



# **United Nations Environment Programme**

**EP**



UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.229/3  
14 May 2003

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

---

---



## **MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

Second Meeting of the Think Tank on the Evaluation of MAP

Athens, Greece, 23 April 2003

### **REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE THINK TANK ON THE EVALUATION OF MAP**

## Table of Contents

	Page no.
Report	1 - 10
Annex I : List of participants	
Annex II: Agenda	

## **Introduction**

1. At their Twelfth Ordinary Meeting (Monaco, November 2001), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention requested the MAP Secretariat to prepare a strategic evaluation of the general framework of the Barcelona Convention (operational entities and the MED Unit), entrusting the Bureau with deciding on the methodology and timetable.
2. At its meeting held in Monaco in October 2002, the Bureau of the Contracting Parties decided on the composition of the think tank to be responsible for the evaluation and on its broad outlines. The group held its first meeting on 6 March 2003 at the headquarters of the MAP Coordinating Unit. At the conclusion of its work, it decided to hold its second meeting in April 2003 and approved a preliminary draft agenda for that meeting.
3. The think tank accordingly held its second meeting on 23 April 2003 in the headquarters of the MAP Coordinating Unit in Athens.

## **Participation**

4. All the members of the think tank took part in the meeting, namely, the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Monaco), accompanied by a technical adviser, a representative of a Mediterranean country member of the European Union (Greece), a representative of a southern or eastern Mediterranean country (Syrian Arab Republic), a representative of a Mediterranean country included in the next enlargement of the European Union (Slovenia), and two experts appointed by the Secretariat. The Secretariat of the Mediterranean Action Plan was represented by the Coordinator, the Deputy Coordinator, and the Programme Administrator.
5. The full list of participants is attached as Annex I to the present report.

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

6. Mr. Lucien Chabason, MAP Coordinator, opened the meeting and welcomed participants to the Coordinating Unit. He said that the meeting would essentially be devoted to the international environment of the MAP, which was an essential aspect of its evaluation. The international environment had changed greatly over the past decade and it was essential to take that into account if the MAP were to remain relevant. Three major changes had marked the period: (1) a change in the concept of sustainable development; (2) a change in the European Union; and (iii) a change in international environmental law. In Johannesburg, following progress that had in general been fairly rapid since Rio, the concept of sustainable development had been reaffirmed at a more global level, pillars had emerged – social, economic, governance – which had not occupied a particularly important place in Agenda 21 at Rio but had been given practical effect in the Johannesburg Declaration and Plan of Implementation. In addition, all the major United Nations agencies and many regional agencies had elaborated action programmes for sustainable development. The MAP had to become part of that new scene. It was an aspect that made the work of the task force on the MCSD's evaluation and future meaningful because the task force had specifically been asked to take into account the new orientations agreed in Johannesburg and to see how the Commission could translate them and adapt them to the Mediterranean context. Consequently, in addition to the agenda

proposed for the meeting, the group could commence by a preliminary exchange of views on the work of the task force, it being understood that the official report would first be submitted to the MSCD at its meeting in Croatia from 14 to 16 May 2003.

7. To illustrate his remarks, the Coordinator cited the example of water, on which an important conference had recently been held in Kyoto. The crucial challenge that water represented for the Mediterranean in years to come, particularly at the political level, was well known. For that issue, which had been one of the MSCD's first themes, the MAP had benefited from the expertise of Blue Plan regarding water resources and management of demand, that of MED POL on pollution, that of PAP/RAC on resource management, and of SPA/RAC on biological diversity. In that area, an expansion of the MAP's competence could be seen in parallel with limitations in other areas such as the economy (fixing rates, taxation, incentives, etc.). That was the type of question now facing the MAP and it was even more acute in the case of other problems highlighted in Johannesburg, for example, energy, agriculture and health.

**Agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda and organization of work**

8. Ms. Tatjana Hema, MAP Programme Administrator, introduced the main items on the agenda. She recalled that, at its first meeting, the think tank itself had outlined the framework for its current activities.. Two items concerned the MAP evaluation process itself, namely, the MAP's response to the challenge of sustainable development, and cooperation with the EU, more particularly the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. A third item related to cooperation and synergy with other conventions and programmes. Those three items, mentioned at the first meeting, needed to be dealt with in more detail, especially the last one. The Secretariat had prepared for the group a draft table of contents for the evaluation report, which the think tank could submit to the Bureau and then to the Contracting Parties, together with a list of indicators for the MAP evaluation, on which the Secretariat was already working, so that the Bureau, at its next meeting in May 2003, would have a detailed document as background for the evaluation. Finally, the meeting would be called on to put forward some conclusions and recommendations on the subsequent stages.

**Agenda item 3: MAP's response to the challenge of sustainable development (including the need for internal institutional reform)**

Exchange of views on the note summarizing the task force's work

9. Mr. Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator, introduced a short two-page note entitled "Task force report on the MSCD assessment and prospects: summary and the most essential elements from the report", which had just been circulated to participants. He pointed out that the note was informal and purely for information as the report itself had not yet been finalized. From a procedural point of view, the report should first be submitted to the next meeting of the MSCD, which had commissioned it. Nevertheless, the note reflected the spirit of the deliberations of the task force, which had just completed its work after holding two meetings in Barcelona, and set out the most salient features of several of the proposals.

10. The Deputy Coordinator reviewed the 18 points in the note, drawing particular attention to those he considered most important for the Commission's future. It was vital for the MSCD to move gradually from being an advisory body for the Contracting Parties to a genuine Mediterranean forum on political and strategic issues in the spirit

of Johannesburg. It should serve as a link for enhancing regional governance, along the lines of the UNEP Conference in Cartagena. Without changing the number of its members but introducing a degree of flexibility for the major groups, members should be appointed in accordance with certain criteria yet to be defined because, seven years after its creation, it had to be admitted that the Commission could only rely on the active participation of one quarter of its members. Flexibility was also the watchword for the working method and definition of the work programme for the next decade. The Commission was urged to encourage its members to develop type II partnerships so that sustainable development could make progress on key issues. Lastly, the MCSD Secretariat, whose resources remained constant, had for several years had to assume an increasingly onerous and wide-ranging role so it was proposed that there should be a progressive sequential approach with the appointment of a full-time officer in the first instance, then a call for more resources and staff so that, ultimately, in five or six years it would have a structure that made it better equipped to carry out its tasks.

11. Mr. Alexandre Lascaratos (Greece) expressed his surprise that the document before the group had only just been circulated, without giving members any time to study it, and that the person introducing the document had spoken on behalf of the task force even though he belonged to the Secretariat. He then conveyed his extremely deep disappointment, even astonishment, that the text did not deal with any of the crucial issues, for example, the fact that the MCSD was not really a sustainable development commission but rather an environmental forum which simply thought up bureaucratic solutions to substantive problems that had long been identified such as the lack of participation by groups in civil society. With such a text, the MCSD appeared to be embarking upon a very dangerous path of self-satisfaction, trying to set itself apart from the rest of the MAP structure. None of the issues mentioned by Mr. Chabason in his opening statement concerning the evolution in the concept of sustainable development since Rio was reflected in the task force's conclusions. Lastly, he was left with the impression that every effort had been made not to inform the think tank responsible for the overall evaluation of the MAP of the status of work in the task force, even though the latter had received a mandate from the MCSD and, naturally, had first to report back to the Commission.

12. Mr. Harry Cocossis, expert, considered that the question of the form and content of the MCSD was vital because it could affect the future of the MAP. What was the goal? What kind of role should the MCSD play? A forum of experts? A network of research centres? A forum where civil society could advise governments? The note was not very clear on that point. There was also another context that had not even been mentioned: the MAP functioned within the UNEP framework and UNEP's Governing Council had given a precise mandate to establish links with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development in New York and with ECOSOC. The MCSD should therefore play a leading role in that particular context.

