



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

**EP**



UNEP/BUR/55/4  
3 July 2000

ENGLISH

---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

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

Malta, 9-10 May 2000

**REPORT**

**OF THE MEETING OF THE  
BUREAU OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES  
TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION  
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA AGAINST POLLUTION  
AND ITS PROTOCOLS**

## **Introduction**

1. The meeting of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols was held in Malta on 9 and 10 May 2000 at the Radisson SAS Hotel, St. Julians.

## **Participation**

2. The meeting was chaired by H.E. Mr. Francis Zammit Dimech, Minister for the Environment for Malta. It was attended by the following representatives: H.E. Mr. Farouk Adli, Minister of State for Environmental Affairs (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Gabriel P. Gabrielides, Director of the Department of Fisheries and Marine Research (Cyprus), Mr. Serge Antoine, French delegate to the MCSD, Committee 21 (France), Mr. Matteo Baradà, Director General of the Department for the Protection of the Sea, Ministry of the Environment (Italy), and Mr. Abdul Fattah Boargob, Head of the Department of Environmental Studies, Public Environment Authority (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya). H.E. Mr. Farouk Adli was accompanied by Mrs. Reem Abed Rabboh, adviser to the Minister, Mr. Serge Antoine by Mr. Laurent Caplat, head of the Mediterranean- Middle Eastern Mission, and Mr. Matteo Baradà by Mr. Francesco Valentini, Department for the Protection of the Sea, and Mr. Giovanni Guerrieri, Water, Waste and Land Department, Ministry of the Environment.

3. The Secretariat was represented by Mr. Lucien Chabason, Coordinator of the Mediterranean Action Plan, and Mr. Roberto Patruno, Director of the Malta-based Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC).

4. The full list of participants is contained in **Annex 1** to this document.

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

5. H.E. Mr. F. Zammit Dimech, President of the Bureau, welcomed all participants to Malta. He greeted H. E. Mr. Farouk Adli, the new Minister for the Environment for the Syrian Arab Republic. He stressed the interest of the various items on the agenda and recalled that the Eleventh Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties which was held in Malta in October 1999 had allowed further headway to be made in Mediterranean cooperation in the fields of the environment and sustainable development.

6. Mr. L. Chabason, MAP Coordinator, thanked H. E. Mr. F. Zammit Dimech and the Maltese government for the warm hospitality they had extended to the members of the Bureau and for the excellent way in which they had organised the meeting. Having in turn welcomed H. E. Mr. Farouk Adli, the new Syrian Minister for the Environment, on his first appearance in a MAP forum, he then went on to present the MAP medal to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, to be transmitted to Mr. Ibrahim Dharat, former Programme Officer in the MED Unit. Until his retirement in July 1999 Mr. Dharat had always acted as Secretary at meetings of the Bureau.

7. On behalf of Mr. I. Dharat who sent his apologies for not having been able to attend the meeting, Mr. A.F. Boargob thanked MAP for the honour being conferred upon him. On a personal note Mr. A.F. Boargob added that this honour was in recognition of the efficient work which Mr. Dharat had put in within MAP over so many years. The goal of Mr. Dharat, a Libyan citizen, had been to behave as a Mediterranean citizen. The Bureau President echoed his praise and called upon Mr. Boargob to pass on the best wishes of the entire MAP family to Mr. Dharat, in whom it saw a great artisan of Mediterranean cooperation.

**Agenda item 2: Adoption of the Agenda and Organisation of Work**

8. The meeting adopted the following agenda based on the draft agenda contained in document UNEP/55/1:

- 1. Opening of the meeting**
- 2. Adoption of the Agenda and organisation of work**
- 3. Activities since the 11<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties (Malta, 27-30 October 1999): Progress Report by the Coordinator and discussion of ongoing activities**
  - a) *MAP legal instruments (status of ratifications)*
  - b) *Status of the process of revision of the Emergency Protocol*
  - c) *Financial and institutional questions*
  - d) *Personnel issues*
  - e) *Information*
  - f) *Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development*
  - g) *MAP collaboration with the NGOs*
  - h) *Cooperation*
  - i) *Pollution prevention and control*
  - j) *Implementation of the L.B.S/SAP Protocol and the GEF project*
  - k) *Conservation of biodiversity*
  - l) *Integration of environment and development*
  - m) *Preservation of 100 historical sites*
- 4. Date and place of the next meeting of the Bureau**
- 5. Any other business**
- 6. Closure of the meeting**

**Agenda item 3: Activities since the 11<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties (Malta, 27-30 October 1999): Progress Report by the Coordinator and discussion of ongoing activities**

9. Mr. L. Chabason introduced the main points of his progress report contained in document UNEP/BUR/55/2, covering the period from October 1999 to April 2000. He pointed out that it contained several recommendations concerning decisions which the Bureau was expected to take and which corresponded to the main items on the agenda. He would run

through it in detail, section by section, in order to provide a sound basis for discussion and to allow the recommendations to be examined in order.

a) MAP legal instruments (state of ratifications)

10. The Coordinator pointed out that in this respect the situation was both positive and worrying: positive in that the new Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Biodiversity in the Mediterranean had come into force in December 1999 once six instruments of ratification had been deposited, thereby providing the legal basis allowing headway to be made in this field; and worrying because there were still major delays in the ratification of the other instruments. As had been requested by the Eleventh Ordinary Meeting, MAP had indeed taken every opportunity to urge countries to speed up their procedures as he, himself as Coordinator, had done particularly during visits. The Bureau was thus invited to adopt a new recommendation to this end.

