), European Environmental Agency, Baltic 21 Secretariat, UNEP/ Division of Environmental Conventions (GPA).

5. A full list of participants is contained in Annex I to this report.

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

6. Mr Bozo Kovačević, Minister of Environment and Physical Planning of Croatia, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to his country. As a member of the MCSD and a member of the Bureau of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), his country was keen to promote the Mediterranean region as a vital bridge between the global, national and local levels in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals and the decisions of the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD). The Mediterranean Sea and its coastal countries faced heavy pressure from uncontrolled and rapid development, which disturbed the delicate Mediterranean ecosystem in a number of ways, from fish contamination by industrial effluents to the destruction of habitats of endangered species by tourism. The Mediterranean was particularly vulnerable to environmental accidents such as that of the "Prestige". With its very long coastline and large number of islands, Croatia had a natural interest in cooperation and joint activities for the protection of marine and coastal areas. In this respect, the preparation of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD) was the only correct approach to the preservation of this outstanding area.

7. Mr Pero Misković, Deputy Prefect of the County of Dubrovnik, expressed pride and honour that the MCSD meeting was being held in a county which boasted 44 specially protected nature areas, as well as a number of nature parks that would soon be declared protected. In this very historical area, where the first statutes of Dubrovnik had been issued in 1272, there was broad recognition of the need for economic development to take into account the protection of nature. The process of bringing development plans into line with European Union standards would be instrumental in preventing negative environmental developments. In this connection, he emphasized that the present generation had a particularly important responsibility in ensuring that future generations were not endangered. The work of the MCSD would contribute to preventing development that was alienated from nature.

8. Mr Frano Matusić, Deputy Mayor of the City of Dubrovnik, recalled that the statute of Dubrovnik adopted in the 13<sup>th</sup> Century also covered the protection of nature and urban planning. With its tradition of international trade and cultural contacts, Dubrovnik recognized its duty to conserve natural resources, and particularly the sea, through close cooperation with all the peoples of the Mediterranean.

9. Mr Bernard Fautrier, Minister of Environment of Monaco, President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties and Vice-President of the MCSD Steering Committee, described the environmental problem which had occurred the previous day off the coast of his country, probably as a result of the degassing of an oil tanker, as an illustration of the fragility of the Mediterranean ecosystem. He emphasized that the MCSD was at a crossroads. The WSSD had adopted new orientations and the UNCSD had developed a very detailed schedule for the years to come. These would serve as benchmarks for the MCSD in building the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD), for which its thematic work would need to be organized very precisely and the various actors brought together effectively to guarantee success.

10. Mr Arab Hoballah, MAP Deputy Coordinator, read out a letter from Mr Lucien Chabason, who regretted that he could not be present at the meeting for health reasons, but recalled that the MCSD was one of the main achievements of the Barcelona system for the attainment of sustainable development in the region. The work of the Task Force, which had evaluated the contribution of the MCSD, would be of importance in the renovation of the MCSD. He also hoped that the meeting would contribute to the adoption of a realistic and concrete regional sustainable development strategy which would put the MCSD on the right road. He wished the MCSD much success in its work for the future.

11. Mr Hoballah recalled that the programme of work of the MCSD had become more intensive as expectations had risen and sustainable development had been put higher on the agendas of local, national and regional institutions. In addition to the intensive work undertaken by the support centres, the Secretariat had prepared a Strategic Review, followed by the MCSD Assessment and Prospects and the preparatory work for MSSD. These latter issues constituted the bulk of the meeting's agenda and important decisions would have to be taken which would determine the future of the MCSD, its efficiency, usefulness and sustainability. The proposals and decisions on these issues needed to enhance and rationalize cooperation, particularly with the major groups, namely local authorities, the business sector and NGOs. It was not only important to determine *what* was to be done, but also *how* and *by whom*, giving due consideration to the crucial question of the necessary and adequate ways and means of implementation. Finally, he thanked the Croatian authorities, particularly the Minister of Environment and Physical Planning, for hosting and cost-sharing the meeting, and the Director and staff of PAP/RAC for their assistance and organization.

## **Agenda Item 2: Election of the Steering Committee**

12. In accordance with rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure and following the customary consultations, the Commission elected its new Steering Committee, the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Monaco) being a member *ex officio*. The composition of the Steering Committee was as follows:

President:	H.E. Mr B. Kovacevic	(Croatia)
Vice-Presidents:	H.E. Mr B. Fautrier	(Monaco)
	Mr S. Antoine	(France)
	Mr A. M. Boargob	(Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)
	Mr Z. Skala	(Municipality of Omisalj)
	Mr J. P. Fonteneau	(ICC-Med)
Rapporteur	Mr E. Adly	(RAED)

### **Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda and organization of the meeting**

13. In a discussion of the provisional agenda set out in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/2, it was agreed that, particularly in view of the fact that delegations consisting of a single member could not follow the work of both proposed break-out sessions simultaneously, more emphasis would be placed on discussion in plenary, with less time allotted to the parallel break-out sessions. In addition, sufficient time should be allocated to the discussion of both the older and more recent thematic issues in view of their importance in the work of the MCSD. The agenda was adopted, as amended.

14. Concern was expressed at the fact that, as of the beginning of the meeting, one-third of the members of the MCSD were absent, including a number of countries, but in particular the members representing the socio-economic actors and local authorities. It was emphasized that the very future of the MCSD depended upon the active participation and support of all of its members and that the issue of representation should be examined closely in the discussion on MCSD Assessment and Prospects. It was added that the host country had made every effort to eliminate any obstacles to the provision of visas for members from countries for which they were required.

### **Agenda Item 4: WSSD and the Mediterranean**

15. Mr Hoballah, introducing the discussion with reference to Annex IV of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3, recalled that the preparatory process for the WSSD had moved concern at the international level away from simple environmental issues and towards the overall question of sustainable development, based on an integrated approach incorporating the environmental, economic and social dimensions. This in turn had raised the issue of governance to prominence as the primary means of efficient implementation of the related strategies. With the emphasis that was now being placed on implementation at the regional level, particularly in relation to eco-regions such as the Mediterranean, the progress made at the Mediterranean level could provide an example for other regions. In this respect, it was important to reaffirm that little progress would be achieved in promoting sustainable development in the region without giving due consideration to essential issues such as: poverty and basic needs; globalization and production and consumption patterns; collective responsibility and partnerships; and governance.

16. In the discussion on this subject it was agreed that those initiatives adopted at the global level (WSSD) or other levels (such as the European Union) which were of relevance to the Mediterranean should be examined and adapted to Mediterranean conditions with a view to their implementation. Initiatives of particular importance included those relating to water and energy, with particular reference to renewable sources of energy. This should be done in coordination and synergy with the other actors concerned, including FAO, UNDP, the World Bank, the European Union and the private sector. For each objective identified, care should be taken to determine who would be responsible, how it would be given effect, by when and by which means. It was also important to realize the difficulties involved in considering the Mediterranean as an eco-region, particularly since many of the Contracting Parties participated in other groupings at the international level (with particular reference to

the expanded membership of the European Union), and a realistic assessment would need to be made of whether all the States and other parties concerned were in practice, and over and above their other allegiances, prepared to act as part of a group based on the Mediterranean eco-region. It was also agreed that care should be taken in organizing awareness raising initiatives, such as side-events at the various meetings, so that they were optimally targeted to achieve the highest possible level of visibility for the region. With regard to the highlights of the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation, as summarized in Annex III to document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3, it was also agreed that more concrete targets should be specified for each item using baseline data, which could perhaps be provided by the Regional Activity Centres in their specific fields of competence.

