



---

---

---

---

---

---

**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



15 April 2004  
UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.247/3  
ENGLISH

---

---



**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

Eighth Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee  
Split, Croatia, 7 April 2004

**REPORT OF THE EIGHTH MEETING  
OF THE MCSD STEERING COMMITTEE**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Main body of the report**

**Annex I List of Participants**

**Annex II Provisional Agenda**

**Introduction:**

1. The eighth meeting of the Steering Committee was held at Split, Croatia, on 7 April 2004, in the offices of PAP/RAC, at the kind invitation of the Croatian authorities.

**Participation:**

2. The following members of the Steering Committee participated in the meeting: Croatia, France, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Municipality of Omisalj and the Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED). The MAP Secretariat was represented by the Deputy Coordinator, together with the Director of BP/RAC and the Deputy Director of PAP/RAC. A UNEP/MAP consultant also attended the meeting.

3. The full list of participants is attached as **Annex I** to the present report.

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

4. Mrs Višnja Jelić Mück, State Secretary of the MoE of Croatia and Chair of the MCSD Steering Committee opened the meeting, extending a welcome to all participants on behalf of the Minister of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction, to whom she would be reporting on the outcome of the meeting. She took a personal interest in the Committee's valuable work and output and hoped that the meeting would be a fruitful one. The future of the MSSD lay in the hands of the Committee members, which was a huge responsibility.

5. Mr. Marko Prem, Deputy Director, PAP/RAC, welcomed participants to Split and the offices of PAP/RAC. He hoped that the meeting would be a successful one for the future of MCSD.

6. Mr. Arab Hoballah, MAP Deputy Coordinator and Officer in Charge, thanked the Croatian authorities for hosting the meeting. He explained that, owing to time restrictions, the Secretariat's report and the annexes containing the texts for consideration had been submitted only in English, and he apologized for that. A new MAP Coordinator had been nominated but the date of his arrival in the post had not yet been announced. The present meeting had already been delayed from the beginning of the year and could not be delayed further. He pointed out that the Steering Committee had a new member, Italy, taking over from Monaco as President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties. He went on to stress that the most important item on their agenda was item 3. The Contracting Parties were due to meet in Slovenia at the end of 2005, by which time three important reports would have to be finalized by MAP/MCSD, MEDPOL and BP/RAC. Time was very short and the draft Regional Strategy would have to be prepared within 8-10 months.

**Agenda item 2: Refining and finalizing the MSSD Vision and Orientations**

7. The Secretariat reminded the Steering Committee that the MSSD Vision and Orientations had already been approved by the MCSD Steering Committee at its previous meeting in Monaco and that no major comments of substance had been received since. At the meeting of the Contracting Parties in Catania, in 2003, it had been requested that comments regarding the document be sent to the Secretariat by 15 January 2004. Those sent by Spain had mainly referred to the following steps of the preparation of the MSSD and note had been taken thereof. Egypt had pointed out

problems mainly related to the Arabic translation of “governance”. The European Commission had confirmed that it had no comments to make. The Committee was, consequently, asked to refine the document, at most, and also to consider the possibility of adding “agriculture/rural development” to the MSSD as a specific Area for Priority Action. It was, however, to be borne in mind that agriculture/rural development was already effectively, if inherently, covered under other Priority Areas.

8. Mr Guillaume Benoit, Director of the Blue Plan, put the case for specific inclusion of the agriculture/rural development sector as a separate priority in the MSSD. He began by stating that there were three main reasons for adding the theme to the Strategy’s sectors of action. The first was the extent of the degradation of vital natural resources as a result of mismanagement of the countryside. Desertification (including erosion and salinization) already affected 80% of the dry and arid zones of the region and had damaged forests, communication routes and farmland. The exceptional mainland biodiversity that made the region one of the leading bio-hotspots in the world was thus seriously endangered. The financial cost of that deterioration (forests, soils, biodiversity) was already alarmingly high (1.36% of GDP in Algeria, for example), and was compounded by downstream impacts (such as the silting of dams) and the excessive consumption of water resources. In numerous countries, mismanagement of the countryside had seriously increased the vulnerability to the risk of forest fires, which currently cost more than 1000 million dollars to fight fires every year.