11. The President stated that he felt it might be useful for the members of the Bureau to report on the state of the ratification process in their respective countries, and the planned timing in this respect, which would be a sign of encouragement for the other countries.

12. The Vice-President representing France stated that his country would have ratified the amendments to the Convention by the end of the year, with the SPA and L.B.S Protocols scheduled for discussion before the Senate in June, and by the National Assembly in the last quarter of 2000; for the new "Offshore" and "Hazardous Waste" Protocols, France was currently looking into the possibility of joining.

13. The representative of Cyprus stated that all the legal instruments save for the "Hazardous Waste" Protocol had been approved at governmental level and that Parliament now had to deal with the matter; he felt that an official letter from the President of the Bureau to the Contracting Parties could provide an effective prompt.

14. The Italian delegation pointed out the huge difference which existed between the amended and the new Protocols, the latter only requiring 6 ratifications as opposed to 15 for the former. It might therefore have been more advisable from the outset to view the L.B.S. Protocol (already amended) and the Emergency Protocol (currently undergoing revision) as new protocols in order to cut down on ratification time. Moreover, for the SPA Protocol which had already come into force, its scope was governed by the amended Convention which had not as yet come into force, which might well give rise to contradictions in terms of implementation.

15. The Coordinator felt this to be a most important matter from the legal point of view and in terms of efficiency. Under international law there were no effective criteria for deciding whether to opt for revision or to create a new instrument. With the 1995 and 1996 revisions MAP had based itself on the remit given to it by the Contracting Parties meeting in Antalya. But lessons ought to be learned for the future and in the case of the "Emergency" Protocol it would be up to the second meeting of experts to see whether it would not in fact be preferable to adopt a new text as long as it received a clear remit to that end. As for the new SPA Protocol, it was not incompatible with the previous Convention which was still in force. The present and former texts could exist in parallel. Generally speaking, although delays in ratification were reason for concern, it should not be forgotten that they were due in part to the fact that the revised texts- such as the "Dumping" Protocol- were much more binding and therefore required in-depth examination by the countries.

16. The Vice-President representing the Syrian Arab Republic thanked the other Bureau members for the kind words they had addressed to him. He stated that the "L.B.S.", "Dumping" and "SPA" Protocols were being studied by the national technical committee and

that his government would shortly be giving its opinion, whilst the matter of the adoption of the "Hazardous Waste" Protocol would be dealt with at a later stage.

### **Recommendation**

**The Bureau renewed its appeal to all Contracting Parties to expedite procedures to ratify the amendments to the Barcelona Convention and its amended Protocols as well as new Protocols. The President of the Bureau shall send a letter in these terms to the countries concerned.**

#### b) Status of the process of revision of the "Emergency" Protocol

17. The Coordinator recalled the way in which the current process for the revision of the "Emergency" Protocol had developed. The second meeting of Legal and technical Experts responsible for revising the text was scheduled for next September, and the Conference of Plenipotentiaries responsible for its adoption for February-March 2001, with the proviso that the necessary funding could be found. As far as funding was concerned, no appropriations were included in the MAP budget, as they were traditionally provided by countries. In the case of the experts' meeting, negotiations were currently underway with Italy, and the Conference of Plenipotentiaries was planned to take place in Malta, although the funding still remained to be found, from which was depending the final setting of the meeting dates.

18. The Coordinator stressed that the revision of this Protocol had taken on a new slant since the *Erika* shipwreck off Brittany in December 1999, which had prompted questions at both European and global level about certain shortcomings in maritime security. The Mediterranean needed an ambitious text within the framework of the IMO's international regulations. MAP had, moreover, been approached by an NGO which would like to see a regional meeting organised which would be open to all players concerned and would assess the state of safety in shipping. Such a meeting would allow civil society to become more closely involved in the current process.

19. The Vice-President representing France pointed out that he was speaking on behalf of the country which had fallen victim to the accident and which would be facing huge costs as a result of its ecological, economic and tourist repercussions. Nor did the matter stop at *Erika*. It extended beyond to all ships which caused chronic pollution. On the accident itself, investigations were currently underway, and would no doubt reveal a sequence of liability. The maritime safety issue had been adopted as one of the priorities of the French Presidency of the EU due to kick off in July, and was already the subject of intense concertation at both European and international levels. In the case of the "Emergency" Protocol it was important to clearly identify the specifically Mediterranean issues, to see how to guarantee effective controls in order to achieve optimal security, and to have responsibility shared between the various different actors. It was essential to involve civil society, and to use every opportunity for contact, such as the forum on maritime transport of hazardous substances to be held in Paris on 22 and 23 June 2000. MAP was invited to circulate any information about meetings and conferences planned on this subject. For its part, France stated that it would inform the Contracting Parties of the lessons to be learned from the *Erika* accident and the measures planned to avoid a repeat of any such incident.

