



United Nations
Environment
Programme



Distr.
RESTRICTED

UNEP/IG.43/INF.3
15 February 1983

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

Third Meeting of the Contracting Parties to
the Convention for the Protection of the
Mediterranean Sea against pollution and its
related protocols.

Dubrovnik, 28 February - 4 March 1983

REPORT ON THE FIRST PHASE OF THE BLUE PLAN

blue plan



STATUS REPORT

OF THE G.C.S.

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

STATUS REPORT OF THE G.C.S.

FOR THE FIRST PHASE OF THE BLUE PLAN

STATUS REPORT OF THE G.C.S.
FOR THE FIRST PHASE OF THE BLUE PLAN

I. THE STUDIES

1. Launching of the studies
2. Development of the twelve studies
3. Confrontation seminars
4. The reports problem

II. THE WORK OF THE G.C.S.

1. G.C.S. meetings
2. Coordination work
3. Synthesis work
4. The Focal Points meetings

III. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. The Information Letter
2. Communications
3. Liaison with the M.A.P.

IV. FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES

The Blue Plan was divided into three phases. The first one dedicated to reconnaissance and inventory work; the second one concerned with future research - one should rather say exploration of "possible futures" - based on the scenario method; and the third one dedicated to presentation and discussion of results and recommendations.

The first phase of the Blue Plan actually started on the 1st September 1980, after years of preparation and preliminary work. Let us recall briefly the major stages :

- in April 1975, the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in Nairobi agreed on the principle of conducting a socio-economic program : the Blue Plan, in parallel with the scientific program of the Mediterranean Action Plan (M.A.P.).
- Split, January 1977 : the Mediterranean States recommended the implementation of the Blue Plan,
- Geneva, February 1979 : the first Meeting of the National Focal Points of the Blue Plan was held to find out how the launching of the project could be facilitated.
- Cannes, October 1979 : the program implementation document was adopted during a second meeting of the Blue Plan Focal Points.
- The UNEP Executive Director asked thereafter the mediterranean countries to introduce candidates to enable him to set up the basic team, or Coordination and Synthesis Group of the Blue Plan, on the basis of the proposed candidates.

The G.C.S. is composed of six members and a Co-ordinator, chosen for their personal capabilities by the Executive Director of UNEP.

The Co-ordinator is M. Isamil SAERI ABDALLA, from Egypt.

The six members are: M.Mohamed El Hadi BENNADJI, Algeria
M.Franjo GASPAROVIC, Yougoslavia
M.Michel GRENON, France
M.Panayotis LAGOS, Greece
M.Ezzedine MAKHLOUF, Tunisia
M.Jose Maria PLIEGO, Spain.

M.Michel GRENON, Executive Secretary of the Blue Plan, works full time on the project, while the other members dedicate one-third of their time to it.

After a preliminary meeting in June 1980 - which gave the G.C.S. members by then appointed an opportunity to meet each other and set up an initial working scheme - the first phase of the Blue Plan started on the 1st September 1980, developed over 28 months and was split into four major parts:

- . September 1980 - February 1981 launching of the studies
- . November 1980 - September 1982 study work
- . October 1981 - December 1982 synthesis of the studies
- . October 1982 - December 1982 G.C.S. synthesis report.

The completion of this program involved:

- . frequent G.C.S meetings
- . launching seminars for the studies
- . confrontation seminars.

1. THE STUDIES

In essence, the first phase of the Blue Plan was one of reconnaissance and inventory work - not only of the current state of affairs in development and environment in the mediterranean seaboard countries, but of our knowledge of it as well. Accordingly, the first phase included twelve cross-studies, encompassing virtually all economic, social or cultural activities in mediterranean countries, and the relevant synthesis. The twelve subjects were selected by the representatives of mediterranean countries during the Cannes meeting, viz.:

- 1° Land-marine systems and sub-systems
- 2° Water resources, competitive uses and human priorities
- 3° Industrial growth, industrialization strategies, and related to the environment, and the utilization of sub-soil resources
- 4° Energy, old and new
- 5° Health, population and population movements
- 6° Space use, urbanization and rural development
- 7° Tourism, space use and the environment
- 8° Intra-Mediterranean economic relations
- 9° Transport and communications
- 10° Cultural heritage and cross-cultural relations
- 11° Environmental awareness and value system
- 12° Impact of non-Mediterranean influence on the Mediterranean Basin

1. Launching of the studies

The G.C.S. members from different countries and sectors, set up a methodology furthering collegial cooperation and started the studies planning work.

