

Background information on the proposed effectiveness indicators

The 15th Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention held in Almeria, Spain (15-18 January 2008) decided to *establish a Working Group on Effectiveness that will work through electronic tools in order to develop, during the next biennium, a list of indicators on the effectiveness of measures taken to implement the Convention and its Protocols and the decisions adopted by the Meetings of the Contracting Parties, and to guide the work for the preparation of the Regional Assessment Report on Implementation for the years 2006-2007, for submission to and consideration by the 16th Meeting of the Contracting Parties in 2009.*

In addition, the 15th Meeting of the Contracting Parties requested the Secretariat to propose, in close collaboration with all MAP Components, the set of effectiveness indicators for discussion by the group.

With a view to implementing this Decision, the Executive Coordination Panel agreed, at its meeting in Malta in May 2008, to establish a group of experts composed of all MAP components in order to identify and prepare the first set of effectiveness indicators. It also recommended the use, for this purpose, of a tool developed by the Blue Plan and successfully implemented in the framework of CAMP projects, i.e. sustainability indicators, namely the method *IMAGINE: a Systemic and Prospective Sustainability Analysis*.

The Secretariat, with the technical support of the Blue Plan, coordinated the work of all concerned MAP components, namely MEDPOL, CP/RAC, REMPEC, SPA RAC, PAP/RAC and INFO/RAC, for the identification and selection of the first set of effectiveness indicators for submission to the virtual working group on Reporting as decided by the 15th Meeting of the Contracting Parties in Almeria.

With regard to the proposed set of effectiveness indicators, the following considerations may help reflection and review by the virtual working group:

1. The effectiveness indicators approved by the 15th Meeting of the Contracting Parties held in Almeria, together with the reporting format for the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols will be not subject to discussion by the virtual working group. For easy reference they are presented in the information document UNEP(DEPI)/MED Inf 1. In this regard, no new effectiveness indicators are proposed for the Offshore Protocol.
2. MSSD indicators were all reviewed in view of ensuring harmonization, where possible.
3. A number of marine pollution impact indicators, currently under development by MED POL, will be considered in the future with a view to proposing them as effectiveness indicators.
4. ICZM Protocol effectiveness indicators will be proposed for discussion at a later stage once its reporting format is developed and agreed.
5. In order to identify and select the set of indicators, the Secretariat and the MAP components made an in-depth analysis of the legally binding requirements of the Convention and its Protocols, as well as of the reporting format adopted for each legal instrument, the Guidelines and the regional action plans and strategies. The analysis also ensured that:

- *different types of legal, institutional, technical, administrative and enforcement measures are taken in a consistent manner by the Contracting Parties (performance indicators) so that the implementation system is effectively in place;*
 - *to some extent, consideration is given to the outputs of the measures taken over the short and medium term (impact indicators);*
 - *the purpose of the measures taken in view of the long term effect of their implementation is fully or partially achieved (sustainability indicators).*
6. There was a need to prioritize the proposed indicators on the basis of the following criteria:
- *Relevance¹ with the legally binding requirements of the Convention and its Protocols;*
 - *Availability of data²;*
 - *Collection of data/Reporting process and institutions in charge³.*
7. For each indicator presented in Annex I to this document the following information is given:
- a) relevant article/s of the Convention/Protocols
 - b) Narrative/action/criteria
 - c) Objective of the indicator
 - d) Relevance
 - e) Availability
 - f) Targeted trends
 - g) Year (no value is proposed, subject to discussion by the members of the working group)

¹ Relevance : 0 -No relevance it is eliminatory, 1-average relevance; 2-very much relevant

² Availability of data: 0-No; 1-in the long term; 2- available

³ Possibility to collect data and institutions in charge: 0-No; 1-to be defined; 2-exists