#### **Agenda Item 5: Vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean**

17. Mr Hoballah introduced the discussion on this subject by recalling that the Strategic Review endorsed in 2001 had assessed the progress made towards environmental protection and sustainable development in the region, as well as the challenges and weaknesses to be overcome. Although the Contracting Parties and other partners in the MAP and MCSD framework had been progressively moving towards the promotion of sustainable development through an integrated approach that incorporated economic and social concerns, little progress had yet been made in the region in the implementation of this approach in practice. Moreover, environmental, economic and social difficulties had been exacerbated by the high short-term costs of economic liberalization and integration into global markets. A strategic regional framework, based on a shared vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean, was therefore needed to provide a basis for cooperation between the countries and partners concerned to build and maintain a shared future. The first elements of such a vision had been presented during the workshop on strategic orientations held in Barcelona in March 2003, and the comments made at that workshop had been incorporated into the document contained in Annex V of UNEP(DEC)/MED WG 217/3.

18. Mr Ennabli, former Minister of Environment of Tunisia, presenting the Mediterranean vision of sustainable development set forth in Annex V, emphasized that the first deficit of sustainable development in the Mediterranean lay in the region's economic and social decline. However, this was counterbalanced by the feeling of belonging to the same community and of a shared destiny, as well as the hope of a better future based on co-development and mutual trust between the various parts of the Mediterranean. This presupposed a shared vision of the future and a willingness to cooperate in the context of an effective consensual process. Such a vision needed to be strategic and express the long-term aspirations of all the stakeholders. It therefore had to go beyond national frontiers and set forth the objective of an eco-region that was more diversified and in which the environment was healthy, natural diversity protected and there was greater prosperity, more democracy and the common cultural heritage was cherished. However, current development in the region was far from being sustainable. The vision was therefore an invitation for intervention at the political level with a view to undertaking reforms, assuming responsibilities, developing new ideas and discussing economic solutions. Sustainable development was the opposite of the "everything, immediately" culture that characterized ultra-liberalism. Indeed, it was only in association with sustainable development that globalization could generate an acceptable system of trade. The starting point for the vision was an extension of all the initiatives already taken at the regional level (MED 21, the revised Barcelona Convention, MAP II and the MCSD) and the Strategic Review, which had revealed the difficulties encountered in the transition towards sustainable development in Mediterranean coastal States.

19. He described the six major challenges set out in the Annex, namely: *peace; poverty and equality; development and its impact on the environment; globalization; productivity and innovation; and governance*. Progress on these challenges, and particularly in relation to governance, would have to be based on an *ethical contract*, that would give meaning and perspective to a Mediterranean sustainable development process that respected a shared ethical view of sustainability responding to a moral imperative and transcending utilitarian considerations. The participation of organizations from civil society, which represented a wide variety of cultural values and traditions in the region, would be necessary. The principles of the Rio Declaration would evidently be an integral part of the process, which would also be designed to protect the physical and human capital of the Mediterranean in the long-term, based on reducing the disparities between the living standards of the populations of the region, mobilizing actors at all levels and strengthening regional cooperation in the fields of research and development, the transfer of technology, training and information. The vision should be such as to raise awareness of what was truly at stake in the development of the region, its environmental problems, social concerns and the major challenges that would need to be taken up.

20. In the discussion of the proposed vision, broad appreciation was expressed of the quality of Mr Ennabli's contribution on this very important subject. It was widely agreed that an ethical vision was required before progress could be made in specific technical areas. The proposed vision constituted a good synthesis of the various discussions on this subject and a sound basis for progress in the development, promotion and implementation of a sustainable development strategy for the region, subject to qualifications on certain of the subjects covered by the vision. One of these concerned the references to globalization, which were in general too negative. It was agreed that globalization could not be reversed and that a positive attitude was needed to draw out the benefits of the globalization process in a manner and based on conditions adapted to the distinctive cultural, economic and social characteristics of the Mediterranean region. Greater emphasis should also be placed on ensuring that economic development and growth in the region were based on the principles set out by the WSSD and UNCSD, with particular reference to the modification of consumption and production patterns and the sustainable management of the scarcity of natural resources. The references to the education and employment of women should also be reviewed to ensure that they were in full accordance with the principles of equality of opportunity and treatment for men and women.

21. All speakers agreed on the importance of the governance dimension in the vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Progress could only be made in this respect when broad participation was assured by all stakeholders at the regional, national and local levels. Sustainable development was by its nature multisectoral, and it was therefore agreed that priority needed to be given to the active involvement of the actors responsible at all levels in the various sectors. At the regional level, these included, for example, the FAO in relation to agriculture and UNDP for poverty alleviation. It was also important to strengthen participation and synergies with the European Union, particularly in the context of its current enlargement, which directly concerned several Mediterranean countries. It was recalled that the need for sustainable development had already been under discussion for several years, but that very little progress had yet been made in its implementation in practice. Indeed, the present generation might be the last that could take decisions and action to secure the environmental conditions essential for future generations. It was therefore urgent to make progress in the development and implementation of the strategy for sustainable development in the region, for which a road map should be developed setting out the actions to be taken in the short term to ensure the involvement and ownership of the vision and the strategy by all the main actors in the principal sectors concerned. Subject to these clarifications, the meeting took note of the proposed vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean and requested the Secretariat to transmit it to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties.

## Agenda Item 6: MSSD Orientations

22. The meeting examined the draft report on Orientations for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy (MSSD) (Annex VI of document UNEP(DEC)/MED/WG.217/3), both in a break-out session and in plenary. Appreciation of the work done was expressed, and it was agreed that two texts on MSSD Orientations should be presented to the Contracting Parties in November 2003: a short and succinct text of Recommendations for adoption by the Contracting Parties, and a Synthesis Report (information document), integrating the content of Mr Ennabli's presentation and reflecting the comments made at the meeting. Members of the MCSD were invited to provide the Secretariat with proposals or suggestions in writing, by the end of May 2003, on the Synthesis Report. It was made clear that the entire draft report required numerous editing improvements to make it more balanced and accurate.

23. When specific shortcomings were discussed, attention was drawn to the fact that some titles unusually took the form of declarations, while others did not correspond to the content of the respective sub-section (e.g. Water and Fisheries). With regard to the fields of "priorities for action", the rationale for their selection should be clearly reflected in the Synthesis Report. It would also be useful to refer to any major obstacles faced in implementation when future actions were being identified. As regards the means, it was recalled that the Outline proposed in Barcelona had covered in a more appropriate manner the different categories, going clearly beyond "partners" to include funding, institutional aspects, reforms, etc. Comments were also made about ambiguous references to sensitive issues like the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership or the role of MAP compared to that of the Contracting Parties. The misleading term "environmentally sensitive products" needed to be replaced by a more accurate term; and the use of the term *governance* had led to misunderstandings over a perceived criticism of certain *governments* in the region. Finally, it was thought that it was premature to refer to "conclusions"; instead, the final chapter of the Synthesis Report might refer to "the next steps".

24. Mrs Mourmouris, who chaired the break-out session, made an oral presentation in plenary of the results of the discussion. The written report of this session is contained in Annex II. This report includes already a number of comments on the Synthesis Report. Once more the need to involve the stakeholders in the process of elaboration of the MSSD has been underlined. Mrs Mourmouris indicated that, given the rather initial current stage of this long process leading to the MSSD, it was not possible to propose substantive recommendations for the Contracting Parties during this meeting. It was therefore for the MCSD to choose if it preferred to present to the CP a short and succinct text with the key points identified so far to orient the next steps, or to entrust the Steering Committee the task of preparing draft recommendations when additional elements would be available from the experts work, or if there was no need at all for recommendations at the next meeting of the CP.