The first six months (September 1980 to February 1981) were fully dedicated to this activity.

The procedure developed as follows:

a) The G.C.S. set up draft terms of reference for each study, covering all points it intended to be covered, and the relevant approach. The twelve studies dealt with quite different topics and, therefore, the terms of reference are different too, however, the following general framework was retained by the G.C.S.:

- 1° description of the current state of affairs (1979 or the most recent year possible),
- 2° historical evolution : retrospect over the past twenty years, or further back if the study required (or the available statistical data permitted)
- 3° the future : "possible scenarios over 20 years or more" extrapolation from the major trends on the one hand, identification of the seeds of change, on the other .

b) On the basis of the preliminary terms of reference, a "launching seminar" was organized for each study. The G.C.S. set up invitation lists from those proposed by the mediterranean countries, and from among the mediterranean scientific community. Generally speaking, ten to twenty participants were invited to each seminar.

All seminars were held at MEDEAS and had a two-days duration. To save time, it was decided to group the seminars in three groups of four, two in parallel on each occasion.

The first four "launching" seminars were held from 27th to 30th October 1980 and dealt with the following studies:

- Water resources 27th and 28th October
- Health, population 27th and 28th October
- Tourism 29th and 30th October
- Cultural heritage 29th and 30th October

The next four seminars were held from 15th to 19th December 1980, concerning :

- Industrial growth 15th and 16th December
- Energy old and new 15th and 16th December
- Space use 18th and 19th December
- Economic relations 18th and 19th December

The last four seminars were held from 2nd to 6th February and concerned :

- Environmental awareness 2nd and 3rd February
- Systems and sub-systems 2nd and 3rd February
- Transport and communications 5th and 6th February
- Non-mediterranean influence 5th and 6th february.

On the whole, the twelve seminars brought together some 100 participants (out of 172 invited) from 15 Mediterranean countries and E.E.C., together with representatives from several United Nations agencies.

The purpose of each seminar was to discuss the terms of reference drafted by the G.C.S.A member of the the G.C.S. took charge of the proceedings to ensure that talks remained true to the lines of the Blue Plan.

In the course or the end of the seminar, the G.C.S. selected two experts to carry out the study along the "binomial" principle favoured by the Blue Plan, that is, one expert from the North of the Mediterranean and one from the South sharing the work.

Generally, the experts stayed one extra day after the seminar was over to draft the definitive terms of reference based on the seminar proceedings, in consultation with the G.C.S.

The G.C.S. drafted two memos handed over to the experts for guidance in their work and to facilitate the eventual integration of the twelve studies into the synthesis report. One was relatively short and provided working recommendations (data, tables, statistics, presentation of documents, etc.), and the other, more sophisticated dealt with the scenarios method.

The experts were selected on the the following criteria:

- first among the candidates introduced by the Governments,
- and when no name was suggested by the Governments, experts were selected on the basis of their proficiency in the subject.

Table I provides the names of the experts who carried out the studies with their nationalities. Four experts were changed (names followed by an asterisk), either for health or professional reasons.

2. Development of the twelve studies.

The first studies started in November 1980 and the last ones in March 1981*.

* Except the study about culture which started later since the expert from the South could not offer his contribution until 1982.

Initially, the G.C.S. intended to follow the experts' work quite closely and planned frequent working sessions between the experts and the Executive Secretary or even with other members of the G.C.S., either at Medeas, or in one of the experts' countries. It was also desired that, if required, the experts should have the possibility of visiting one or two Mediterranean countries to widen the scope of their research. Unfortunately, the available financial means did not allow as many meetings as desirable. Depending on the studies, the experts met in fact once to three times only. This complicated further the coordination work and had also an effect on the formal standardization of the reports. The G.C.S. will nonetheless avail of this opportunity to thank all of them warmly for their understanding and unrestricted co-operation to the work of the Blue Plan.