9. The second reason, Mr Benoit went on, was the importance of the rural issue in terms of poverty, economic development and social stability. All indicators showed that, in the developing Mediterranean countries and those in transition, poverty was far more severe in rural areas than in towns and cities. Agricultural communities still accounted for a high proportion of the working population in those countries (46% in Turkey, 36% in Morocco and 33% in Egypt). In addition to achievement of the goal of fair and equal development in rural areas, the overall development of those countries was also at stake. Rural poverty had a knock-on effect on the development of domestic markets and the rural population (133 million in total in 2000) was not expected to decrease despite the countryside-to-city exodus. Against that background several countries believed that no decisive social and economic progress could be made while such a large part of the population remained economically and politically sidelined. That marginalization was also the main cause of the rural exodus that increased pressure on cities, coasts and emigration. It made those regions extremely susceptible to the negative impact of free trade, while it heightened the risks of poverty, further rural exodus and emigration, all factors to be reckoned with. On the other hand, the Mediterranean countryside boasted a number of assets in a globalizing world. It could enhance or create comparative advantages, thanks to the quality of its products and services. Tuscany in Italy offered an excellent example of rural development since considerable profits were derived there from a successful synergy between agriculture, the agro-food industry, tourism and the strengthening of rural centres. Several countries, in particular Italy, were well down the road towards developing organic farming.

10. Thirdly, Mr Benoit said, there were the political considerations. Agricultural policies were among the most significant policies in the whole region. They had, however, become excessively focused on irrigation and high-productivity farming, had only benefited a small number of country dwellers and had actually increased the pressures on the environment while polarizing internal social and territorial divergences. They had just begun to evolve in such a way as to take more successfully into account the challenges of sustainable rural development. At the

same time, resource conservation policies (water, soil and forest conservation) had been ineffectual since they were too technically biased and were not sufficiently integrated into rural development policies. That said, the first signs of highly encouraging experiences had begun to appear in terms of integrated, participatory rural development (natural parks, pilot operations in the livestock or forestry sectors, biosphere reserves, etc.), which brought about both environmental and socio-economic progress. At worldwide level the non-commercial aspects of farming were beginning to be taken into account – namely the social and environmental aspects, or the question of food self-sufficiency, and so forth. They were being included in trade negotiations and could be highly consequential in view of the many roles played by farming and forestry in the region and the risks of instability that might stem from a move towards free trade that did not take all the various issues at stake into consideration.

11. The Director of the Blue Plan concluded that sustainable rural development was a sine qua non of environmental development in the Mediterranean in general and of the Euro-Mediterranean project in particular. He emphasized the political aspect, pointing out that the farming and forestry sectors had been major precursors in the field of Euro-Mediterranean cooperation. The Mediterranean faced specific rural problems, as its climate and vegetation were unique.

12. During the discussion that followed, it was agreed that agricultural and rural issues were extremely important and that it should be a strong possibility to include them as a specific sector in the MSSD, although such a decision should be left to the following meeting of the MCSD. That decision could not, however, be taken any later than the Genoa meeting in June 2004.

### **Agenda item 3: Discussing and advising on the MSSD preparatory process**

13. It was stipulated by the Secretariat that item 3 was the most important of all on the agenda. The preparatory process for the MSSD was being defined and the output from the Committee's discussions would guide the related workshop to be held in Rabat, Morocco on 7 and 8 May 2004,.

14. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that the Johannesburg Summit had been criticized for failing to set enough quantifiable goals in addition to those of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The lesson to be drawn was that realistic quantifiable results had to be obtained through implementation of a Strategy. Those practical quantifiable objectives might vary from country to country but it is important to agree on regional ones that would then be translated at the national level. It was not, however, an easy exercise as had been shown by the efforts of other organizations, including Baltic Agenda 21. Follow-up was often the weak point and that was why performance indicators were so important. It was vital that such matters be discussed at Genoa in readiness for the 2005 meeting of Contracting Parties. Significantly the main MAP legal instruments were about to enter into force since enough signatures had been forthcoming or were soon expected.