25. A debate was triggered on MCSD's working methods. Several speakers expressed concerns at the practice of break-out groups, suggesting that issues of such importance as MSSD Orientations should be discussed in plenary session only. It was recalled that no rules or guidelines had been laid down before the two break-out sessions were held, which had led to different approaches being taken. Nonetheless since the two break-out sessions had addressed different activities, it was to be expected that the respective outcomes should also be different, especially since preparation of MSSD had only begun recently and was still in progress. Moreover when concern was voiced that, if the MCSD merely mandated other bodies, such as the Steering Committee, to authorize texts produced outside MCSD meetings, the MCSD itself would be weakened and its very existence called into question. In this respect, assurances were given that there was no question of the MCSD being circumvented. It was also agreed that all documents should be made available to all



participants well in advance. The meeting agreed on the crucial importance of involving non-governmental partners, which might otherwise be dissuaded from attending MCSD meetings; non-governmental organizations might find it hard to justify attendance at future MCSD meetings, for example, if there were no concrete results to show.

26. It was decided that a drafting group from the break-out session would prepare a brief text of guidelines for the preparation of the MSSD, which would be submitted for the attention of the Contracting Parties. These guidelines, as amended by the meeting, are attached to this report as Annex II. In this respect, it was specified that a constructive approach should be followed when preparing the strategy, bringing to the fore positive elements such as MAP implementation and the SAPs, as well as regional challenges, and employing balanced language on sensitive issues. The definition of sustainable development provided in the Bruntland Report (as approved by all countries) should be used as a basis in this process. In addition, clear explanations should be provided of the geopolitical changes in the region, without overlooking initiatives, programmes and possibilities relating to the Balkan countries.

#### **Agenda Item 7: MCSD Assessment and Prospects**

26. The meeting examined the proposals contained in the report of the Task Force on MCSD Assessment and Prospects (Annex VII to document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3) both in a break-out session and in plenary. Following the presentation of the report by Mr N. Georgiades, many speakers commended the work of the Task Force, but felt that the report called for further examination, particularly with regard to existing MAP structures and the causes of the shortcomings identified. There was broad agreement concerning the important role of the MCSD as a think tank and high-level policy forum, but also on the need to improve its functioning and to ensure that it was more responsive to the new world environment. It was agreed that emphasis should be placed on improved internal efficiency, including the establishment of a timetable for the MCSD's work, rather than institutional expansion. It was also agreed that now was not the time to change the membership structure of the MCSD, but that there should be flexibility in calling upon experts to participate in its work. Efforts also needed to be made to identify the reasons why certain of its members were failing to participate in its meetings and work so that this situation could be remedied.

27. The meeting discussed the importance of providing sufficient resources for the MCSD to carry out the specific tasks entrusted to it. The financing of the MCSD itself needed to be seen within the context of the overall financing of MAP and its components. With regard to the possibility of identifying the total resources within the MAP context allocated to activities related to sustainable development, it was explained that, although it would be possible in the context of the MAP budget to indicate a number of specific items in this connection, all MAP activities were related more or less directly to sustainable development, and it would therefore be extremely difficult to indicate in a single budget line all the resources utilized for this purpose.

28. There was a feeling that proposals for the reform of the MCSD needed to ensure that its work was more practical and focused on specific issues, so that its recommendations could be realistically implemented and would attract greater interest from a wider range of stakeholders, including intergovernmental agencies. The need was expressed for a more systematic follow-up of the implementation of the MCSD recommendations approved by the Contracting Parties, either through reporting or the organization of specific forums and activities, where appropriate in the context of the work of the Regional Activity Centres. The MCSD should also be more proactive in taking into account the information available through MAP structures and other channels and in producing evaluations of the attainment of sustainable development goals, the identification of weaknesses in this respect and the formulation of recommendations for improvement.

29. The proposals for recommendations concerning the MCSD assessment and prospects, including the changes agreed upon by the meeting, are contained in Annex III to this report.

**Agenda Item 8: Presentation and discussion of MCSD “thematic” issues: Progress and proposals**

Cultural heritage and sustainable development

30. Mr S. Antoine, France, recalled that this theme had been entrusted to the MCSD by the Contracting Parties following the audit undertaken in July 2001 of the work carried out since 1989 on the Programme of the 100 Historic Sites. At the previous meeting of the MCSD, it had been decided that a programme on the cultural heritage of the Mediterranean would be undertaken based on the 100 Historic Sites network, but that it would be substantially renewed in the perspective of sustainable development and would be related to the problems of the development of tourism. The activities carried out under the guidance of France and Tunisia had involved Croatia, Monaco, Morocco and Turkey, as well as MedCities and the City of Naples. A workshop had been held on this subject in Nice in April 2003 and had developed proposals on the scope of cooperation, a three year programme of work and the organization of a structure within the framework of MAP. It had been envisaged in this respect that the activities would only be launched after an agreement had been reached with MAP and examined by the MCSD, and that the proposed structure would be neither an activity centre nor an institution subsidized by MAP. Instead, the support of cities, universities and research institutions would be sought and a balance would be maintained between the various shores of the Mediterranean. The structure would develop relations with UNESCO and ICOMOS.

31. The meeting welcomed the proposed initiative and agreed that Tunisia and France should continue the project and present the progress achieved at a future meeting of the MCSD, if possible in 2004. It noted that the City of Marseilles, which had cooperated in the implementation of the 100 Historic Sites programme for over 14 years, would continue to provide support for the transformation of the programme, thereby avoiding any interruption in MAP's activities in the field of culture. It emphasized that cultural heritage was essential for the Mediterranean and important for sustainable development.

Industry and sustainable development

32. Mr V. Macia, Director, Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (CP/RAC), described the role of the centre in promoting the concept of cleaner production among industry partners, particularly within the framework of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) for the implementation of the LBS Protocol. The recommendations of the thematic working group on industry and sustainable development had been approved by the Contracting Parties in 2001 and, in view of the fact that the working group had not continued its work, the centre had found that the SAP offered a good framework for developing the implementation of some of these recommendations, particularly in relation to the introduction of sustainable standards within companies and the transfer of knowledge. The activities of the centre to give effect to these recommendations included the preparation of three regional guidelines and one regional plan for use by countries to develop their own national action plans taking into account the principles of sustainable development in industrial activities. It had also developed coordination with other similar centres and UNIDO on this subject, as well as collaborating in the establishment of a cleaner production centre in Bosnia and Herzegovina. A meeting had been organized with other institutions working in the field of sustainability in Mediterranean industry, including UNEP, UNIDO, MED POL and the Mediterranean Chamber of Commerce Association (ASCAME), to review and confirm the approach

proposed to give effect to the relevant recommendations in the framework of the SAP. Knowledge had also been disseminated, particularly through contacts with organizations representing industry.

33. The meeting agreed that CP/RAC had been very active in undertaking work that was broadly appreciated. It was proposed that contact be established between the International Chamber of Commerce and the centre with a view to future collaboration. The meeting noted the role played by the centre in the context of the SAP. It also requested more complete information in future on the implementation of the recommendations of the MCSD on this subject and on any follow-up activities.

#### Local governance (and follow-up of previous themes)

34. Mr I. Trumbic, Director of the Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC), reviewed the activities of the centre in implementing the relevant recommendations of the MCSD, particularly as they related to coastal and urban management, as well as sustainable tourism. Continuing the work commenced under an earlier working group on urban management and sustainable development, importance had been assigned to the development of a legal context for Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) and a feasibility study was being prepared on a regional protocol for coastal management. The centre had also continued with the preparation of new Coastal Area Management Projects (CAMPs) in a number of countries, through which local stakeholders had been identified, especially in Lebanon. In the field of capacity building, a clearing house for information had been established on the centre's website. The implementation of the MCSD's recommendations on urban management and sustainable development was being pursued through urban regeneration activities, including a project that was being implemented with the support of the European Union. These activities had led to reinforced contacts with relevant NGOs. With regard to local governance, it was recalled that the previous meeting of the MCSD had agreed that preliminary work only would be carried out on this theme with a view to the establishment of a thematic working group on the subject at a later date. It was therefore hoped that more substantive activities on this theme could be presented at the next meeting of the MCSD.