20. The Rapporteur representing the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya noted with satisfaction that both the MAP Secretariat and REMPEC were studying the matter very carefully, and that the timetable for revision provided enough time for reflection, because in such an important area it was essential not to rush into things. The idea of widening the field of consultation within the experts' meeting would mean that any new problems which cropped up in the meantime could be defined.

21. The Vice-President representing Italy felt that the emotional shock of recent events- extremely serious in themselves- was not the only factor behind the revision. It was but one factor in a vast context of international law where complicated notions such as insurance and the sharing of responsibility were at stake, and that it would be legitimate to ask exactly what was going to be revised. When the future text was discussed, use of the term “amendments” was to be avoided, in order to leave open the possibility of a completely new instrument.

22. The Vice-President representing the Syrian Arab Republic pointed out that REMPEC, which bore responsibility for the situation in the Mediterranean, should be closely involved in this new area of work for Mediterranean law. Syria laid great stress on this question since, given its position on the Eastern shores of the Mediterranean and the direction of currents in the basin, its coasts received a goodly share of spillages.

23. On behalf of Malta and the Bureau as a whole the President expressed his deep sympathy to France which today, as in the past, had fallen victim to this type of accident on its Atlantic seaboard. It was a most serious problem and we would be reproached by history if we were simply to push it into the background. An objective analysis should be carried out with an eye to introducing new and very stringent rules. Any similar accident in the Mediterranean would have even more disastrous consequences. For years now REMPEC had been carrying out excellent work on crisis management. The NGO’s proposal for a regional conference was positive and would encourage follow-up involving other actors and civil society.

24. The Vice-President representing Cyprus also expressed his regrets at the accident which had affected France. Any debate obviously did not centre on the need for a revision but rather at what level of competence it should come about. The IMO had a specific commitment and a meeting of Mediterranean actors simply to level criticism at the present state of play would not necessarily be appropriate. It would be more advisable to combine a meeting with the IMO’s Safety Committee to which technical experts could invite representatives of civil society.

25. The Director of REMPEC thanked the members of the Bureau for their kind words about the Centre’s work, and for their support. In REMPEC’s case, the lesson to be learned from the *Erika* shipwreck was that a new area was being opened up for the Centre’s work which should be reflected in a new remit for the Centre allowing it to monitor the implementation of those international conventions already approved. In order to be effective in the legal field, however, the switch should be made from the regional context to the global context as governed by the IMO; in this context the role of REMPEC- a centre of regional scope- would of necessity have to fall within the field of activity conferred upon it by the Contracting Parties.

26. As support for the regional meeting proposed by an NGO was not unanimous, a discussion then ensued on a proposal to precede the experts’ meeting by an “introductory day” during which actors from civil society would provide their own views for the completion of the Protocol. According to one representative, however, funding for the meeting had still not been found, and experts would not have received instructions to react to the new proposals. Finally at the President’s suggestion the Bureau agreed on a compromise formula which it included in the following recommendation.

### **Recommendation**

**With regard to the revision of the “Emergency” Protocol, the Bureau invited the Secretariat to arrange a written consultation process with those environmental and economic NGOs which were active in this field in the Mediterranean, so as to collect their positions and convey them to the Legal and Technical Experts attending the 2<sup>nd</sup>**

**Meeting to revise the draft Protocol. NGOs concerned would be invited to attend the meeting as observers. The Secretariat shall remind the Contracting Parties that the adoption of a new Protocol rather than an amended one would entail the advantage of facilitating its entry into force, as only six ratifications would be required. Moreover, the Secretariat was invited to take every opportunity to facilitate the dialogue between the actors concerned on environmental questions related to maritime safety.**

c) Financial and Institutional Questions

27. Introducing this heading, the Coordinator stressed that, compared with the financial crises it had faced in the past, MAP's current position was improving. A satisfactory revolving fund had been rebuilt which meant that certain activities only foreseen in the 2000-2001 budget-programme if funds were available might be undertaken. To this end, the Secretariat would forward a report to the Bureau on the financial situation for its next meeting. On 12 April 2000 the situation concerning contributions to the Mediterranean Trust Fund showed that four countries had paid their contribution for 2000. Arrears principally concerned two countries apart from the 469,976 US dollars owed by the former Yugoslavia which for many years had been posing a problem of legal succession which the countries which had emerged following the break-up of the state had not managed to resolve.

28. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that because of the position it had found itself in within the United Nations over recent years his country had had difficulties in paying its contributions. Now that the embargo had been lifted, and following the agreement reached with MAP on means of payment, half of the arrears would be paid in the near future, with the remaining half following shortly. The representatives of those countries in the Bureau which had not as yet paid their 2000 contribution indicated that the relative procedures were underway and would soon be completed. The representative of France felt that if a call for contributions were to be sent out before the start of each new year this would shorten the administrative formalities, and he invited the Secretariat to lobby UNEP to this end.

29. Regarding the problem of arrears in the case of the former Yugoslavia, the Bureau members felt that it was not possible to take any decision in the absence of the countries concerned and in any case, given the complex nature of the problem, it was up to the United Nations to indicate what rules applied in such circumstances. The Secretariat was thus mandated to clarify the matter with New York and Nairobi.