15. The Committee was also reminded of the tight schedule – namely 8-10 months – within which decisions had to be taken, in terms of determining specific objectives and possibly setting quantitative goals. To begin with it was proposed to focus on water and energy, and the experiences learned could then be applied to other issues. He presented a "matrix", which extrapolated the parameters and objectives for the MSSD from the documents already agreed upon. It was emphasized that the Strategy was not for MAP alone but for the Mediterranean as a whole. Other actors

would have to be brought into play. For example, in the field of agriculture and rural matters, the Blue Plan could not act alone but would need to work with FAO and others such as ICAMAS. In the area of tourism they would have to cooperate with the World Tourism Organization (WTO) and private enterprises. The very success of the Strategy depended on the ability to involve other partners. Civil society and the private sector were currently waiting to see what developed and were waiting for inducement to join in the Strategy. The clearer the methodology for preparing and implementing the Strategy, the greater the chances of involving more partners. That had already transpired from the meeting of some of the largest and most active MAP environmental NGOs, in Madrid, on 17 and 18 January 2004; a document entitled "The MSSD formulation process, NGO recommendations, March 2004" (attached in Annex II) was presented to the Committee. Above all, MAP had a political mandate to implement a strategy, which was its main asset. Much progress had been made in working together with the private sector: ICC/Monaco had expressed its eagerness to pursue such cooperation. MCSD had been invited to attend the ICC Council in Marrakesh, Morocco, in June 2004; that would provide an ideal moment to present the preparation of the Strategy. ICC had also agreed to prepare for the organization of a summer workshop on coastal management in Split, Croatia, a pilot project that could be repeated annually in other Mediterranean regions if successful.

16. In the light of the developments concerning CSD in New York, an appeal was made for all Parties and Partners of UNEP/MAP to put their case at the Ministerial Segment at the next CSD meeting, in particular at a side event on "the Mediterranean responses to the WSSD". It would be useful to promote not only the Strategy but also the SAP-MED, SAP-BIO and the RED.

17. All of the above meant that it was important to define clearly the responsibilities for collecting data, organizing meetings and taking the political decisions. It was agreed by the Committee that the Task Managers needed to be appointed as a matter of urgency, at Genoa at the latest, which meant that the matter had to be discussed at Rabat. All Mediterranean agencies had been invited to the MCSD meeting in Genoa and also to the Rabat workshop and it was hoped that their participation would be high. Several speakers intervened to emphasize the need for the Strategy not to remain "on the shelf" as had been the fate of previous documents. The necessary financial means lay at the centre of the Strategy while solidarity in the Mediterranean region was also a crucial factor. One speaker made it clear that commitments had to be made on the part of the States – albeit with flexibility in the form of different commitments from country to country.

18. At the request of various speakers the Secretariat agreed to make available relevant information contained in Baltic Agenda 21 and OECD documents at the next MCSD meeting. It was hoped that those organizations would be present at future meetings to present such data themselves.

19. Attention was drawn to the need to decide what kind of final document should be elaborated and presented to the 10th meeting of the MCSD in June 2005, which would then be presented to the meeting of the Contracting Parties later that year; three options were set out in the Report by the Secretariat for the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee (UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.247/2). In the ensuing discussion it was generally agreed that the intermediate option would be most satisfactory. In other words the main document should be around 30-40 pages in length (taking its inspiration from the Baltic Agenda 21 and the EU Gothenburg Declaration), possibly a little longer, and accompanied by a punchy political message setting out the "headlines", in the form of a Declaration. The details would have to be left to technical experts. Each country would have to agree to a minimum regional

commitment, preferably in the form of a questionnaire checklist of commitments. In view of the lack of public awareness of MCSD and its activities, or even the issue of sustainable development, it was important to aim any awareness raising activities at the general public and the "grassroots". A proactive communications element would be vital for the Strategy; a request was made for the documents to include a brief press release. The Secretariat pointed out that MCSD had already greatly improved its visibility in the media, in particular the regional written press. UNEP Headquarters had been impressed by the degree of press coverage achieved at Catania. As for the technical documents they were also crucial; the European Commission had already expressed an interest in many of those produced by the Blue Plan. Several speakers pointed to the need to produce as many documents as possible in as many different languages spoken in the Mediterranean as possible. One speaker called for more use to be made of the Internet.