35. The meeting noted the activities carried out by the centre. It was proposed that consideration should be given to the organization of a forum on local governance.

#### Management of water demand

36. Mr G. Benoit, Director of Blue Plan, recalled the activities carried out over several years in the field of the management of water demand, including the Fréjus meeting in 1997 and the recent Fiuggi Forum on "Advances of Water Demand Management in the Mediterranean", attended by various concerned stakeholders and organized with the support of the Global Water Partnership. He recalled that water was a rare resource almost throughout the Mediterranean basin, especially in view of the constantly increasing demand for water as the population rose and tourism developed. According to the available prospective analyses, a real crisis could be foreseen within 25 years if current consumption patterns continued. Nevertheless, the management of water demand offered considerable savings. Indeed, one scenario suggested that over 70 km<sup>3</sup> of water could be saved through the application of effective water demand management by the year 2025, which constituted almost one-fourth of the 300 km<sup>3</sup> of water currently used in the region. He cited a number of cases in which the relevant techniques had been employed to very good effect, including Tunisia and the Rabat-Casablanca conurbation. However, there was still a widespread tendency to apply supply-side policies rather than endeavouring to manage demand, which required a profound change in policies and practice. The relevant organizations tended to have little awareness or training. A series of case studies had provided indications of the measures needed to promote greater use of water demand management, including the

rallying of organizational effort, economic instruments, administrative tools and training. The Fiuggi Forum had developed a series of recommendations addressed to the MCSD and covering the fields of government action, the strengthening of regional partnerships, support for the adoption of water demand management by local organizations and the dissemination of the necessary practices.

37. The meeting welcomed the presentation of the activities carried out by Blue Plan on water demand management, which had provided very full information and clearly indicated to potential partners, including the business sector, the fields in which cooperation could be established. It recognized that Blue Plan was an important partner in Mediterranean water management efforts. The Fiuggi Forum was a useful tool for creating partnerships and promoting awareness among decision-makers of the relevant scientific knowledge. Similar initiatives should be considered in other MCSD activities. It was pointed out that several initiatives were active at the Mediterranean level in the field of water and that partnerships should therefore be promoted. Considerable funding had also been made available in the context of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership in the field of water, and it was therefore disappointing to note that no projects had been submitted on water demand management. Nevertheless, the progress made demonstrated what could be achieved when MAP and the MCSD continued to be active in a specific field.

38. The meeting commended Blue Plan on the activities carried out and the contacts established with professional networks. It noted the recommendations of the Fiuggi Forum and hoped that this type of forum would be organized in relation to other themes covered by the MCSD.

#### Free trade and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context

39. Mr G. Benoit, Director, Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC) and Mr A. Jorio (BP/RAC expert) described the further action taken on the impact of free trade on the Mediterranean environment since the first action phase. The focus of work had been on the impact of free trade on agriculture, a particularly important sector in view of the ongoing multilateral and regional negotiations – but one not hitherto included in proposals for a Euro-Mediterranean free-trade area – and of the vulnerability of the agricultural sector in the diverse Mediterranean context. In addition to country case studies, notably one on agriculture in Morocco, an especially important development had been the holding of a regional forum, organized jointly with the International Centre for Advanced Research in Mediterranean Agronomy (CIHEAM), in Montpellier in May 2002.

40. Among the main findings of the forum was the very great diversity of conditions between countries and regions, with high risks of a serious negative social, economic and environmental impact on some vulnerable countries of the south and east Mediterranean, and of instability in those countries and in the region in the event of unregulated free trade that was not accompanied by strong support measures to help countries over the transition period. In the context of the move towards extended free trade in agricultural markets, the decline in State support for agriculture and the failure hitherto to take account of sustainability in the current negotiations, and in the light of the multiple role (“multifunctionality”) of agriculture and the potential wider social, economic and environmental consequences of expanded free trade, the forum had proposed several courses of action, some of which had been taken up in the recommendations now before the MCSD.

41. A shared vision of the multiple roles of Mediterranean agriculture and rural areas and concrete accompanying measures for the transition in the countries of the south and east should be developed. Further consideration should be given to the future for Euro-Mediterranean agriculture and ways and means of ensuring sustainable agricultural and

rural development. The joint holding of a regional forum in 2005 was proposed. A further recommendation concerned the MCSD/Blue Plan's involvement in the consultation committee for the sustainability impact assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean free-trade area, to be undertaken by the European Commission.

42. In the ensuing discussion, speakers stressed the need, as of 2003, to undertake practical action and further studies on the environmental aspects and multiple roles of agriculture, with a precise time-frame, and to prepare proposals for concrete action programmes for sustainable rural development in the Mediterranean. It was suggested that meetings at ministerial level might be organized to discuss the full range of agricultural issues as they related to the environment and sustainable development in general. In response to misgivings expressed about the capacity to influence the impact assessment process, it was explained that consultations were still under way and there was still ample room for input by the MCSD. Moreover, the introduction of environmental language into such assessments was an important novelty and an opportunity not to be missed.

43. The recommendations presented were briefly discussed but the meeting felt that, as they stood, they were premature. Following a review, proposals for recommendations on free trade and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context were adopted, as below:

#### *Agriculture and Rural Areas*

MCSD takes note with interest of the work carried out in the field of free trade, agriculture and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context. It takes note of the risks of social and environmental repercussions facing fragile rural areas in the southern and eastern Mediterranean and the instabilities that might result in certain countries and on a regional scale, in the event of expanding free trade that is unregulated and unaccompanied by adequate support policies for the transition. Taking into account the extent of the economic, social and environmental challenges at stake, the negotiation timetables and the urgent need for a shared vision and to improve the integration and adaptation of policies, it proposes:

- that MAP, the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (CIHEAM) and the Contracting Parties ensure that the work done is widely disseminated among the public and professional actors,
- that the Contracting Parties might organize *ad hoc* interministerial meetings and that they take into account the full set of economic, social and environmental aspects in the meetings and negotiations under way on agriculture and trade, in particular in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership,
- that MAP, in cooperation with CIHEAM and the other regional partners, and in synergy with the relevant initiatives, study in greater depth the environmental aspects and the multiple roles of agriculture, organize in 2005 a forum together with CIHEAM and frame proposals for concrete action programmes for the sustainable rural development of the Euro-Mediterranean area.

#### *Sustainability impact assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area*

MCSD takes note of the launch by the European Commission of the sustainability impact assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area and asks the Contracting Parties to be fully involved in the process directly and through the MCSD Secretariat and concerned Support Centres, in particular the Blue Plan by participating in the consultation committee to be created by the European Commission in order to ensure a broad consensus by all parties concerned.

### Financing and cooperation for sustainable development in the Mediterranean

44. Mr G. Benoit and Mr A. Jorio gave a brief presentation of a Blue Plan document setting out the context and the main findings and conclusions of the work carried out on the subject. A few sets of additional statistics were also presented, referring for example to the concentration of aid and investment in certain Mediterranean countries. Emphasis was laid on the usefulness of organizing a regional forum in 2004 to report back on the completed work and hold a debate. It ought to be attended by a broad range of participants to include, in addition to representatives of the countries, qualified experts, sponsors and NGOs. An appeal was made for a country or city to volunteer to host and help to finance the forum. No specific recommendations were put to the meeting in the light of the limited time left for the presentation and discussion of this thematic issue.