Initially, a full two-months work was contemplated for each study, to be spread over a six months period.

In fact, the need to delay the confrontation seminars for financial reasons allowed the G.C.S. to accede to the experts requests for a little more time than scheduled. This extra time requirement can be explained by several reasons:

- in general, the terms of reference were fully detailed and perhaps slightly too ambitious,
- the distances between the experts did not make the communications necessary for their work any easier while increasing the difficulties encountered in collecting data, owing among other reasons, to sluggish postal relations in some cases,
- it should also be pointed out that the Focal Points reacted often lately, when they did at all, to expert's requests for filling in questionnaires and/or bridging statistical gaps.

The experts were at liberty to submit one or two reports for each study, depending on whether they elected to deal jointly or separately with the subject. These preliminary reports (forty to one hundred and fifty pages) were accompanied by numerous statistical appendixes (no limitation was imposed) intended not only to support the report(s), but also to contribute to the statistical stock of the Blue Plan. These reports (excluding the appendixes) were immediately translated into French or English.

The first interim study report was delivered to the G.C.S. in July 1981; most of the others came gradually:

- seven reports were available by the end of 1981,
- seven were ready within the first two months of 1982,
- the last six were submitted between March and October 1982*.

The magnitude of the subject (the whole mediterranean basin on the one hand, and a "whole" field like tourism or transportation and communication, on the other) and the little time and efforts allocated (2 x 2 men / months) must of course be taken into account in the evaluation of the reports and studies, the latter being effected by quite different teams.

* For eight of the studies, the experts submitted two reports.

In fact, these studies and reports ought to be considered in the light of their true objective, that is, providing the G.C.S with factual data, statistical materials and ideas for the synthesis work on the current situation and possible evolutions of the Mediterranean Basin. It was never dreamed that these reports should compete with highly sectorial surveys carried out by strongly manned teams working in close cooperation for several years.

3. Confrontation seminars

The G.C.S. granted greater importance to the confrontation seminars than initially contemplated since, as the studies developed, it appeared that some aspects of the terms of reference could not be fully covered by the experts. The seminars were organized and held as the reports became available, depending however on the financial resources available.

Following a remark made by some Focal Points deploring that they were not sufficiently consulted about invitations to the launching seminars, (third meeting, 3-4th April 1981), the G.C.S. wrote to all Focal Points towards the end of April 1981 asking them to nominate whoever they wished to be invited to the confrontation seminars.

The G.C.S. granted priority to the names suggested by the Focal Points, when they did reply, or asked them to appoint representatives.

Twenty five to forty invitations were sent for each seminar (to all participating countries in most cases). The variable rates of attendance are shown in Table II. The G.C.S. can only stress once more its profound desire to associate as many representatives of participating countries as possible, and to

further expand the operational relationships with the Focal Points.

The invitations were discerningly distributed, as far as possible, between participants who had attended the launching seminar on the same study (or another one in exceptional cases) and new ones. Moreover, experts in charge of other studies were also invited sometimes, to allow mutual information updating and the beginning of cross-study work.

The invitations called for two written documents from the participants:

- . an opinion on the preliminary report (forwarded against the expert's acceptance to attend)
- . a personal contribution offering complementary information (including, but not limited to, on the participant's own country), or extra material with due relevance to the subject tackled by the experts.

One must admit that only a limited number of participants acceded to both requests. Some of them gave the complementary information requested, or a summary taking up all their major contributions, in writing, during or after the seminar. The oral contributions and interventions of the participants were generally excellent and valuable for both the experts and the G.C.S. staff. As a result, some reports had to undergo modifications, sometimes major ones, which obviously raises some problems.