13. The President, Mr. Bernard Fautrier, pointed out that the note under consideration had been submitted for information and the meeting had not been asked to discuss it in detail, which would take one or two days, but only to agree on a number of remarks to be conveyed to the next meeting of the MCSD in Croatia.

14. Ms. Reem Abed Rabboh (Syrian Arab Republic) agreed with the political content of the note, although in her view it had a number of technical or administrative weaknesses. For example, point 15 mentioned "All the RACs are encouraged to refocus their programmes towards more sustainable development issues", and point 17 "there should be a special budget line for the Commission,

including all the activities of MEDU and the RACs related to sustainable development", that meant dissociating sustainable development from the whole MAP structure and activities, while at the same time it sought to commit the MAP to sustainable development to an even greater degree. There was an obvious contradiction.

15. The President said that he wished to make four comments: (1) the note did not mention the short term, namely, the major undertaking of elaborating the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy; (2) the links with the UNCSD, as quite rightly mentioned by Mr. Cocossis, were totally disregarded; (3) the MCSD could only be viable and credible if it represented the economic and social fabric, and the measures proposed for that purpose in point 5 seemed to be playing with words; (4) it was by no means certain that there was value added in institutionalizing the presence of IGOs by reserving three places for them in the Commission (point 5).

16. Mr. Chabason explained that it had not proved possible to circulate the note before the meeting. The task force had decided that its two Co-Chairs (Italy and Spain) would send a summary of their conclusions to the President of the Bureau and the think tank. As that text had not arrived in time for the meeting, the Secretariat had urgently requested authorization to prepare the note before the meeting so that the think tank would have some indications on the matter.

16. Mr. Van Klaveren (Monaco), speaking as a member of the task force, said that all the comments made responded to the ongoing concerns expressed at the discussions in Barcelona, even though the note, which was necessarily brief, could not contain all the points and had also to be read between the lines. Should the MCSD be for the MAP or for the Mediterranean? The task force had replied unambiguously to that fundamental question that it should be for the Mediterranean. That had led to the idea of bringing other institutional actors in the region into the MCSD so as to cover the new issues put forward at Johannesburg – poverty, social justice, agriculture, fisheries, energy, etc. – for which those actors had the expertise and the essential tools; it had also given rise to the idea of creating an informal interorganizational platform and having two or three representatives of IGOs within the Commission (not necessarily representatives of their Secretariats). Regarding the proposal on type II partnerships, that would bring together civil society, socio-economic actors, IGOs and NGOs around the new issues mentioned above, which was precisely what the speakers wanted. In that connection, the comments to be made by the think tank could be useful, not by filling in gaps that did not exist, but by helping the two Co-Chairs of the task force to make the MCSD aware of the concerns common to the think tank and the task force.

18. Mr. Cocossis considered that there were two opposing views and a decision would have to be taken: a MCSD for the Mediterranean in which the MAP would simply be an actor like any other, or a MCSD for the MAP in which the latter would still be the principal framework. Mr. Lascaratos had said that, in his view, it was a question of semantics with no substantive content because the MAP was exclusively for the Mediterranean; it had launched and financed the MCSD. There was indeed a flagrant lack of vision, as if the task force had not understood the debate that had been going on within the Commission for years because of its inability to associate civil society's driving forces and the socio-economic sector in its work. The need for links with the UNCSD had quite rightly been underlined by two speakers. Although the Commission should not closely imitate the New York Commission, the way it worked could serve as inspiration with its two-year thematic cycles, one dealing with strategic thinking and the other with the follow-up, and the participation of ministers

concerned depending on the theme. The note under consideration meant that the MCSD would remain the closed club it had been for seven years without any tangible results.