### **Ninth meeting of the MCSD**

45. Mr Hoballah called for offers from any of the members of the MCSD to host and cost share the next meeting of the MCSD in May 2004. The meeting would be held over a period of three or four days and its agenda would include a maximum of four items, which could include the preparation of the MSSD, the programme of work of the MCSD for the period 2005-15, cooperation and financing and free trade, agriculture and environment.

### **Any other business**

46. For the first time, side-events were organized in the context of MCSD meetings with a view to enhancing interaction, the exchange of experience, common understanding and effective joint action in relation to shared concerns for the promotion of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Three side-events were organized on the following subjects: inspection systems, by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of Croatia on the evening of 14 May; the business sector and the MCSD, by ICC-Med on the evening of 15 May; and NGOs and the MCSD, by MIO-ECSDE on the afternoon of 16 May. The three side-events were attended by most of the MCSD members and were very interactive with constructive discussions. It was considered that such side-events were useful and the Secretariat was encouraged to renew this experience in so far as possible in future MCSD meetings. Side events in the Ninth meeting of the MCSD could be related to local Agenda 21s and regional cooperation, such as with the Baltic 21.

### **Closure of the meeting**

48. Mrs Mourmouris announced that she would no more follow the MCSD work in the capacity of EC representative because she would change post soon. She thanked all members for the good co-operation during all these years and promised to continue supporting the MCSD on any occasion. M. Hoballah, on behalf of the MCSD Secretariat and MCSD members, thanked her for her active participation in the MCSD activities that have benefited a lot from her very constructive contributions, wishing her the best for her future endeavours.

49. Following the usual exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 2 pm on Friday 16 May 2003.

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

**BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA**  
**BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE**

**Mr. Tarik Kupusovic**  
 Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment  
 Hydro Engineering Institute  
 Box 405, S. Tomica ,1  
 71000 Sarajevo  
 Bosnia and Herzegovina  
 Tel/Fax: 387 33 207949  
 Email: mapbh@bih.net

**CROATIA - CROATIE**

**H.E. Mr. Bozo Kovacevic**  
 Minister of Environment and Physical Planning

**Mr. Roko Andricevic**  
 Assistant Minister  
 Tel: 38516106578  
 Fax: 38516118388  
 Email: roko.andricevic@mzopu.hr

**Ms. Margita Mastrovic**  
 Head of Unit  
 Marine and Coastal Protection Unit  
 Ministry of Environmental Protection and Physical Planning  
 Uzarska ulica 2/I  
 51000 Rijeka  
 Croatia  
 Tel: 385 51 213499  
 Fax: 385 51 214324  
 Email: margita.mastrovic@mzopu.hr

**Ms. Iva Milic-Strkalj**  
 Head of Sector  
 Ministry of Environment  
 Gajeva 30A  
 Tel: 385 1 4898070  
 Fax: 3851 4898066  
 E-mail: iva.milic@mzopu.hr

**Ms. Gordana Ruklic**  
 Senior Advisor for International Cooperation  
 Tel: 38513782160  
 Fax: 38513717118  
 E-mail: gordana.ruklic@mzopu.hr

**Ms. Sandra Rajsic**  
 Assistant in International Cooperation Office  
 Tel: 38513717125  
 Fax: 385 3717118  
 E-mail: sandra.rajsic@mzopu.hr

Ministry of Environmental Protection and Physical Planning  
 Republike Austrije 20  
 Zagreb 10000

**Mr. Frano Matusic**  
 Deputy Mayor  
 Tel: 38520351812  
 E-mail: fmatusic@dubrovnik.hr

**Ms. Marija Crncevic**  
 City of Dubrovnik, Pred Dvorom 1  
 Dubrovnik, 20000  
 Tel: 385 20 351835  
 Fax: 385 20 351839  
 Email: mcrncevic@dubrovnik.hr

**CYPRUS-CHYPRE**

**Mr. Nicos Georgiades**  
 Director for the Environment  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and  
 Environment  
 Tagmatarhou Poulou 17, Aghios Andreas,  
 Nicosia 1411, Cyprus  
 Tel: 357 22303883  
 Fax: 357 2774945  
 E-mail: esdirector@cytanet.com.cy

**ICC/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAMBERS  
 OF MONACO**

**M. Jean-Pierre Fonteneau**  
 Directeur Général

**Ms. Catherine Fautrier**  
 Deputy Manager  
 Email : cfautrier@cde.mc

« le Concorde »  
 11 rue du Gabian, P.O.Box 653  
 Le Concorde, Monaco 98013, Monaco  
 Tel : 37797986868  
 Fax: 37797986869  
 E-mail: info@cde.mc

**Mr. Amerigo Gori**  
 Secretary General/ ICC Italy  
 Via XX Settembre 5  
 Roma 00187  
 Italy  
 Tel: 3906 42034301  
 Fax: 39064882677  
 E-mail: icc@cciitalie.org

**Ms. Demet Ariyak**  
 Director ICC/Turkey  
 Ataturk Vlv.149  
 Bakanliklar  
 Ankara 06540  
 Turkey  
 Tel:902312 4178733  
 Fax:90312 4171483  
 E-mail: dariyak@tobb.org.tr

**EGYPT - EGYPTE**

**Mr. Hatem Kandil**  
2<sup>nd</sup> Secretary  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs/ Environment and Sustainable  
Development Affairs  
Kornish el Nil  
Cairo, Egypt  
Tel: 202 5141847  
E-mail: Hatem. Kandil@msn.com

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
COMMISSION EUROPEENE**

**Ms. Athena Mourmouris**  
Coordinator for MCSD, SMAP, METAP  
200, rue de la Loi  
1049 Brussels  
Belgium

Tel : 322 2963951  
Fax : 322 2963440  
Email : Athena.mourmouris@cec.eu.int

**FRANCE - FRANCE**

**Mme Emmanuelle Leblanc**  
Chargé mission Méditerranée

**Mme Nathalie Chartier-Touzé**  
Chef Bureau Appui aux Coopérations  
Ministère Écologie et Développement Durable  
20 Avenue de Ségur  
Paris 75302  
France  
Tel:33-1-42191705  
Fax:33-1-42191719  
emmanuele.leblanc@environnement.gouv.fr

**M. Serge Antoine**  
Délégué de la France à la CMDD  
Comité 21, 3 villa d'Orléans  
75014 Paris, France  
Tel : 33 1 43278421  
Fax : 33 1 43278420  
Email:antoine@comite21.asso.fr  
et  
10, rue de la Fontaine  
91570 Bièvres, France  
Tel : 33 1 69412056  
Fax : 33 1 69855233

**GREECE - GRECE**

**Mr. Alexander Lascaratos**  
MAP Focal Point  
Department of Applied Physics University of Athens  
(buildings-PHYS-V)  
Panepistimioupolis  
15784 Athens  
Tel: 3021072766839 – 7276933  
Fax: 302107295281  
E-mail: alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr

**ISRAEL-ISRAEL**

**Ms. Shlomit Doten**  
Chief District Planner  
Central District Office of the Ministry of Environment  
91 Hertzal street  
Ramla  
Israel  
Tel: 972 8 9788817/00  
Fax: 972 8 9229135  
E-mail: shlomit@sviva.gov.il

**ITALY - ITALIE**

**Mr. Aldo Iacomelli**  
Expert for the Ministry of Environment  
Head of Mediterranean Unit  
Tel: 390657228117  
Fax: 390657228175  
E-mail: iacomelli.aldo@minambiente.it

**Mr. Salvatore D'Angelo**  
Expert  
Ministry of Environment  
Tel: 390657228182  
Fax: 390657228178  
Email: dangelo.salavatore@minambiente.it  
Ministry of Environment  
Via C. Colombo 44  
Rome 00147, Italy