It can be noticed that, contrary to the launching seminars all held at MEDEAS, confrontation seminars - except one - were held elsewhere as proposed by mediterranean countries during the third meeting of the Focal Points, offering to be hosts to Blue Plan seminars. Therefore, two seminars were held in Tunisia, two in Greece, one in Spain and two in Yugoslavia. Four more were held in France outside MEDEAS (two in Paris, one in Arles and one in Montpellier).

The Blue Plan staff would not miss this opportunity to express their thanks to these countries and the local organizers for the excellent welcome extended to them and to the participants, and the valuable financial support thus offered to the Blue Plan. Holding these seminars in mediterranean countries allowed to expand the exchange between the G.C.S., the experts and the mediterranean community, and offered the G.C.S. an opportunity to introduce, or to better advertise the Blue Plan to many political and scientific authorities of the host countries.

Each seminar lasted two days.

The methodology was the same for the twelve seminars. The two experts presented their report and the results of their work, which were then discussed, commented and supplemented by the participants, experts and the G.C.S. who issued recommendations for the final report.

As a whole, the twelve seminars brought 314 participants together. The rate of attendance was markedly higher than at the launching seminars as the host countries invited a number of native experts to attend, and because the G.C.S. had more time to set up and circulate the invitations since the pressure of the starting stage had relaxed.

Although it appears complicated, the study procedure proved efficient and the confrontation seminars which were especially fruitful and substantial contributed useful, and perhaps indispensable, supplements.

The 12 studies were shared between the members of the G.C.S. (one or two for each one), each one on its staff being entrusted with the synthesis of the experts' work, the minutes of the seminars, the supplements, etc... and also with the duty of identifying shortcomings, if any, and suggesting appropriate means for their elimination (with or without the expert's assistance depending on circumstances) by applying the utility criterion relating to the synthesis of the twelve studies.

4. The reports problem

As contemplated, after completing their work, the experts delivered a preliminary report in French or English which was immediately translated into the other language. The translation was not an easy job owing to the limited time left. As the reports were sometimes delivered only days before the confrontation seminar, it was not always possible to send them early enough to the participants, especially into countries with relatively slow postal service.

To submit their final report, the experts were allowed a maximum of two months after the confrontation seminars, and it should be pointed out that this schedule was seldom met. The delay results partly from the often major modifications - and relevant extra work - they had to introduce following the highly substantial discussions in the confrontation seminars.

Nevertheless, albeit completed and enriched, these reports are still incomplete and of variable quality. In addition to the magnitude of the topics (both from a sector and geography viewpoint) two major causes for discrepancies in relation to the terms of reference can be identified.

- a. To secure extra information material, the experts sent questionnaires to the Focal Points, and the response was generally low-keyed, the more as the Focal Points or Structures were less acquainted with, or concerned by our work.
- b. As between the two terms of development AND environment, the former is best known and was dealt with very fully. The latter term of environment, in particular in the wider sense advocated by the Blue Plan, was often dealt with scantily, on our insistence (in particular during seminars). This only illustrates the difficulty inherent to the pluri-disciplinary approach, especially when the manpower allocation is restricted to a binary principle.

Naturally enough, this entailed an extra work load on the G.C.S. and the need for a more thorough evaluation in a number of matters.

As of today, final reports are completed for five studies :

- Water resources
- Industrial growth
- Energy old and new
- Tourism
- Environmental awareness

All other reports should be available by mid-February 1983 at the latest.

The current final draft of the reports cannot be published. For these reports to be published, they need intensive corrective work, including from a linguistic point of view (let us not forget that the vehicle language, whether French or English, was seldom native to the experts), reformatting, typing and editing. Moreover, the G.C.S. will have to make up for existing shortcomings in most reports, and write up a synthesis for each one.

This time-consuming work could not be possibly completed within the time allowed to the first phase of the Blue Plan considering the extra work load implied. It is only after completing the first draft of the synthesis report and the discussions thus generated, that it will be possible to consider completing this work.

II. THE WORK OF THE G.C.S.

1. G.C.S. meetings

In the course of the first phase of the Blue Plan, the G.C.S. held eighteen meetings coupled up, whenever possible, with the launching or confrontation seminars. The meetings were convened at MEDEAS or where the seminars were held.