19. The Deputy Coordinator responded to the concerns expressed and the criticism by emphasizing that at least 90 per cent of them could find a response in the 40-page document which the task force would submit to the meeting of the MCSD in May, but which had not been submitted to the think tank for reasons of professional ethics and the timetable. Emerging from the "environmental ghetto" and involving other actors, changing the orientation of the Commission and its programme in the light of the elaboration, content and implementation of the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, mobilizing other relevant ministries (economy, finance, agriculture, etc.), adapting and implementing Johannesburg, etc., were all to be found in the report in black and white. The debate was not "with or without the MAP" because the terms of reference of the MCSD, approved in 1997, already contained all the elements now demanded. They appeared explicitly therein and the problem was that, with one or two exceptions, they had never been applied. He strongly emphasized that the essential, vital question was that of appointment of the members of the Commission. The majority of the representatives of civil society appointed to date – although the remark also applied to some country representatives – were manifestly not qualified to belong to the Commission. They did not even take part in its work and were not at all motivated. Of the 36 members, the number who really participated in the Commission's activities with the aim of advancing the cause of sustainable development in the region could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Whole meetings went by without engaging in fruitful discussion due to the lack of valid participants. What could the Secretariat do under such conditions? It was not the Secretariat's role to intervene in the internal affairs of countries or institutions in order to obtain valid nominations. One solution would be to set precise criteria for candidates and there should be a clear mandate to that effect. In any event, if that major handicap was overcome, the MCSD would become operational and active, and other organizational, management or budget problems would be much more easily resolved.

20. Mr. Mitja Bricelj (Slovenia) said that the discussion showed that, from the outset, sustainable development had posed a problem of understanding. The MAP should first of all define what sustainable development meant for the region so that countries could then focus on that concept. He agreed with point 15 of the note, which encouraged the RACs to refocus more on sustainable development. He cited the example of the Danube River Protection Convention, which had working groups, where the focus was not only on marine ecosystems but also on land ecosystems, the subregional approach. In his view, the MCSD did not call for the creation of a new autonomous body.

21. Mr. Mohammed Saied, expert, recommended that the group make some general proposals to the MCSD rather than focus on the short note, which gave the impression that the task force had reached simplistic conclusions, judging by the clarification given by Mr. Hoballah and Mr. Van Klaveren. Going back to the origins of the MCSD, it was obvious that it had been set up within the MAP and for the MAP in order to constitute a "brains trust" and that there was a symbiosis between the two bodies. It was that vocation, which had often been cited as a regional model, which had to be preserved by ensuring that the Commission was represented at a high level so that there was genuine political commitment and that it was open to civil society and IGOs. The innovative feature was the evaluation, which corresponded to the preparation of a new cycle that would begin in 2005 with MAP III and benefit from

the results of Johannesburg, just as MAP II in 1995 had benefited from Rio, with revised priorities, new areas covered, and new methods. The reform of the MCSD should be envisaged from a dynamic historical perspective that was regularly updated.

22. Ms. Hema considered that the environmental component remained the most important for countries such as hers – Albania – in the approach to sustainable development. From the perspective of other countries in the region, particularly those in the South and East, the MAP's role in support of the MCSD was essential.

23. Mr. Lascaratós stated that Mr. Hoballah's response, uttered with genuine passion and considerable sincerity, showed a disappointment that he understood and shared with regard to the level of participation of members of groups. Nevertheless, countries and the Secretariat no doubt also had their share of responsibility in that respect inasmuch as they had been unable to make the Commission sufficiently attractive. Perhaps it would be necessary to adopt a more practical, pragmatic attitude and give the Secretariat a role to play in appointing members. In addition, establishing links with the UNCSD would make it easier to mobilize actors from the desired ministries and institutions by conferring the label and authority of the United Nations body on its work.