**Ms. Stefania Fusani**  
External Relations  
Agenzia Nazionale per la Protezione dell'Ambiente (ANPA)  
Via Vitaliano Brancati, 48, 00144 Roma , Italy  
Tel: 390650072862 - 393473362003-  
Fax: 390650072834  
E-mail: fusani@anpa.it

**LIBYA - LIBYE**

**Mr. Abdulfatah Boargob**  
Environmental Advisor  
Environmental General Authority  
El Gheran, P.O. Box 83618, Tripoli  
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya  
Tel: 218 21 4831316  
Fax: 218 21 4839991, 218 21 3338098  
E-mail: ega@egalibya.org

**MALTA - MALTE**

**Mr. Paul Mifsud**  
Permanent Secretary  
Ministry for Resources and Infrastructure  
Floriana CMR02, Malta  
Tel: 356 21 241644  
Fax: 356 21 250335  
Email: paul.mifsud@magnet.mt



**MEDCITIES****Mr. Joan Parpal**

Secrétaire Général, MedCités,  
Mancomunitat de Municipis de l'Àrea,  
Metropolitana de Barcelona, C/ 62, Núm. 16/18 – Sector A,  
Zona Franca, 08040 Barcelona, Spain  
Tel:34-93-2234165,  
Fax:34-93-2234849  
desurb@amb.es

**MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION OFFICE FOR ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (MIO-ECSDE)****Mr. Michael Scoullios**

Chairman

**Ms. Anastasia Roniotes**

Programme Officer

**Ms. Barbara Tomassini**

Programme Officer

28 Tripodon Street  
Athens 10558, Greece  
Tel: 30210 3247490-267  
Fax: 30210 3317127  
E-mail: mio-ee-env@ath.forthnet.gr

**MONACO - MONACO****S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier**

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

**M. Patrick Van Klaveren**

Conseiller Technique  
Direction des Relations Extérieures  
Le Conseiller Technique du Ministre Plénipotentiaire  
Chargé de la coopération internationale pour  
l'environnement et le développement

16 Villa Girasole, Bd. de Suisse  
MC-98000 Monaco-Ville  
Monaco  
Tel: 377-93158148, 377-680861895  
Fax: 377-93509591  
E-mail: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

**MUNICIPALITY OF OMISALJ****Mr. Zoran Skala**

Municipality of Omisalj,  
11 Prikoste, 51513 Omisalj,  
Croatia  
Tel 385 51 354 379  
Fax:385 51 212 436  
zoran.skala@zavod.pgz.hr

**RAED-ARAB NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT****Mr. Emad Adly**

General Coordinator  
Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)  
Zahra'a el Maadi Street, Masr Lel Ta'ameer Building No.3  
First floor, entrance 1-2,  
Zahra'a el Maadi, Cairo, Egypt  
Tel: 202 5161519-5161245  
Fax: 202 5162961  
Email: aoye@link.net

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

Adviser to the Government  
Ministry for Environment and Spatial Planning  
Regional Development Agency  
South Primorska  
Obala 128  
6320 Portoros  
Slovenia  
Tel:386-5-6777262  
Fax: 386-5-6777263  
Email: s.mezek@sid.net

**SPAIN - ESPAGNE****Mr Adrian Vecino Varela**

Subdirección General de Cooperación Institucional  
Y Políticas Sectoriales  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente  
Plaza San Juan de la Cruz s/n  
Madrid 28071  
Spain  
Tel: 34-91-5976732  
Fax: 34-91-5975980  
E-mail:avecino@mma.es

**TUNISIA - TUNISIE****M. Khalil Attia**

Directeur Général  
Agence Nationale de Protection  
de l'Environnement (ANPE)  
12 rue du Cameroun-Belvédère  
Tunis, Tunisie

Tel: 216 71 840221  
Fax: 216 71 890032  
Email: dg@anpe.nat.tn, boc.meat@rdd.tn

**UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND SECRETARIATS  
SECRETARIAT DES NATIONS UNIES  
OTHER OBSERVERS- AUTRES OBSERVATEURS**

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME-  
GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION**

**Ms. Annie Muchai**

Associate Programme Officer  
Kortenaerkade 1  
P.O. Box 16227  
2500 BE the Hague  
The Netherlands  
Tel: 31 703 11 4463/79/60  
Fax: 31 703 45 6648  
Email: a.muchai@unep.nl

**CIESM (INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR  
THE SCIENTIFIC EXPLORATION OF THE  
MEDITERRANEAN SEA)**

**M. Frederic Briand**

Director General  
16 Vd de Suisse  
Monte Carlo MC98000  
Monaco  
Tel: 37793303879  
Fax: 377 92161195  
E-mail: fbriand@ciesm.org

**EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY**

**Mr. Ronan Uhel**

EEA Project Manager  
Kongeni Nytovej, 6,  
Copenhagen  
Denmark  
Tel: 45- 33367130  
Fax: 45- 33367128  
ronan.uhel@eea.eu.int

**BALTIC 21 SECRETARIAT**

**Ms. Anne-Cerise Nilsson**

Deputy Director of the Division of International Affairs in  
the Ministry of Environment  
Agenda 21 of the Baltic Sea Region –Baltic 21  
10333 Stockholm  
Sweden

Tel: 4684054750

E-mail: anne-cerise.nilsson@environment.se

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

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

**M. Guillaume Benoit**

Directeur  
PB/CAR  
15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven  
Sophia Antipolis  
F-06560 Valbonne  
France  
Tel: 33492387130/33  
Fax: 33492387131  
E-mail: planbleu@planbleu.org, gbenoit@planbleu.org

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

**Mr. Victor Macia**

Director CP/RAC  
184, Paris Street 3rd floor,  
08036 Barcelona  
Spain

Tel: 34-93-4151112  
Fax: 34-93-2370286  
Email: cleanpro@cema-sa.org

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

**Mr Ivica Trumbic**

Director  
PAP/RAC  
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana  
P.O Box 74  
HR-21000 Split, Croatia  
Tel: 38521340370  
Fax: 38521340490  
E-mail: pap@ppa.tel.hr  
E-mail: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr

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

**M. Mohamed Adel Hentati**

Directeur  
SPA/RAC  
Boulevard de l'environnement  
B.P. 337, 1080 Tunis Cedex  
Tunisie  
Tel: 21671795760  
Fax: 21671797349  
E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org.tn

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

**M. Daniel Drocourt**

Coordonnateur  
"100 Sites historiques méditerranéens"  
Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville de Marseille  
10 Ter Square Belsunce  
F-13001 Marseille  
France  
Tel: 33491907874  
Fax: 33491561461  
E-mail: ddrocourt@mairie-marseille.fr

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

**Mr. Arab Hoballah**

Deputy Coordinator  
Tel: 302107273126  
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

**Mr. Francesco Saverio Civili**

MED POL Coordinator  
Tel: 302107273106  
E-mail: fscivili@unepmap.gr

Coordinating Unit for the  
Mediterranean Action Plan  
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue  
P. O. Box 18019  
116 10 Athens  
Greece  
Tel: 30210 7273100  
Fax: 30210 7253196-7  
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr  
www.unepmap.org

**Mr. Mohamed Ennabli**

MAP Expert  
1 rue Malchus  
La Marsa 2070  
Tunis, Tunisia

Tel/Fax : 21671 774169  
E-mail : mohamed.ennabli@gnet.tn

## **ANNEX II**

### **Guidelines of the MCSD on the preparation of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD), submitted for attention to the Contracting Parties\***

The MCSD considered the revised Synthesis Report (attached), based on six experts' reports and the contributions made at the Barcelona workshop in March 2003.