The dates and places of the G.C.S. meetings are given in Table III.

2. Coordination work

For the first six months, the G.C.S. concentrated mostly in organizing and preparing work, planning and holding launching seminars and writing up the terms of reference. The working program of the first phase was discussed and more thoroughly assessed by the G.C.S. during these initial meetings.

Afterwards, the G.C.S. followed up the execution of the studies and provided guidance to the experts for their work. As the reports became available, it organized and held confrontation seminars. Too much time was lost owing to frequent modifications to the work schedule as a result of the serious financial difficulties in 1981 and early in 1982 on the one hand, and delayed deliveries of expert's reports, on the other.

The G.C.S., and its Executive Secretary in particular, did not wait until after the organisational work was completed to start up the fundamental work, that is to say, preparing the synthesis and basic scheme of a mediterranean information system.

3. Synthesis work

A) Preparation of the twelve studies synthesis

The reflection and preparation of the system synthesis of the twelve studies began as soon as the studies were launched. Although one cannot actually talk of a "Mediterranean Basin System" in which all components would be listed in an inventory, weighted and their inter-relations exemplified or,

better still, quantified, a system synthesis methodology was prepared and should naturally articulate to the second phase, and the evaluation of possible developmental/environmental scenarios. Concerning the twelve studies, and before effecting their synthesis, this methodology yielded, amongst other results, a "reading grid", enabling to identify in a very simple manner, the shortcomings of the studies, and bridge the gaps between the different studies.

This methodology is based on a non-exclusive breakdown of the Mediterranean Basin into four sub-systems (Needs, Resources: people-goods-capital or information Flows, and Actors).

Whereas economic surveys usually concentrate on market equilibria (supply and demand) and flows - men, goods or money - which are the easiest to comprehend, the Blue Plan aims at a more comprehensive reflection, paving the way for future studies. It follows that interest focused on the Needs, upstream of the Demand, on the Resources, upstream of the Supply and on the Actors, in growing numbers in current societies. A better understanding of the needs to be satisfied will allow to define objectives for some scenarios, while the seeds of technological change may perhaps expand the resources traditionally scarce in the Mediterranean Basin.

The G.C.S. wrote up several internal memos on these methodological reflections and many of their aspects were already discussed with specialists of the system analysis approach.

B) Data bases for the Blue Plan

To cope with the G.C.S.'s own needs over the first phase, keeping the following phase in mind, the Blue Plan team developed a data base covering the 18 Mediterranean countries and the major sectors. These are, at the present stage - as this work is voluntarily limited to exploration - mainly economic or socio-economic data: population, land utilisation, agricultural production and consumption, industrial activities

transportation, energy, "lifestyle" indicators: education, health, pollution etc... The accompanying statistical data can go as far back as 1960 (seldom 1950) in retrospect, and the forecasts cover a period ending in 2025 (in five years increments).

All data gathered from the United Nations, the World Bank, and gleaned from the twelve studies, were digitalized using the equipment available at MEDEAS, viz. a VAX 780 produced by DIGITAL EQUIPMENT, fitted with an associated software of average performance (this is not a true Data Base Management System). Albeit technically acceptable, this solution is unfortunately expensive in comparative terms. Another solution which ought to be cheaper to operate, more self-sufficient, and with higher performances (as far as data management only is concerned) is currently being sought out by MEDEAS in close cooperation with French authorities.

Digital mapping of the Mediterranean Basin (based on the material from the French National Geographical Institute coupled up with statistical data) was also tried with the assistance of the French Department for Environment. The results are quite interesting and this technology sounds quite substantial and promising.

A "Progress Report on a Mediterranean Information System, September 1982", was already sent to the Focal Points:

- for information,
- for verification as far as possible.

So far, more than 60,000 statistical data were stored and this figure is increasing. It is contemplated to circulate this report on the third meeting of the Contracting Parties after verification by the Focal Points and countries under the Blue Plan, as an Appendix to the synthesis of the first phase and to initiate a wider circulation after this meeting as a response to the many applications we have received.