20. Mr Mahjoub then gave a power-point presentation on the methodology to be followed in the process, referring to the Report by the Secretariat for the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee (UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.247/2). He said that, when moving from the orientation to the preparation, it was fundamental to regard the MSSD as both an outcome and a process; strategies were often seen only as the outcome of an action, not an ongoing process. The main principles to be applied were participation and integration, but that would not be easy since participation entailed information, coordination, analysis, follow-up and capacity building where necessary. The preliminary stage in the process, that of determining the orientations, had already been completed, and the preparation stage had been started, which left implementation, followed by monitoring and assessment of that implementation of the Strategy. The fourteen key steps laid down by OECD in such a process were a guideline but did not necessarily have to be followed in a rigid sequences; he had assigned each key step a "traffic light", to specify the levels of urgency and achievement, which together constituted a roadmap for the process.

21. He added that useful methodological lessons could be learned from the Baltic Agenda 21. Eleven countries had been involved and the Strategy had been implemented since 1993. It enjoyed top-level commitment, from the prime and foreign ministers of each country and also high-level, intensive NGO participation. It had been a democratic and transparent process from the outset, based on a common vision, namely the convergence of standards of living and the reduction of unemployment to minimal levels by the year 2030. The so-called "overgoals" had been translated into eight sector goals: agriculture, energy, fisheries, forestry, industry, tourism, land planning and education. The Strategy's action programmes included sectoral and joint actions, along with pilot and demonstrative projects.

22. According to Mr Mahjoub, the first steps should focus on establishing organizational structures and networks for the areas of priority action, followed by the development of a work plan for each area. It was then important to create the necessary frameworks to enable the sectors to function, determining the roles of each partner (lead parties) and stakeholders, which in effect was the present stage of preparation of the MSSD. The main outcomes of the Orientations had to be borne in mind: a conceptual and methodological framework, in which governance played a key role; the major economic, social and environmental challenges and stakes; the priority areas of water, energy, air pollution, tourism, transport, marine/coastal areas and urban management; and the identification and involvement of the necessary actors and stakeholders. The terms of reference of the MSSD were as follows: the outcome would be the preparation of sectoral (priority area) reports, once the main guidelines for their contents had been decided upon; the process entailed setting up sector networks, identifying partners and stakeholders, selecting the main

management asks, and creating the necessary frameworks for the sectors to function.

23. In conformity with the Secretariat's request, Mr Mahjoub had selected two priority areas for case studies at the current stage, namely energy (it had been the subject of the most successful sectoral report in the Baltic Agenda 21) and water (in connection with poverty) since it was the subject of a Type II, GWP MED Initiative and was central to the question of integration and sustainable development. In the context of MAP – taking as the source the Blue Plan's Mediterranean Environment and Development Report – the following conclusions could be drawn. For energy no significant additional work was required in terms of the challenges and stakes, but the overall objectives still had to be translated into goals and targets. As far as partnership and stakeholders were concerned, they needed to build on the existing informal Mediterranean Energy Network. Further investigation into potential partners and stakeholders was also required, while the Mediterranean Observatory of Energy could be responsible for preparing the energy report. Substantial work had to be done on institutional and financial means and the issue of policies, actions and measures, within a comprehensive action plan. The Baltic Agenda 21 Agenda's action programme could prove useful in the preparation of the work plan relating to the energy sector report.

24. Turning to the subject of water, Mr Mahjoub repeated that no significant additional work was required in terms of the challenges and stakes, but the overall objectives still had to be translated into goals and targets. With regard to partnership and stakeholders he referred to UNEP/MED IG. 15/10 Part B, pages 20. He added that substantial work remained to be done on institutional and financial means and the issue of policies, actions and measures. He referred to the tripartite programme of action Euro Med WPF, whose main goal was poverty reduction in urban areas, in terms of water and sanitation and involving Egypt, Greece, Morocco and Tunisia. He made three recommendations: that the geographical scope be extended to the whole Mediterranean; that rural areas be included; and that the components be increased to include safe access to water.

25. Mr Mahjoub went on to remind the Committee of the Millennium Development Goals and Targets and to present a number of graphs illustrating current trends and goals in the areas of primary school enrolment, gender disparities at primary school, infant and maternal mortality, and the central issue of unemployment specially youth unemployment. According to the World Bank extreme poverty had been reduced in the region but poverty remained a real problem. He concluded that additional work was needed with regard to the challenges and stakes and that the objectives, goals and targets were those set out in the Millennium Development Goals. The programme action could be built on Euro Med WPF, in cooperation with MOI-ECSDE.