24. The Coordinator summarized some of the comments he had noted from the discussion and which needed to be seen positively as it was essential to avoid creating tensions at the MCSD meeting the following month because that would only discourage the new members of the three groups and tarnish the image of the MAP gained through the Commission. There was a consensus to focus on civil society, the participation of the socio-economic sector, and preparation of the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy. Regarding substance, the question was whether the MAP was capable, politically and institutionally, of dealing with the challenges of sustainable development. The problems encountered by the MCSD in connection with themes such as industry, urban management, etc. showed its limits in the economic and governance spheres and, *a fortiori*, social issues. Going from a marine convention to sustainable development was not easy. Even with additional expertise, could the MAP attract economic and social organizations? It was true that the latter did not like environmental bodies, but a change in mentalities could be perceived in the Mediterranean. The economic sector, business circles and employers were becoming better organized. After having long served as window dressing for the environment, sustainable development was taking form with its economic axis, to such an extent that at Johannesburg environmental organizations had felt themselves marginalized. That trend should be put to good effect by bringing the economic and social spheres into the Commission. At the political level, the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference in Athens had entrusted the MCSD with the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, and that confidence had to be justified. Lastly, concerning the MCSD's budget, Mr. Chabason considered that it should only cover the Commission's institutional activities and that sustainable development issues could not be removed from each RAC or each programme. In conclusion, the thinking could be summarized as being that the Commission should not be separated from the MAP, but should expand the latter's horizons.

**Agenda item 4: Cooperation with the EU, focusing on the enlargement process under way or planned and on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership**



25. The Coordinator reviewed the development of relations between the EU and the MAP over the past decade, in a context that had changed radically at three levels: (1) the current enlargement, which would increase the number of Mediterranean countries belonging to the EU from four to seven, and the subsequent enlargement, which would raise the figure to 11 or 12, so the MAP would find itself, on the one hand, with countries taken up by assimilating the Community's rules and disciplines and, on the other, countries that would be posing the question of the relations between the MAP and the EU and the legal harmonization which the EU appeared to require of its neighbours, (2) the development of Community policies in areas covered by the MAP: since the directive on bathing waters in 1976, the EU had in recent years built up an impressive stock of environmental law (habitat directives, IPPC directive, framework directive on water, etc.), including the Erika 1 and Erika 2 packages in the maritime security area, whose provisions were stricter than those of the IMO, thereby creating a delicate situation in the Mediterranean with two different legal regimes; (3) the Euro-Med Partnership, with the EC's declared intention to associate the MAP henceforward. It was necessary to seize the opportunities afforded by those developments, which would lead to an administrative restructuring of the European Commission, by creating close links with those responsible for various policies in Brussels, establishing focal points within the corresponding structures, and showing greater political ambition, for example, through a memorandum of agreement between the MAP and the EC.

26. The Deputy Coordinator confirmed that in the EC there was a positive move towards the MAP and he reported on the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of SMAP correspondents held in Brussels (1 to 5 May 2003). In the document synthesizing the regional processes established by the EC, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, the MAP's contribution was analysed exhaustively and highlighted. Several of the points adopted at the Athens Euro-Med Conferences had been embodied in proposals for synergetic mechanisms (half-yearly joint meetings to discuss political and thematic issues, possible involvement of the RACs and other DGs on specific subjects). In addition, the MAP might be invited to make presentations to the Euro-Med Committee and cooperation among countries would be established through the respective correspondents and focal points. Although for the moment, on the EC's side, there was no question of preferential treatment for the MAP in respect of project financing, the overall impression was that those in charge in Brussels were ready to move ahead with the cooperation officially approved in July 2002 in the Athens Declaration.

27. During the discussions that followed the above two presentations, the meeting expressed divergent views regarding the scope of the changes mentioned. Some signs could turn out to be less encouraging than they first appeared, for example, the fact that the MAP should deal with the Enlargement and Neighboring Countries Directorate-General, which might mean that it would then be associated with the "foreign affairs" Council rather than the "environment" Council. Moreover, in the European Commission's document on "Pan-European Environmental Co-operation after the 2003 Kiev Conference", there was no reference whatsoever to the Mediterranean, even though it occupied the whole of Europe's southern shore. It was suggested that MAP should also remain in contact with the EU outside the Partnership, which did not cover certain MAP countries (the Balkans and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), thereby undoubtedly causing problems when the MAP/MCSD bodies adopted certain recommendations or decisions. One participant was in favour of a dual approach, progressive on the one hand, at the official level, with institutional arrangements (for example, for the submission of reports, MED POL activities) and,

on the other, vertical - from bottom to top - with a proactive role for the MAP in respect of subregional initiatives.