C) The Mediterranean Information System

The data base of the Blue Plan as described above is only one component of the Mediterranean Information System for which the G.C.S. was entrusted with "laying the foundations" on the second meetings of the Focal Points of the Blue Plan in Cannes (1st to 5th Oct. 1979), an assignment which was confirmed during the third meeting of the Focal Points at MEDEAS (3rd and 4th April 1981).

In this frame of mind, some surveys were carried out by the G.C.S. and the Blue Plan team at MEDEAS, to try and define what such a Mediterranean Information System could turn out to be with, the willingness to come up with practical suggestions on the third meeting of the Contracting Parties. Various factors and criteria ought to be taken into account to design such a system:

- in addition to the socio-economic data base of the Blue Plan, this system should be able to integrate and to offer other data bases :
 - . data bases peculiar to the M.A.P., e.g. the MEDPOL data base currently building up in Athens, together with data from the Regional Activities Centers, such as Malta, Split and Tunis. Initial contacts were made with the Coordination Unit and inter-centers.
 - . peculiar to other organizations, but of genuine mediterranean relevance, for example :
 - mining resources
 - urban data
 - information on mediterranean islands
 - . inventories of specialized Mediterranean Organizations, such as Chambers of Commerce, research centers, cultural institutes, etc....

- a maximum number of mediterranean countries (ideally all) should share in the activities in this Mediterranean Information System, whose structuring and "culturing" effects should not be overlooked.

All the above factors and criteria suggest a Distributed Data Base Network, including a number of mini-computers of average cost with local interactive mode by terminals or micro-processors, under which each "center" would be offered the possibility of access to all data bases, and to take on responsibility for the management and updating of two of them. In the short and medium terms, periodical updating would be circulated by mail between all centers, unless a cable link should prove valuable (e.g. a teleconference through and for Athens). A comprehensive remote EDP net can be envisioned in the longer term.

In the short term, as users will increase in number, conversational interrogation with delayed response from the locally questioned center (on short or medium distance) is contemplated.

4. Focal Points meetings

It was originally agreed that the Blue Plan Focal Points would meet twice during the first phase of the Blue Plan. The first meeting took place in April 1981 and the second one is scheduled in January 1983.

April 1981 : Third meeting of the National Focal Points of the Blue Plan at MEDEAS (3rd and 4th April).

Delegations from 12 countries and the E.E.C. were in attendance as well as M. Aldo MANOS, Director, M.A.P. Coordination Unit and two representatives from United Nations Agencies. They were explained by the G.C.S. the progress of the work and its working schedule.

The meeting was a highly constructive one; in fact the Focal Points expressed a desire to be closely associated to the work of the Blue Plan through regular and mutual information, and pledged to facilitate the G.C.S.'s work.

Two important recommendations were made by the Focal Points:

- one concerning the capital required for the Blue Plan to proceed properly,
- the other one for the identification of Focal Points not yet identified.

January 1983 : The fourth meeting of the National Focal Points will be held at MEDEAS (31st January - 2nd February)

The completion meeting of the first phase should have taken place earlier, however, the Blue Plan work took more time than expected and, therefore, the G.C.S. deemed preferable to wait until all confrontation seminars were held and its draft synthesis ready before convening this meeting.

III. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. The Information Letter

The G.C.S. decided to publish an Information Letter in French and English three times a year to make its work more widely known and develop exchanges both with governments representatives or mediterranean scientists interested in or concerned by the Blue Plan. Due to insufficient editorial staff, it proved difficult to publish the first issues on schedule. Until today, five numbers were issued. The G.C.S. is trying hard to catch up for the delays in drafting the Letter and to improve its circulation.

2. Communications

A special effort was dedicated to try and introduce the Blue Plan on the occasion of meetings or conference, whenever the opportunity arose.

3. Liaison with the M.A.P.

Permanent contact was maintained with the Coordination Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan, as M. MANOS attended several seminars and G.C.S. meetings, and with the Contracting Parties Office as well.