**Recommendation**

**The Bureau expressed its thanks to all those countries which had already paid their contributions for the year 2000; it took note with satisfaction of the announcements made by several countries that payment of their contributions was imminent, and invited all other countries to forward their contributions as promptly as possible. The Secretariat will request UNEP to send out its requests for payment of contributions before the beginning of each new year in order to expedite the national administrative procedures. In the case of arrears accrued by the former Yugoslavia, the Secretariat was requested to seek the guidance of the United Nations with regard to the rules to be applied under such circumstances and to report back on the results of this inquiry to the Bureau.**

d) Personnel issues

30. The Coordinator pointed out that the new means for preparing and following up budgetary questions adopted by the MED Unit would create new responsibilities for the

Budget Assistant. Consequently, this post would require upgrading, although this would not entail any implications for the Trust Fund since it was paid from the UNEP Programme Support Costs. All members of the Bureau agreed to the upgrading.

## **Recommendation**

**The Bureau consented to the upgrading of the MEDU's Budget Assistant post from G5 to G6.**

### e) Information

31. The Coordinator recalled that the adoption of "MAP's Information Strategy" by the Eleventh Meeting in Malta in October 1999 implied certain obligations for MAP which it had begun to shoulder. The recruitment of an Information Officer by transforming the existing post was already underway and would be completed by the next summer, MAP's brochure had been updated and was soon to be published, and a draft logo with six variants was awaiting selection by the Bureau.

32. Regarding the brochure, the representatives of Syria and Libya expressed surprise that there had never been an Arabic version of the previous brochure. In more general terms, more of MAP's documentation and information material should be translated into Arabic. There were seven Arabic speaking countries, no Mediterranean country was strictly English-speaking, and the other three working languages of the meetings and conferences of the Parties were only spoken by one country apiece. It therefore went without saying that wider distribution in Arabic would serve MAP's cause by making its achievements better known, and by creating a favourable impression on political leaders.

33. Mr. L. Chabason recalled that certain provisions in the Rules of Procedure governed language use within MAP and that although English and French were the two working languages for experts' meetings and other more run-of-the-mill meetings, Arabic was one of the four official languages in the meetings and diplomatic conferences of the Contracting Parties, as was Spanish. The Secretariat would ensure that this new brochure was published in Arabic, as would all the other support material aimed at a wide audience.

34. The draft logo was discussed at length by participants. Of the six options before them which were annexed to the Coordinator's report, it was the fifth option which gained the support of the majority of members. Several participants, however, whilst acknowledging the quality of the work, questioned the legibility of the central element in the favoured logo, i.e. the geographical representation of the Mediterranean Sea. If a survey were to be carried out amongst the general public on the street, how many people would immediately grasp its significance? Particularly considering that a small scale version of the logo was to be applied to letters, brochures, etc., and that in such a format the central element would become nigh-on impossible to identify. Moreover, there was a problem with the representation of the sea itself: by including watersheds the new Convention exceeded the limits established by the eastern basin, where it would also be advisable to indicate the direction of the currents in stylised form. And shouldn't some idea be given of the Mediterranean's place in the world?

35. The President, whilst noting that logo no. 5 was supported by the majority of participants, recognised the relevance of the comments about legibility: given the circumstances, it would perhaps be advisable either to run a type of test amongst the general public or to organise a competition amongst certain groups such as school pupils, students, etc. One representative supported the idea of a competition, seeing this as an opportunity to spark off an "affinity flow" towards MAP.



36. The Coordinator pointed out that summer was just around the corner and that if this type of competition were organised for certain sectors of the population at this time of year it could well be left with no takers. Moreover, the discussion showed just how hard it was to invent a logo which would meet various legibility criteria. If the competition were to be organised it would be more advisable to work through MAP's usual contacts and open it to professionals- graphic artists and designers- in Mediterranean countries, with the proviso that they receive a clear indication of the elements to be incorporated and the desired symbolism. Participants backed this solution, stressing various elements for inclusion (wave movement, currents, geographical limits), and the need to maintain the Secretariat's essential contribution. At the end of the discussion and following a proposal by the President they adopted the following recommendation.

### **Recommendation**

**After examining a set of logo design proposals submitted by the Secretariat, the Bureau invited the Secretariat to compile a list of requisites for the logo ( symbolic content, visibility, size, etc.), and to distribute said list to the MAP Focal Points which would then invite graphic artists and designers from their respective countries to produce their own concepts. The logo design proposals thus collected, together with those developed or amended by the Secretariat, would be submitted to the next Bureau meeting for final selection, in liaison with UNEP.**

#### f) Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

37. Before tackling this heading the Coordinator pointed out to the members of the Bureau that two documents amongst MAP's recent publications struck him as important, both of them coordinated by the representative of Cyprus, Mr. G.P. Gabrielides, whilst he was still MAP Programme Administrator, before leaving this job to take up a new post back home: firstly, a joint report by the European Environment Agency and MAP on the state of the Mediterranean marine environment and the pressures therein, including an important contribution from the Italian thematic centre in La Spezia, and some rich, updated data; and secondly the Proceedings of the Workshop held in March 1998 in Heraklion (Crete) on *Caulerpa taxifolia*, where consensus was reached amongst the scientific community on such a tricky issue.

38. Moving on to recent developments related to the MCSD, Mr. L. Chabason mentioned the preparation of the Strategic Review which was progressing well with the first national reports coming in. The Review was of prime importance to the success of the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, since a good Review would make the MCSD better known to the region's decision- takers. As the members of the Bureau had already been informed, the UN-CSD which had promised to join the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting in Tunis, had withdrawn for financial reasons. This did not in any way undermine the scope of the Tunis meeting, however, which would have a ministerial segment.