28. Because of the increasingly marked dividing line between members and non-members of the EU, would there be a move towards a two-speed MAP? While one speaker considered that such a trend was realistic and even inevitable (at the level of reporting and recommendations adopted by the Contracting Parties, for example), others considered that there should be no such division. EC member countries would adopt the stricter Community rules while non-members would update their legal framework at their own pace, but without constraints and provided that the ratification of the amended or new Barcelona instruments was completed in the near future. In general, it was considered essential for the MAP to ensure that regional cooperation was not affected by bilateral agreements, which appeared to be a priority in the preparation process for the Kiev Conference (May 2003), and to adopt a more decisive approach to the EC so as to give practical effect to the issues agreed at the Athens Conference in July 2002. The Coordinator's proposal on a memorandum of agreement between the MAP and the EC was part of a political will to cooperate that needed to be reaffirmed, particularly as Europe was turning towards the countries of the East and, at least in the short term, its centre of gravity would move away from the Mediterranean.

**Agenda item 5: Cooperation and synergy with other conventions and programmes, particularly on the conservation of biological diversity**

29. The Coordinator introduced the item by outlining the situation in that area, where in recent years there had been a dramatic increase in the number of instruments both at the international level (Basel, climate, biological diversity, Stockholm) and the European level (Aarhus, landscapes, Kiev Convention, to be signed in May 2003), as well as dynamic activities by the UN/ECE and the Council of Europe, which had built on earlier texts (Bonn, Bern, Ramsar, etc.). Regarding the more specific issue of liability and compensation, which was on the agenda of the next meeting of the Bureau, there were a protocol to the Basel Convention, a European Directive being negotiated, the IMO Convention of 1996, a Kiev Protocol in May 2003, and the MAP was considering whether a new instrument under the Barcelona Convention could add further value. Lastly, there were also institutions, whether or not environmental (EIB, WB, etc.), and the development of a regional or subregional system to promote environmental policies, such as the Budapest Regional Centre, which was very active.

30. The question of cooperation arose at three levels: (1) attendance at the regular meetings of the above bodies, which a Secretariat such as that of the MAP could only ensure within the limits of its resources and staff, and which was not always productive except in terms of image; (2) cooperation among Secretariats to identify mutual areas of interest and create synergy, which led to the signature of memorandums of understanding (Ramsar, Convention on Biological Diversity, soon the Red Sea Programme), although that type of cooperation needed to be better organized and strengthened; and lastly (3) cooperation with institutions that showed an interest in the Mediterranean (WB, EEA), which was by definition more operational.

31. Within the MAP, biological diversity was a special case because cooperation with the relevant conventions and institutions (Bonn, Bern, Ramsar, IUCN, WWF, etc.) had been handed over entirely to the SPA/RAC in Tunis, which was essentially

a technical centre, managed by a national authority, with a regional vocation, Because it did not have international status, it might not have the authority needed to negotiate with other institutions and conventions or to ensure respect for the SPA and Biological Diversity Protocol. It was nevertheless the area in which international and regional law had developed the most. The Centre was currently being evaluated and that should provide some answers, while a change in its intermediate status could eventually be envisaged.

32. Mr. Chabason's final comments gave rise to an exchange of views. As far as the Tunis Centre was concerned, the meeting considered that, in view of the importance of biological diversity in the Mediterranean, the considerably expanded scope of the SPA Protocol with unprecedented provisions (SPAMIs), the role played by the Centre in other forums (for example, as the Mediterranean unit of ACCOBAMS), all militated in favour of giving the Centre international status, subject to the conclusions of the evaluation being conducted, but because the current financial constraints would make that difficult for Nairobi and the Contracting Parties, it should at least be given "intermediate" status like the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) set up in Tunisia. One speaker considered that, in the case of the Centre, national focal points appeared to lack the necessary competence to assist it in its work. Lastly, speakers considered that the joint meeting of national focal points for Blue Plan and the MAP remained relevant bearing in mind the complementarity of the two RACs and the need to define clearly the scope of their respective competences, but the ERS/RAC should no longer be associated because that was not its place and, in addition, it was the source of growing concern regarding its future within the MAP.