A. The Commission decided that the preparatory process for the MSSD would be pursued with the aim of presenting the Strategy for adoption at the 2005 meeting of the Contracting Parties. It proposed that work should be carried out in four stages, addressing:

- a shared vision,
- the strategic orientations,
- cooperation with major stakeholders, and
- the elaboration of the regional strategy for sustainable development (with action plans and governance provisions).

B. Stakeholders should be identified and involved in the process before the strategic orientations are finalized.

C. The future work for the preparation of the Strategy should be undertaken along the following lines:

- the four stages of the preparatory process described above;
- the paper proposing a shared vision (submitted for information) with a view to meeting effectively the sustainable development challenges concerning the region. To this end, due consideration should be given to the following common values:
  - Justice and peace
  - Equity and solidarity
  - Rights of future generations
  - Mediterranean identities
  - Innovation and creativity
  - Governance, participation and responsibility.
- a constructive approach should be followed when preparing the strategy, bringing to the fore positive elements such as MAP implementation and the SAPs, as well as regional challenges, and employing balanced language on sensitive issues. The definition of sustainable development provided in the Bruntland Report (as approved by all countries) should be used as a basis in this process.

D. The following general orientations for the preparation of the MSSD were endorsed by the MCSD:

- The Strategy should be based on effective interlinkages among and integration of the three components of sustainable development, that is economic, social and environmental, giving due consideration to the issue of governance;
- Links should be established between the long-term vision, the medium-term objectives and the short-term actions;
- Proposals should be based on an analysis of realities in the region using input from all available sources and, in particular, the report being prepared by Blue

- Plan on “Environment and Development in the Mediterranean”, including the main trends, regional strengths and weaknesses, and geopolitical challenges;
- The Strategy should fit into the regional political context, establish links with the evolving Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area (EMFTA), propose ways to face the challenge of convergence and provide alternative scenarios in order to face the multiple uncertainties related to this regional political context.

E. Priority fields of action should be set out on the basis of the on-going analysis and in cooperation with the stakeholders who will be involved in the preparatory process; these priority fields of action, to be further specified, could include water, energy, industry, tourism, transport, land use, urban development and improvement of the quality of life. Work to be undertaken would promote sustainable production and consumption patterns, and identify appropriate economic development and social models taking into consideration the specific characteristics of the Mediterranean.

*\*When reviewing the Orientations or the MSSD and related recommendations to the attention of the next Contracting Parties meeting, attached report from the Chair of the break-out session need to be given due consideration*

**Annex II**  
**Appendix I**

**Break-out session “Orientations” for a MSSD**  
***as prepared by Ms. A. Mourmouris, Chair of the session***

- Mr. Ennabli gave a PowerPoint presentation of Annex VI of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3, which was in fact a draft synthesis report based on six experts' reports already produced in relation to the orientations for the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development under preparation.
- The group expressed appreciation of the work done and felt that the oral presentation was more focused than the written report and better explained the logic of several parts thereof.
- Four stages were proposed by Mr. Ennabli for the strategy preparation addressing a shared vision, the strategic orientations, cooperation with major stakeholders and the elaboration of the regional strategy for sustainable development (with action plans and governance provisions). These four stages were acceptable to the group. However, it was stressed once more that stakeholders needed to be identified and involved in the process before the strategic orientations were finalized.
- It was suggested and generally agreed that 2 texts on orientations should be presented to the Contracting Parties (November 2003):
  - a) A short and succinct text of Recommendations for adoption by the Contracting Parties;
  - b) The synthesis report, based on the revised report and reflecting the comments made, to be used as an information document.
- The Steering Committee would consider both documents at its September meeting, before submitting them to the Contracting Parties.
- The short text of recommendations would include brief reference to the process to follow (4 stages), the general principles, indications as to the involvement of stakeholders and consultation procedures at national and regional levels, some orientations for the content, possible prerequisites (human and financial resources, etc) and an indicative calendar.
- The most important comments made during the section-by-section examination of Annex VI (UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3), to be reflected in the revised version of the synthesis report, were the following:
  - Suggestions (mostly for tactical reasons) to avoid a pessimistic approach (the decline of the Mediterranean) and excessively strong or ambiguous language, in particular regarding sensitive issues. Instead they should bring to the fore some positive elements (MAP implementation, challenges, etc).

- Avoid inventing new definitions for sustainable development. Use the one in the Bruntland Report (adopted by all countries) and add explanations-if needed-afterwards.
- Try to explain better the geopolitical changes in the region-without forgetting to refer also to initiatives, programmes and possibilities concerning Balkan countries.
- There was a clear feeling in the group that, in addition to a number of editing improvements needed for the entire text, section 3 in particular should be revised and considerably redrafted in a more balanced and accurate way (possibly including change order). Attention was drawn to the fact that some titles took the form of declarations, while others did not correspond to the content of the respective sub-section (eg. Water). Participants suggested that the text should not enter into too many details at the current stage or prejudge priorities for action until the analysis was well advanced, if not completed. It was also felt that a reference to major obstacles in implementation would be of interest and of use when future actions were being identified. Another suggestion was the avoidance of using the wrong and misleading term “environmentally sensitive products” (and its replacement by a more accurate term). As regards the means (Section 5) it was recalled that the different categories, going clearly beyond partners and including also funding, institutional aspects, reforms, etc. Comments were made also on some specific paragraphs referring in ambiguous ways to sensitive issues like the EMP, the role of MAP compared to that of Contracting Parties, and governance. The use of the term governance had led to misunderstandings over a perceived criticism of certain governments in the region. Finally, it was thought that it was premature to refer to Conclusions. Instead, the final chapter of the Synthesis Report could refer to the next steps (including stakeholders, road map, prerequisites).
- Given the limited time for discussion in the group session, participants were invited to provide the Secretariat with proposals/suggestions in writing (preferably by the end of the Cavtat meeting) on both the short recommendations text and the Synthesis Report.



### **ANNEX III**

#### **Proposals of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD) for recommendations concerning the Commission's assessment and prospects**

Eight years after its establishment, a considerable amount of work has been done by the MCSD in many fields of sustainable development, and a wide range of recommendations and proposals for action have been made. This has been a rich source of inspiration for the Contracting Parties and all the sustainable development partners in the Mediterranean. In order to make the work of the MCSD more efficient and visible, and to improve the participation of the different civil society groups, a review and assessment of the MCSD's organization and methods of work were considered necessary by Contracting Parties as well as the MCSD. Accordingly, the MCSD, at its Seventh Meeting held in Antalya, established a Task Force from among its members to consider the issue of its assessment and prospects. The MCSD considered the Task Force's report (finalized in April 2003 and attached for information) at its Eighth Meeting in Cavtat and decided to propose to the Contracting Parties that they adopt the following set of recommendations, aimed at further strengthening the Commission and refocusing its action in the post-Johannesburg era:

1. The MCSD should continue to be a think tank/high-level policy forum for identifying, evaluating and examining sustainable development issues in the region. The Commission should seek to better establish its credibility so as to extend its active dialogue with international and regional agencies and national governments, as well as all the bodies within MAP and civil society, in order to assist their work and strengthen their contribution to sustainable development.
2. To improve the efficiency and credibility of the MCSD, special attention should be given to the organization of dialogue on substantive policy issues at the annual meetings, to the progress of work of the thematic groups and to the networking of MCSD members with other stakeholders at regional and national levels.
3. Aiming to secure a more coherent regional approach on sustainable development and in line with the overall concern for improving global environmental governance, as evidenced by UNEP's Cartagena Agreement on governance and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, MEDU is urged to act as a catalyst and renew initiatives for the establishment of an informal Interagency Platform in the Mediterranean in consultation with the regional offices of agencies active in the region on sustainable development issues.
4. The recommendations and proposals for action of the MCSD should not be restricted only to formal approval by the Contracting Parties (CPs), which have the major responsibility to deliver. The MCSD Secretariat, with the support of other MAP bodies, through external resources if necessary, should elaborate on the strategic recommendations and proposals for action, making them more explicit and strengthening them with detailed guidelines. Implementing the recommendations and proposals for action remains the responsibility of governments at all levels in cooperation with other stakeholders. Follow-up responsibility should mainly be entrusted to MEDU, which should also encourage all MAP bodies to integrate such recommendations and proposals for action in their regular activities and programmes of work, including in their mainstream reporting requirements.