39. Concerning the national and regional reports foreseen for the Strategic Review, the representative of France emphasised the matter of follow-up: the clocks should not be stopped the minute the documents landed on the table. As those who had worked for any length of time with the OECD were aware, it was the "post" dialogue which counted, with requests for clarification and further information, this type of dialogue being impossible at global level. Seen in this light, the UN-CSD's withdrawal seemed less serious.

40. The representative of Italy wondered why the UN-CSD had really backed down: should this not also be seen as a growth crisis within the body in question which had taken on too many problems all at once, with documents all too often simply ending up on a shelf?

And was this not something which was also likely to affect the MCSD in the longer term? For its part Italy, a thematic group coordinator, was striving to set up an interactive rather than a passive information system, to allow for fruitful exchange between actors and not just theoretical work by a handful of experts. If this system, which was also being tried out at UNIDO in Trieste, proved its worth it could well be replicated under other circumstances.

41. The Coordinator suggested that this discussion could be started following the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MCSD and the circulation of the Strategic Review. He nevertheless echoed these comments, pointing out that many leaders and experts had doubts as to whether sustainable development could be dealt with effectively at global level. In this respect, "Rio + 5" had raised many questions by showing that it was not possible to apply the self-same analysis to countries with different levels of development and facing such diverse problems. However at regional level, such as the Mediterranean, besides the differences in level and type of development, there were nonetheless common problems- such as the marine environment- as well as problems which we have in common, such as the impact of tourism, coastal urbanisation, the sustainable management of our historical heritage, consumption patterns and their ecological impact; the Strategic Review and the discussions it would prompt would show whether the MCSD was capable of carrying out an in-depth analysis of concrete scope which would be of use to the actors involved. The Bureau could discuss this substantive point at its first meeting in 2001.

42. Having been presented by the Secretariat with the two candidatures which they had to choose between in order to fill the fifth and final seat in the MCSD's "socio-economic actors" category, the members of the Bureau acknowledged the fact that on the basis of their resumes annexed to the progress report they were both of equal merit, and that they covered activities which corresponded to the two major themes currently being studied by the MCSD, i.e. "industry and environment" and "free trade and environment". It was important to bring a solid and active economic organisation into the MCSD. So the Bureau was spoilt for choice and would have to base itself on criteria apart from the unquestionable intrinsic value of the two organisations, such as geographical balance. On this basis, a study of the geographical origins of the three groups since 1996 led to the selection of the Egyptian Federation. Consequently, the Bureau adopted the following recommendation.

### **Recommendation**

**After having noted that the two candidatures received were of equal value, the Bureau decided to select the Federation of Egyptian Industries (FEI) as the fifth member of the Socio-economic Actors group of the MCSD.**

#### **g) MAP collaboration with NGOs**

43. Introducing this heading, the Secretariat recalled that the Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties in Malta had approved the inclusion of 12 new organisations which had so requested on the list of MAP's NGO partners. To date a great degree of liberalism had always governed the choice of partners rather than any clear objective criteria. In the future, therefore, the inclusion of new NGOs should be further rationalised and possible checking and reassessment procedures introduced, and in order to achieve this the Secretariat had been invited by the Contracting Parties to give some thought to the need to add additional criteria for the selection of the best-qualified NGOs. This work was ongoing and by the next meeting of the Bureau the Secretariat should be in a position to submit a more thorough method of selection.

h) Cooperation

44. As a follow-up to the decision taken by the Contracting Parties Meeting in Malta to support the request of the Palestinian Authority to participate in MAP activities, the Coordinator reported on his recent visit to the Palestinian Territories, and more specifically to the Gaza Strip, in order to discuss the situation on the spot and the possibilities of cooperating with MAP with H.E. Dr. Yousef Abu Safieh, Minister of the Environment, and the competent departments. The Palestinian leadership was faced with serious environmental problems- particularly in the refugee camps- in the areas of rehabilitation, solid waste, water resources and coastal urbanisation. Moreover, tourism was starting to take off. The Palestinian Authority expressed its determination to tackle these problems, and for this purpose it had set up some sound structures staffed by highly qualified personnel, most of which enjoyed substantial bilateral or multilateral support, primarily and to varying degrees from European countries, and wanted to put the funds allotted them to the best possible use. The Palestinian Authority was already involved in the activities of REMPEC and the MEDSTAT project implemented under the aegis of EUROSTAT in order to build up the statistical capacity of the countries on the southern and eastern banks of the Mediterranean. In accordance with the decision of the Contracting Parties and the wishes of the Palestinian Authority one possibility could be to initially involve the latter in the MED POL programme and the work of the MCSD, and possibly also the activities funded by the French GEF, such as pre-investment studies for any pollution "hot spots" identified in the Palestinian Territories.

45. Concluding, the Coordinator proposed that the Bureau should decide that participation by the Palestinian Authority as well as that of Palestinian delegates and experts in the MED POL programme and the work of the MCSD should be funded by MAP.