26. During the discussion of Mr Mahjoub's presentation, which was lengthy and involved all participants, it was stated that the necessary information for the Strategy already existed; it was necessary to focus on its objectives, on the partners to be involved and on the follow-up, which was vital to the whole process. On the question of water, it had to be borne in mind that it was a complex subject, with quantity, quality and access all major factors. Access to water had to be part of the priorities of both urban and rural development. Water savings, for example, would be beneficial for the whole region, but they would also require inter-State cooperation. It was requested that, above all, the preparation process should be coherent, efficient and concise.



27. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya complained that the data relating to his country were not totally accurate; many of the statistics were outdated. In a discussion of that aspect, it was stipulated that MCSD had to rely on existing data, mostly UNDP statistics, which were generally regarded as the most reliable. One speaker also called for more information on non-Arab countries; reassurance was given that whereas the paper had concentrated on Arab countries, the Strategy would, of course, extend such considerations to include all Mediterranean countries. The consultant's presentation had merely been an example of the kind of problems faced within each sector. It was lamented that data differed from country to country, especially when it came to the definition of elements such as poverty. The notion, suggested by the statistics presented, that poverty had actually decreased in the developing countries of the southern Mediterranean, was challenged. Poverty was not confined to southern countries and there were large numbers of extremely poor people even in richer countries such as France. Nor was water access, quality or quantity confined to southern countries; again France and other richer countries had suffered a serious deterioration in the quality of drinking water in recent decades.

28. The Secretariat reiterated the fact that the purpose of Mr Mahjoub's presentation was to offer a guideline or ideas as to the general methodology to be followed for the Strategy as a whole. That methodology had to be fleshed out. At Rabat working groups would have to be formed, according to the participants attending, to cover a set of various sectors due to be covered in the Strategy, such as energy/air/transport, or similar groupings. One important objective would be the identification of lacunae in existing data on relevant subjects. Poverty was not related solely to water but to all the objectives to be met by the Strategy. It was important for all sectors to be discussed in Rabat and not only water and energy; the aim of all proceedings should be transparency and efficiency, and the broadest possible participation in the meeting had to be aimed at. One speaker warned that it would not be possible to send experts from every field to the Rabat meeting.

29. One speaker noted that it was important to set out the specific objectives, preferably not in abstract form. For example, with regard to energy, renewable energy sources should be mentioned. In any case it would be useful to present the experts in Rabat with short documents setting out the work already done on water and energy, so that MCSD would be assisted in its work on the Strategy as a whole. It was recalled that the Split meeting was intended to guide and prepare for the Rabat workshop, which in turn would assist the work of the MCSD at its Genoa meeting. The Rabat workshop should comprise a plenary session to decide on a methodology for energy and water, followed by meetings of 3 or 4 working groups, depending on the total number of participants. The plenary would then be reconvened to review what had been decided by each of the working groups, with a view to deciding the next steps to be taken in the ongoing process. One suggestion for the four working groups was: water/rural-agriculture; air/energy; transport/urban; and tourism/marine coastal management. The final permutation would be decided in Rabat, on the basis of who took part in the workshop. Reference to the structure that had been adopted for preparation of local SD Strategy, which a group of experts had analysed needs before going on to develop the methodology and such an approach might usefully be taken in the case of MSSD. Finally, it appeared that more probably 3 working groups would be constituted: water/rural-agricultural development, energy/air-climate/transport, and marine-coastal management/urban development/tourism.

30. One speaker warned against inviting too many participants to Rabat. The Secretariat recalled that the Barcelona meeting had been a success owing to the presence of many NGOs, whose contribution had been invaluable.

31. It was also decided that the Steering Committee would have to meet at least twice before the meeting of Contracting Parties. A specific meeting would have to be convened to discuss the all-important topic of financial means, a sine qua non for the Strategy.