33. Regarding cooperation with other conventions and programmes, the meeting agreed that the focus should be on global conventions, especially those arising out of Rio that were of special interest to the Mediterranean (Biological Diversity, Desertification), programmes for neighbouring seas (Red Sea, Baltic), giving consideration to drawing up more politically-oriented memorandums of understanding that would lead to practical action, and maintaining minimum cooperation with European conventions. There was the question of the relations between the regional Protocols and the parent conventions (Izmir Protocol/Basel Convention, for example) and whether or not new instruments should be prepared on liability and compensation or coastal management. As had been shown by the Contracting Parties' recent discussions on proposals to create new RACs, it was now agreed that in each particular case decisions should be based on feasibility studies that showed the value added to be gained by the Mediterranean.

**Agenda item 6: Report on the MAP evaluation – table of contents which the think tank must submit to the next meeting of the Bureau, to be held in Sarajevo on 19 and 20 May 2003 – next stages in its final preparation**

34. Ms. Hema introduced the table of contents for the report, which would be submitted to the next meeting of the Bureau. The meeting approved the table and agreed that it was the responsibility of the Bureau, a political body, to formulate in the report not only questions, proposals and options, but also precise recommendations drawn up in the light of the discussions in the think tank. Regarding Annex I to the report on "Performance indicators", the Secretariat was requested to find a more appropriate title, but to retain the table, expanding it with quantitative data that could

be collected before submitting it to the Bureau as background for the evaluation. As the three evaluations under way (SPA/RAC, REMPEC, Historic Sites) would not be ready in time for the MAP evaluation, it was agreed that the report should be based on the Secretariat's introductory note, the reports of the think tank's two meetings, the report of the task force, and other prior but extremely useful elements to be found in MAP documentation, for example, the evaluations of BP and PAP/RAC or the strategic review – which had not been sufficiently utilized – and that MAP II should serve as a reference, i.e. the mandate dating from 1995. Lastly, it was requested that, if possible, a synthesis of the reports of the two meetings of the think tank be presented in a single annex.

35. The meeting agreed that the follow-up to some of the purely administrative recommendations in the evaluation report should be prepared on an informal basis immediately after the Bureau's meeting in case they were adopted by the Contracting Parties in Catania, so that no time would be wasted.

**Agenda item 7: Closure of the meeting**

36. The Secretariat said that, in view of the time-frame, the evaluation report would be sent to members of the Bureau shortly before their meeting in Sarajevo. It would be a draft to be discussed by the Bureau before a final version was prepared for transmission to the meeting of the national focal points in September and then to the meeting of the Contracting Parties in Catania in November 2003. The members of the think tank would also shortly receive the report of the present meeting.

37. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 4.45 p.m. on Wednesday, 23 April 2003.

**ANNEX I  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**MONACO  
MONACO**

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

Ministre Plénipotentiaire  
chargé de la Coopération Internationale pour  
l'Environnement et le Développement  
"Villa Girasole"  
16 Blv. de Suisse  
MC-98000 Monaco-Ville  
Monaco

Tel: +377-93-158333

Fax: +377-93-158888

E-mail : [bfautrier@gouv.mc](mailto:bfautrier@gouv.mc)

**M. Patrick Van Klaveren**

Conseiller technique  
Coopération Internationale pour l'Environnement et  
le Développement  
Conseiller Technique du Ministre Plénipotentiaire  
chargé de la Coopération Internationale pour  
l'Environnement et le Développement  
16 Blv. de Suisse  
MC-98000 Monaco-Ville  
Monaco