46. The President, followed in turn by all the other Bureau members, congratulated the Coordinator on the outcome of his visit to the Palestinian Territories and his express will to implement the decision taken at the last meeting of the Contracting Parties with no further ado. It was generally felt that the time was ripe to bring the Palestinians into the Mediterranean family and to help them to solve the difficulties they were facing in the field of the environment and sustainable development. Some participants confirmed that they themselves had noted a high degree of professionalism amongst the Palestinian officials responsible for dealing with such issues.

47. Thus although in substance there was total agreement amongst the members of the Bureau on gradually bringing the Palestinian Authority into MAP activities, which would also be a factor of peace, two representatives expressed hesitations as to the form which this participation would take, particularly since it would have financial implications, albeit modest. It was the first time that a body aspiring to state-ship which was not a Party to the Convention, and was still not recognised as a state by the United Nations where it held observer status, would be associated with MAP, which raised a problem of law and could create a precedent likely to be invoked by other bodies in the region. Would it not be possible to get around this obstacle by requesting the Palestinian Authority to pay a symbolic voluntary contribution, for example, a sort of "visiting card" to join the "club"? Couldn't some sort of arrangement be found?

48. Another representative pointed out that they could not stand in for the Contracting Parties on major decisions; the Bureau should, however, use its full clout when it had a mandate. Point 162 of the report from the Malta meeting was absolutely explicit and spoke of unanimous support for the Palestinian Authority's request for participation: it was therefore just a matter of implementing it.

49. Summing up discussions on this point, the Coordinator stated that they were faced with a unique, one-off situation which should be dealt with in a one-off manner, using the

legal basis provided by the decision of the Contracting Parties. There was a duty of solidarity. Moreover, the matter of MAP financial support put MAP's reputation on the line. The Euro-Mediterranean partnership and METAP had long been inviting the Palestinians to their meetings and some of their programmes: MAP should show itself to be flexible and to anticipate change.

50. One representative stated that since this financial-type decision had not been on the agenda he had no instructions from his government on this subject and would therefore have to report back to it before informing MAP of its position.

51. Having taken note of this statement, the President pointed out that the progress report clearly stated that the Coordinator would report to the Bureau on the outcome of his visit to the Palestinian Territories, made in the light of the decision taken by the Contracting Parties in Malta on participation of the Palestinian Authority in MAP activities. The President suggested that the representative's statement should be noted in the following recommendation which was adopted by all the other members of the Bureau.

### **Recommendation**

**In application of a unanimous decision by the 11<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of Contracting Parties in Malta, the Bureau decided to endorse the request from the Palestinian Authority to take part in MAP's activities. As a first stage, the Palestinian Authority would be associated with the MED POL programme and MCSD activities. The Secretariat would, within reason, assure the appropriate resources for this purpose. One delegate stated that he would need to report to his government and that he would inform MAP of his country's final position within two months.**

#### **i) Pollution Prevention and Control**

52. Having briefly run through the activities of the MED POL programme, the Secretariat drew the attention of the Bureau to the Meeting of Experts on Compliance and Enforcement of Legislation in the Mediterranean for Control of Pollution resulting from Land-based Sources and Activities, which was held in Athens from 16-18 March 1999, under the aegis of MED POL. On this occasion delegates recommended to the Secretariat that it establish contact with other regional and international networks for the exchange of information and experience in this field. The Secretariat did just that in approaching the INECE (Network for Environmental Compliance and Enforcement), which brought regional networks together on a global basis. The members of the Bureau would find an information sheet about this network in the annex, with a "declaration of intent", and they were asked to decide whether MAP should join this network.

53. On the actual principle the members of the Bureau did not raise any objections, although they did request some clarification as to what obligations affiliation to INECE would entail in terms of time, participation in meetings, and expenditure.

54. The Coordinator replied that it was first and foremost a question of general policy: it was a good thing to belong to global networks. In this respect, INECE was an active, effective network dealing with the enforcement of environmental conventions and legislation, and the inspectorates responsible for monitoring. But there was no question of being tied down by over-binding commitments which would result in an excess of work for MAP: with INECE it would be a case of working out some highly flexible form of cooperation.

55. Noting that there was a consensus in favour of a very general mandate the President had the following recommendation approved.

## Recommendation

**The Bureau agreed in principle to the idea of establishing some form of association with the INECE network and requested the Secretariat to explore how this could be achieved so as best to reflect MAP's effective requirements in terms of funding and participation. The Secretariat would report back on this issue at the next Bureau meeting.**

### j) Implementation of the L.B.S./SAP Protocol and the GEF Project

56. The Coordinator provided some additional detail regarding the Mediterranean project financed by the GEF: the project document had been approved by the GEF Council in April 2000, there would shortly be a recruitment announcement for the Project Manager who would be responsible for it within the MED Unit, and a meeting was to be held imminently in Paris in order to conclude a memorandum of understanding with the French GEF on the activities it was to fund. Given the amounts involved and the stringent implementing procedures, the GEF Project would render MAP much more operational than it had been in the past, which meant that ratification of the L.B.S. Protocol on which the project was based was more pressing than ever.

57. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic recalled that under the "Syrian Coastline" CAMP from some years back a study of pollution from land-based sources had helped identify two major pollution "hot spots" at Baniyas and Djéblé caused by the presence of refineries, the lack of any effluent treatment and the increase in discharges. In order to make use of this old CAMP to which no follow-up had been given, would it be possible for MAP or donors to provide financial assistance to do something about these "hot spots"?