5. The Commission will periodically review and assess implementation of its recommendations and proposals for action. In order for the MCSD to be enabled to fulfil this function, the following should be adopted:
  - The MCSD Secretariat should prepare a common reporting format, following the Commission's Programme of Action, in consultation with CPs.
  - The MCSD Secretariat, on the basis of short voluntary reports from governments and the other actors on progress made with regard to the Commission's recommendations and proposals for action, should prepare a concise report on implementation and submit it to the MCSD.
  - The MCSD should review the report, assess progress made, formulate its findings and suggestions concerning implementation and submit them to the meetings of the CPs for further consideration.
  - Selected working groups could reconvene from time to time in order to assess the results of the periodic monitoring of the implementation of their recommendations and proposals for action.
6. The Commission's composition is its main strength and any changes should maintain its open, autonomous, advisory and representative nature, with members that are informed experts from various sectors and civil society in general. The MCSD should continue to consist of 36 members, with 15 seats allocated for the non-governmental sectors, on the basis of a flexible, broad and representational approach (e.g. trade unions, federations of professionals, consumer groups, women, youth, etc); members proposed by non-governmental partners should accept that they have a responsibility to consult with the sectors they represent on any particular issue.
7. To each session two to three ad hoc members could be invited, having special competence in the matters included in the agenda of a meeting.
8. The Commission will hold ordinary meetings once every year, to last for three days and consider a limited number of issues each time. In its working methods, the Commission and its groups should be encouraged to fully utilize the potentials offered by modern technology. The practice of holding meetings in various countries will be maintained, but proposals to host such meetings should be accompanied by a substantial contribution of the host country towards the logistics of the meeting.
9. The reasons that restrict the effective and active participation of some groups should be addressed through direct contacts with the organizations concerned so as to allow all groups to take advantage of, and contribute to, the opportunities and challenges offered by the setting up of the MCSD.
10. Representatives of the various agencies to MCSD meetings should be invited not only to MCSD meetings, but also, on the basis of the relevance of the issues to their interests, to meetings of working groups, participating with equality of interaction as stakeholders.
11. Every effort must be exerted to establish connections with the Type II Initiatives launched either in Johannesburg or later which are of special interest to the Mediterranean. The Commission should also strongly encourage its members to

develop additional partnership Initiatives guided by the “Bali criteria” for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) partnerships.

12. The MCSD proposes to the CPs that they mandate the MAP Coordinator to identify, through outside professional advice, the appropriate means required for the MAP structure, including the MCSD, to successfully respond to the requirements for the promotion of sustainable development at regional level and make appropriate recommendations thereon to the CPs.
13. A clear distinction should be maintained between the functions of the MCSD Secretariat (coordination, policy and strategic issues, etc) and the function of the RAC support centres (basically for “thematic issues” and related activities including some kind of follow-up). All RACs are encouraged to refocus their programmes more on sustainable development issues and act as support centres for the scientific and technical aspects of the MCSD’s “thematic” activities.
14. The potentials offered by current manpower resources and relevant arrangements within MEDU should be fully utilized, with outside professional advice if necessary, in order to give greater visibility not only to the MCSD but to MAP itself, as an integral part of a structured communications strategy.
15. A multi-stakeholder fund-raising strategy should be developed as an integral part of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development under preparation within MCSD/MAP.
16. At its 2004 session, the Commission should adopt a Programme of Work for the period 2005-2015, based on the priorities of relevant global, regional and national initiatives, such as the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) and national commissions on sustainable development, as they relate to the Mediterranean specificities.

**ANNEX IV**

<b><u>WORKING GROUPS, 8<sup>th</sup> MCSD MEETING</u></b>	
<b>Assessment and Prospects for the MCSD SIPUN conference room, 5<sup>th</sup> floor, near the main elevators</b>	<b>Orientations for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, ORLANDO conference room (plenary)</b>
ATTIA	ATTIA
KANDIL	KANDIL
HENTATI	HENTATI
ADLY	DROCOURT
FONTENEAU	MILIC
VAN KLAVEREN	SKALA
MIFSUD	MUCHAI
LASCARATOS	TRUMBIC
GORI	CATHERINE FAUTRIER
GEORGIADES	BERNARD FAUTRIER
ANTOINE	UHEL
RONIOTES	DOTEN
IACOMELLI	VECINO
MEZEK	CHARTIER-TOUZE
FUSANI	ENNABLI
BOARGOB	LEBLANC
MASTROVIC	TOMASSINI
PARPAL	MOURMOURIS
	ARIYAK
	RAJSIC
	RUKLIC
	D'ANGELO
	KUPUSOVIC
	BRIAND
	CIVILI

**ANNEX V**

**AGENDA of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)  
Cavtat, Croatia 14-16 May 2003**

	<b>Wednesday 14 May 2003</b>	<b>Thursday 15 May 2003</b>	<b>Friday 16 May 2003</b>
<b>0900-1100</b>	<b><u>S1: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Opening</li> <li>○ Election of the Steering Committee</li> <li>○ Adoption of the Agenda</li> <li>○ Organisation of the meeting</li> <li>○ WSSD and the Med.</li> </ul>	<b><u>S56: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wrap up from “Orientations” Group and discussion</li> </ul>	<b><u>S9: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation and discussion of MCSD “thematic” issues: progress and proposals</li> </ul>
<b>1100-1130</b>	Coffee Break	Coffee Break	Coffee Break
<b>1130-1300</b>	<b><u>S2: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vision for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean.</li> <li>○ Introduction to next items and organisation of break-out sessions</li> </ul>	<b><u>S6: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wrap up from “Orientations” Group and discussion</li> <li>○ Wrap up from “MCSD Assessment and Prospects” and discussion</li> </ul>	<b><u>S10: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 9<sup>th</sup> MCSD meeting (venue)</li> <li>○ Any other matters</li> <li>○ Adoption of the brief report and proposals**</li> <li>○ Closure of the meeting (14.00)</li> </ul>
<b>1300-1430</b>	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	Lunch Break
<b>1430-1600</b>	<b><u>S3: Break-out Sessions (parallel)</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MSSD Orientations*</li> <li>○ MCSD Assessment and Prospects</li> </ul>	<b><u>S7: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wrap up from “MCSD Assessment and Prospects” and discussion</li> </ul>	<b><i>S11: Side Event/ NGOs-MIO-ECSDE</i></b>
<b>1600-1630</b>	Coffee Break	Coffee Break	
<b>1630-1800</b>	<b><u>S4: Break-out Sessions</u></b>  (Continued)	<b><u>S8: Plenary</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presentation and discussion of MCSD “thematic” issues: progress and proposals</li> </ul>	
<b>1830-2000</b>	<b><i>Side Event /Croatia</i></b>	<b><i>Side Event/ Business-ICC/MED</i></b>	

\* Presentation and discussion on « Orientations » in the break out sessions will include a short presentation by BP/RAC on progress in preparing the Med. Environment and Development Report

\*\* As decided at the 7<sup>th</sup> MCSD meeting, only a brief report (maximum 10 pages) would be prepared and presented for adoption on 16 May in the morning.