Tel: +377-93-158148

Fax: +377-93- 509591

E-mail: [pvankalveren@gouv.mc](mailto:pvankalveren@gouv.mc)

**GREECE  
GRECE**

**Mr. Alexander Lascaratos**

MAP Liaison Officer  
Assistant Professor of Oceanography  
University of Athens  
Building Phys-V  
Panepistimioupolis  
GR-157 84 Athens  
Greece

Tel: +30-210-72 76 839/72 76 933

Fax: +30-210-72 95 282

E-mail: [alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr](mailto:alasc@oc.phys.uoa.gr)

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC  
REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE**

**Ms. Reem Abed Rabboh**

Director, Water Safety Directorate  
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs  
Tolyani Street  
Damascus  
Syrian Arab Republic

Tel: + 963-11-3336027

Fax: + 963-11-3335645

E-mail: [env-min@net.sy](mailto:env-min@net.sy) / [reemabedrabboh@mail.sy](mailto:reemabedrabboh@mail.sy)

**SLOVENIA  
SLOVENIE**

**Mr. Mitja Bricelj**  
Advisor to the Government  
Ministry for Environment and Spatial Planning  
Dunajska 48  
SI-1000 Ljubljana  
Slovenia

Tel: +386-1-4787384  
Fax: +386-1-4787420  
E-mail: [mitja.bricelj@gov.si](mailto:mitja.bricelj@gov.si)

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT  
PROGRAMME  
COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE  
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN  
PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES  
POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT  
UNITE DE COORDINATION DU PLAN  
D'ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE**

**Mr Lucien Chabason**  
Coordinator  
UNEP/MAP  
48 Vass. Konstantinou Ave  
116 35 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30-210-72 73 100  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [chabason@unepmap.gr](mailto:chabason@unepmap.gr)

**Mr. Arab Hoballah**  
Deputy Coordinator  
P.O. Box 18019  
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Av.  
116 10 Athens  
Greece

Tel: +30-210-7273100 (switchboard)  
Tel: +30-210-7273126 (direct)  
Fax: +30-210-7253196/7  
E-mail: [hoballah@unepmap.gr](mailto:hoballah@unepmap.gr)

**Ms. Tatjana Hema**  
Programme Officer  
UNEP/MAP  
48 Vass. Konstantinou Ave  
116 35 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30-210-72 73 115  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [thema@unepmap.gr](mailto:thema@unepmap.gr)

**Mr. Harry Coccossis**

UNEP/MAP Advisor

Professor

Department of Planning and Regional Development

University of Thessaly

Environment and Spatial Planning Laboratory

1 Pedion Areos

38 334, Volos

Greece

Tel: 30-24210-74475/210-6800051-2

Fax: 30-24210-74398/210-6800053

E-mail: [enpl@prd.uth.gr](mailto:enpl@prd.uth.gr)

**M. Mohammed Saied**

UNEP/MAP Advisor

Conseiller à la Direction Générale

Agence Nationale de Protection de l'Environnement

12, rue du Cameroun

Le Belvédère

1002 Tunis

Tunisie

Tel: +216-71-841995/216-71-840221

Fax: +216-71-890-032

E-mail: [dg.ms@anpe.nat.tn](mailto:dg.ms@anpe.nat.tn)

## **ANNEX II**

### **AGENDA**

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Adoption of the provisional agenda and organization of work
3. MAP response to the Sustainable Development challenge (including the need for an internal institutional reform)
4. Cooperation with EU, focusing the ongoing and expected enlargement process and EuroMed partnership
5. Cooperation and synergy with other conventions and programs with a special focus on biodiversity conservation
6. MAP evaluation report. Table of content of the preliminary draft to be submitted by the Think tank to the upcoming Bureau meeting in Sarajevo 19-20 May. Next steps for its final preparation.
7. Discussion, conclusions and recommendations
8. Other business
9. Closure of the meeting