58. In his response the Coordinator indicated that the GEF's first activities would be the identification of at least one "hot spot" per country, followed by pre-investment studies. Available funds would allow twelve studies to be conducted in GEF-eligible countries. Syria could therefore benefit from this. In more general terms concerning the CAMPs from the generation to which the Syrian one belonged, it was true that there had been no follow-up as such, which would have allowed the results to have been put to good use. Through PAP/RAC in Split MAP was currently preparing a coastal management project which would be submitted for funding to the EU's MEDA financial instrument. This project would include a section on CAMP implementation in which Syria should be involved in order to benefit from funding if the project were accepted.

### k) Conservation of biodiversity

59. The Secretariat pointed out that, following the entry into force of the new SPA Protocol in December 1999, the Tunis Centre was endeavouring to adopt new tools for the implementation of certain aspects in the conservation of biodiversity. This applied in particular to the list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Interest (SPAMIs) for which a standard form and guidelines had to be drawn up.

60. Following confirmation by the representative of France that the proposal for a meeting to this end was being studied by the services of the French Ministry of the Environment, that the principle of its funding had been accepted and that the "Collectivité Territoriale" of Corsica was prepared to host it, the President had the Bureau approve the following recommendation.

## Recommendation

**The Bureau approved the idea of convening a meeting of experts to develop a standard form and guidelines for the SPAMI list and thanked France and the *Collectivité territoriale* of Corsica for their willingness to host and resource this meeting.**

61. The Secretariat recalled that the Eleventh meeting of the Contracting Parties in Malta had been the forum for a discussion of the standard data entry form for the national inventories of natural sites of conservation interest. Whilst endorsing the general framework, it felt that the form was not entirely applicable to marine sites and therefore called a new meeting in order to improve it. Exceptionally, the Contracting Parties had empowered the Bureau to adopt the final version of the form, which would be produced by the meeting which Italy offered to host and to finance.

62. The representative of Italy confirmed that the planned meeting had been held in Rome on 23 and 24 March 2000 with the support of ICRAM, and that his country fully endorsed the final version of the form which was drawn up on that occasion, which was available to the members of the Bureau in a separate document. Consequently, the President invited the Bureau to adopt the following recommendation.

## Recommendation

**The Bureau adopted the Standard Data Entry Form for national inventories of natural sites of conservation interest approved by the experts' meeting held in Rome from 23 to 24 March 2000; it expressed its gratitude to Italy for having hosted and resourced the meeting.**

### l) Integration of Environment and Development

63. The Secretariat briefly presented activities organised within the framework of the BP/RAC in Sophia Antipolis, the PAP/RAC in Split and the Coastal Areas Management Programme (CAMP). He seized on the fact that this meeting was being held in Malta to stress the particular interest of the CAMP which was going to be organised there following the preparatory meeting in Athens in September 1999, and the agreement signed two months after between MAP and the Maltese authorities. Given the nature of its land and the human pressures exerted upon it the Maltese CAMP would be a most beneficial exercise and would serve as an example to other Mediterranean coastal or island areas interested in hosting a CAMP. The President of the Bureau echoed these words in expressing his satisfaction at the agreement reached and the benefit his country would draw from it.

64. Concerning the activities of the CP/RAC, the representatives of Syria and France pointed out that although they had appointed a focal point for cleaner production, they had not been informed of the two experts' meetings held in October 1999, and requested the Secretariat to inform the Barcelona Centre accordingly in order to receive the necessary information in due time and to appoint their experts. Moreover, on indicators for sustainable development, the representative of France requested the Secretariat to establish by the next meeting of the Bureau whether the regular meetings of Mediterranean statisticians which had taken place in the past still existed because if the answer was yes, steps should be undertaken to ensure that they included environmental and sustainable development concerns in their work.

m) Preservation of 100 historical sites

65. Moving on to this heading the Coordinator recalled that the Marseilles programme did not receive any funding from the Trust Fund, but was still running on the basis of its own funds within MAP. The Secretariat would not lose sight of the fact that it would have to carry out an assessment of this programme so that the Contracting Parties could decide whether or not it should be integrated into MAP by putting an end to the very vague status which had been its lot for many years.

66. The representative of France pointed out that in the "Genoa Declaration" adopted by the Contracting Parties in 1985 for MAP's second decade, there was a very clear commitment to the priority of the 100 historical sites and the Mediterranean cultural heritage. As far as he was aware, this commitment still stood, and it would be unfortunate if the heritage and cultural dimension were to completely disappear from MAP, particularly as it incurred no cost.

67. The representative of Italy asked that the programme of 100 historical sites be passed on to UNESCO, which was logical in every respect, even though it was no burden on MAP's budget. Since 1985 MAP had undergone a profound change. It had become involved in the major MED POL/SAP enterprise with clear-cut timetables, in the various CAMPs, and in the conservation of biodiversity- a notion which was barely emerging back then-, and all this with a budget-programme which was being squeezed. It should therefore avoid spreading itself too thinly when there was an international organisation such as UNESCO whose vocation it was to "oversee" this type of programme.