The relations with the other units or Regional Activities Center under the M.A.P. are expanding and, incidentally, they are felt as a necessity for the future. The first coordination meeting between the M.A.P. project managers - held in Athens on the inauguration of the Coordination Unit - allowed to establish excellent contacts between the Blue Plan and other projects.

FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES

Let us recall that the first phase of the Blue Plan started on the 1st September 1980 and was due for completion by the turn of 1981. To keep abreast of this -perhaps too ambitious- rate, a 1,100,000, US\$ budget was requested by the Blue Plan team. This budget was reduced to 900,000 US\$ by the M.A.P. Co-ordination Unit and, on the second meeting of the Contracting Parties in Cannes from 2nd to 7th March 1981, 700,000 US\$ were eventually appropriated. However, if the UNEP financial difficulties in 1981 and early 1982 cut the sums made available to the Blue Plan down to US\$ 406,000 for 1981, that is, hardly more than half the original appropriation, and slightly in excess of the capital requirement originally considered necessary to cope with the amount of work actually involved, adding on top the erratic and unpredictable payments in 1981, this will explain why so many changes were introduced to the calendar and many meetings postponed, and the unavoidable lengthening of the first phase will be easily understood.

The financial situation went back to normal only until after the second quarter of 1982 (US\$ 540,000 appropriation released against 1982 requirements) when a tentatively definitive working program could be set with the object of completing the first phase on or before the third meeting of the Contracting Parties scheduled in March 1983.

We do not feel inclined to elaborate on this major stumbling block of the Blue Plan, as was the case with the other activities under the M.A.P.

Two points can be nonetheless made:

- Unfortunately, as is well known, lengthening the program will boost the relevant costs, due to permanent and inflation-prone operating expenses,
- Conversely, against these mishaps and setbacks, the G.C.S. used every endeavour to secure the best possible development for the first phase.

CONCLUSIONS

In spite of the above financial difficulties and resulting delay, this first phase proved highly rewarding and fruitful.

One must nonetheless emphasize that the magnitude of the work involved in this first phase was grossly underestimated originally, and the growing importance of the Blue Plan in the course of its execution involved extra work for the very small team in charge of it.

The due date of the Contracting Parties meeting on the one hand, and the late date of the last confrontation seminars on the other, left a very short time to draft the synthesis and supporting documents, to be submitted first to the Focal Points meeting and, after correction, to the Contracting Parties meeting. Notwithstanding the lack of manpower and time, every endeavour was used to ensure completion of the documents on schedule. After the Contracting Parties Meeting, more time will be however necessary to finalize the draft synthesis - which will embody Focal Points's suggestions and other comments if any - left behind due to the extra work encountered throughout the first phase.

The G.C.S. would not miss the opportunity to express his gratitude to all persons who helped it with its work, particularly the experts, with whom very warm and fruitful relations were made, and some Focal Points of the Blue Plan who showed a high degree of efficiency and drive for the Blue Plan.

The G.C.S. would also thank MEDEAS and its staff for the valuable assistance offered in the work management and organization.

STUDIES

EXPERTS

1. LAND-MARINE SYSTEMS AND SUB-SYSTEMS	A. GHARBO (Egypt) - J.P. FORET (France)
2. WATER RESOURCES, COMPETITIVE USES AND HUMAN PRIORITIES	M. ENNABLI (Tunisia) - Y. Emsellem (France)
3. INDUSTRIAL GROWTH, INDUSTRIALIZATION STRATEGIES AND SUB-SOIL RESOURCES	K. MAKSoud (Egypt) - G. LUCIANI (Italy)
4. ENERGY, OLD AND NEW	N. BERRAH (Algeria) - R. RIGOPoulos* (Greece)
5. HEALTH, POPULATION AND POPULATION MOVEMENTS	T. NACEF (Tunisia) - I. BAUCIC (Yugoslavia)
6. SPACE USE, URBANIZATION AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	L. KHALDOUN*(Algeria) - C. MUSCARA (Italy)
7. TOURISM, SPACE USE AND THE ENVIRONMENT	A. SMAOUI (Tunisia) - M. BARETJE/J.M. THURROT (France)
8. INTRA-MEDITERRANEAN ECONOMIC RELATIONS	K. ABDEL-NOUR (Syria) - M. PAPPAYANNAKIS*(Greece)
9. TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS	M. BENCHEKROUN*(Morocco) - J. CUENA (Spain)
10. CULTURAL HERITAGE AND CROSS-CULTURAL RELATIONS	Mrs NESTOROS (Greece) - R. HABACHI (Lebanon)
11. ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND VALUE SYSTEM	S. GHABBOUR (Egypt) - F. GONZALEZ BERNALDEZ (Spain)
12. IMPACT OF NON-MEDITERRANEAN INFLUENCE ON THE MEDITERRANEAN BASSIN	A. NAJIB (Morocco) - V. VUKASOVIC (Yugoslavia)