68. The President pointed out that the Bureau could but take note of the divergent view expressed by two of its members on a matter which was obviously not a priority, and that the assessment which MAP was to carry out would decide one way or the other.

69. Noting that the general discussions on the progress report were drawing to a close, the President thanked the Coordinator for the clarification he had given on the various decisions which the Bureau had been called upon to take, which had greatly facilitated them. The discussions had shown that the recommendations adopted in Malta were being applied in dynamic fashion, for which the Secretariat should be congratulated.

**Agenda item 4: Date and Place of the next Meeting of the Bureau**

70. **The Bureau gratefully accepted the offer of the Syrian Arab Republic to host its next meeting in Damascus.** The final dates would be fixed in concertation between the Syrian authorities, the Secretariat and the members of the Bureau, preferably in the last week of October or the first week in November 2000.

71. The representative of Cyprus announced that his government was willing to host the Bureau meeting following the one in Damascus. The members of the Bureau readily accepted the idea of this invitation and thanked the Cypriot government.

**Agenda item 5: Any other business**

72. No matters were raised under this agenda item.

**Agenda item 6:      Closure of the meeting**

73. The meeting examined a record of its recommendations which it adopted with several amendments. The Secretariat pointed out that the *in extenso* report of the meeting would shortly be sent to the Libyan representative, the rapporteur for the Bureau, who would review and possibly revise it, before then being sent out to all members of the Bureau. They would make any comments so that the Secretariat could then draw up the final version.

74. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 11.45 on Wednesday, 10 May 2000.



**ANNEX I**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**MALTA  
MALTE**

**President**  
**H.E. Francis Zammit Dimech**  
Minister for the Environment  
Ministry for the Environment  
Floriana CMR 02  
Malta

Tel: 356-222378  
Fax: 356-250335

**CYPRUS  
CHYPRE**

**Vice-President**  
**Mr Gabriel Gabrielides**  
Director  
Department of Fisheries and Marine  
Research MANRE  
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural  
Resources and Environment  
13 Aeolou Street  
Nicosia  
Cyprus

Tel: 357-2-807867  
Fax: 357-2-775955  
E-mail: ggabriel@cytanet.com.cy

**FRANCE  
FRANCE**

**Vice-Président**  
**Mr Serge Antoine**  
Délégué de la France à la CMDD  
Comité 21  
8 rue Antoine Bourdelle  
F-75015 Paris  
France

Tel: 33-1-42848421  
Fax: 33-1-42848420  
E-mail: comitell@worldnet.fr

**Mr Laurent Caplat**

Chargé de mission Méditerranée -  
Moyen Orient  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du  
Territoire et de l'Environnement  
20 Avenue de Ségur  
F-75302 Paris 07 SP  
France

Tel: 33-1-42191705

Fax: 33-1-42191719

E-mail: laurent.caplat@environnement.gouv.fr

**ITALY  
ITALIE**

**Vice-President**

**Dr. Matteo Baradà**

Direttore Generale  
Ispettorato Centrale per la difesa  
del Mare  
Ministero dell'Ambiente  
Piazza Venezia, 11  
00187-Rome  
Italie

Tel: 39-06-57223429-31

Fax: 39-06-57223470

**Dr. Francesco Valentini**

Ispettorato Centrale per la difesa  
del Mare  
Ministero dell'Ambiente  
Piazza Venezia, 11  
00187-Rome  
Italie

Tel: 39-06-57223429-31

Fax: 39-06-57223470

**Mr Giovanni Guerrieri**

Servizio Acqua, Rigiuti e Suolo  
Ministero dell'Ambiente  
Via della Ferratella in Laterano 33  
00184-Rome  
Italie

Tel: 39-06-70362219

Fax: 39-06-77257012

E-mail: guerrieri@flashnet.it

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC  
REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE**

**Vice-President**

**H.E. Mr Farouk Adli**

Minister of State for Environmental  
Affairs

Ministry of State for Environmental  
Affairs

Tolyani Street

P.O. Box 3773

Damascus

Syrian Arab Republic

Tel: 963-11-2234309

Fax: 963-11-3335645

**Ms Reem Abed Rabboh**

Ministry of State for Environmental  
Affairs

Tolyani Street

P.O. Box 3773

Damascus

Syrian Arab Republic

Tel: 963-11-2234309

Fax: 963-11-3335645

**LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA  
JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE**

**Rapporteur**

**Mr Abdul Fattah Boargob**

Head

Department of Environmental Studies

Environment Public Authority

Tukia Street - Eldahra

P.O. Box 83618

Tripoli

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Tel: 218-21-4448452

Fax: 218-21-3338098

E-mail: epalibya@hotmail.gr

UNEP/BUR/55/4

Annex I

page 4

**UNEP/COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE  
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN (MAP)  
PNUE/UNITE DE COORDINATION DU  
PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA  
MEDITERRANEE (PAM)**

**Mr Lucien Chabason**

Coordinator

Tel: 30-1-7273101

E-mail: [chabason@unepmap.gr](mailto:chabason@unepmap.gr)

P.O. Box 18019

48, Vassileos Konstantinou Av.

11610 Athens

Greece

Tel: 30-1-7273100 (switchboard)

Fax: 30-1-7253196/7

E-mail: [unepmedu@unepmap.gr](mailto:unepmedu@unepmap.gr)