TABLE I. THE TWELVE STUDIES AND THE EXPERTS IN CHARGE

TABLE III. THE G.C.S. MEETINGS

1980	Meeting N° 1	1 to 2 September (1)	Médéas
	Meeting N° 2	25, 28 and 31 October (1)	Médéas
	Meeting N° 3	19 and 20 December (1)	Médéas
1981	Meeting N° 4	3, 6 and 7 February	Médéas
	Meeting N°	2 and 5 April	Médéas
	Meeting N° 6	22 and 23 May	Médéas
	Limited meeting	15 June	Paris
	Meeting N° 7	22 to 24 July	Paris
	Meeting N° 8	30 September and 3 October	Tunis
	Meeting N° 9	18 and 21 October	Athens
1982	Meeting N° 10	14 and 15 January	Tunis
	Meeting N° 11	4 to 7 March	Médéas
	Limited meeting	30 March	Geneva
	Meeting N° 12	10 to 12 June	Médéas
	Meeting N° 13	11 July	Paris
	Meeting N° 14	3 September	Médéas
	Meeting N° 15	16 and 17 October	Médéas
	Meeting N° 16	30 and 31 October	Split
	Meeting N° 17	20 to 22 November	Médéas
	Meeting N° 18	12 to 17 December	Médéas

(1) As the G.C.S. was not nominated at the same time, these meeting were held with a limited number.

TABLE II. THE CONFRONTATION SEMINARS

	DATE	PLACE	INVITED	PARTICIPANTS	REPRESENTED COUNTRIES AND ORGANIZATIONS
Tourism, space use and environment	1-2 / 10 / 1981	Tunis	27	15 + 21 Tunisians	8
Energy old and new	16-17 / 10 / 1981	Athens	29	19 + 11 Greeks	9 + A.I.E.A.
Industrial Growth	19-20 / 10 / 1981	Athens	28	13 + 4 Greeks	8 + C.E.E.
Water Ressources	12-13 / 01 / 1982	Tunis	27	18 + 34 Tunisians	9 + UNESCO + P.A.M.
Intra-Mediterranean Economic relations	7-8 / 07 / 1982	Paris	23	11	7 + C.E.E.
Environmental awareness	9-10 / 07 / 1982	Paris	33	23	9 + O.C.D.E. + O.M.S. + UNESCO
Transport & communications	1-2 / 09 / 1982	Médéas	32	13	9 + P.A.M.
Land-marine systems and sub-systems	27-28 / 09 / 1982	Barcelona	32	10 + 9 Spaniards	6

DOCUMENTS ELABORATED DURING THE FIRST PHASE

- . Blue Plan booklet (September, 1980)
English and French, external document

- . Information Letter (five issues)
English and French, external document

- . Statistical data (November, 1982)
English/French, internal document

- . Report of the third Meeting of the National Focal Points for the
Blue Plan (April, 1981)
English and French

- . Preliminary reports of the twelve studies
English and French, internal document

- . Final reports of five studies
English and French, internal document

- . Three activities reports for the Blue Plan (March, 1981, March, 1982,
November, 1982)
English and French, internal document

- . Internal notes :
 - One on the method of the scenarios
 - Three methodological ones
 - One on the Mediterranean Information System
 - Note sur l'agro-alimentaire (french only)
 - Note sur les grandes villes méditerranéennes (french only)