**Agenda item 4: Discussing and advising on the MCSD Inter-Agency Platform and MSSD Advisory Group**

32. The Secretariat recalled that it had been agreed at the previous meeting of the Contracting Parties that the two bodies needed to be established. The original terms of reference of the MCSD had called for regional cooperation, but little had so far been done to ensure that the relevant activities of the various UN agencies were rationalized where possible. Other agencies had shown little interest in participating in MCSD proceedings as mere observers, the only status they could be offered. Indeed, care should be taken not to add too many fully-fledged members to the Commission; there were already a large number of Members. Lessons had certainly been learned from the Rio process, following which the Secretary General had called on all United Nations bodies to enter into formal discussions on sustainable development through the UN Inter Agency Committee for Sustainable Development. The institutions had to agree among themselves who was responsible for the matter, especially when preparing for CSD. In 2001, a decision had been taken to form a smaller committee that would be closer to the Secretary General, holding ad hoc meetings whenever necessary. Obviously UNEP-MAP had neither the United Nations' power nor its framework to act as a leading body, but it could act as a catalyst; it could rely on both a legal framework and its political clout deriving from the Contracting Parties. The Inter-Agency Platform would, therefore, serve as a forum for discussing the various SD challenges in the Mediterranean context, together with how to improve cooperation through joint activities and projects. The Platform would decide upon the principles of that cooperation, and advise the Members and Partners accordingly. Synergy could be improved, and overlapping and duplication avoided. A whole range of different regional organizations plus actors from the civil society would be involved. The key principles to be applied were "informality" and "flexibility", but the Platform could definitely help to enhance MCSD's general visibility and promote sustainable development in the Region. Exchanges of views with other agencies could only be beneficial, and should result in an increased sharing of information and greater cooperation. The long-fought-for recognition of MCSD in New York needed henceforth to be harnessed.

33. Some speakers expressed the view that, although the decision taken at Catania obviously had to be respected, the danger of increased institutionalization had to be avoided. Others referred to the fact that MCSD was already being invited to meetings of other agencies, a sign that there was a desire to work in synergy. Space should be opened up to encourage and promote such synergy without necessarily creating a new body as such. In fact, some speakers pointed out the undesirability of creating an excessively burdensome bureaucratic machinery by creating a whole series of new bodies. It was pointed out that there was no budget for holding meetings of such a new body and that the Platform, regardless of its form and composition, should always meet in parallel with other MCSD meetings. The request to set up the Platform could be responded to simply by inviting other agencies to attend MCSD meetings in the future; on that score, it also had to be recalled that not all agencies would be interested in participating in any case, though obviously the more that did the better. One suggestion was that the agencies themselves would pay for their attendance at MCSD meetings or possibly at Platform meetings. The Secretariat

reassured the Committee that such a Platform would not become a permanent part of a machinery, since its aim is to improve regional cooperation.

34. With regard to the MSSD Advisory Group, the Secretariat explained that the Group would comprise 5-10 experts, who would assist MCSD in preparation of the MSSD. Decisions on the membership would be taken at Genoa, but it had to be borne in mind that all strategic challenges needed to be covered, by having experts specializing in all the sectors involved.

35. Requests were made for specific names to be prepared in time for the Genoa meeting of MCSD – rather than the suggested names given as a guideline, or to provoke a reaction, contained in the Report by the Secretariat for the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee (UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.247/2). The Blue Plan was asked to propose suitable candidates and agreed to do so. Several speakers insisted that the criteria for nomination and selection of the experts also needed to be drawn up by the Secretariat (as a kind of job description), and that request was agreed to. The same went for a request for the Group's terms of reference to be made explicit. Warnings were sounded about the possibility that the Group might confuse rather than focus the Commission's work on the MSSD (in view of its achievements to date, the fruit of many years' work) and doubts were expressed as to the advisability of setting up such a Group. If it were to be created, its members should be dynamic and of the highest calibre, perhaps new combatants rather than people who had already been involved in the process for a long time.

36. The Secretariat emphasized the "advisory" role explicit in the Group's title. The Group would not, it was asserted, be a decision-making body. A plea was made for suitable candidates to be proposed, especially from OECD countries, i.e. from the European side of the Mediterranean, along with candidates representing the Adriatic subregion. It was important, however, that all the experts should be knowledgeable about the situation in the whole Mediterranean, not just a given subregion. One speaker requested that the Group should respect the gender balance; no women had yet been nominated.

#### **Agenda item 5: Agenda for next MCSD meeting**

37. The Secretariat referred to the provisional agenda of the MCSD meeting due to take place in Genoa, Italy, on 17-19 June 2004, contained in the Report for the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee. It was agreed that under "Any other matters" progress made on the Euromed Sustainability Impact Analysis would be presented. A call was made for special reference also to be made to the work of the CSD, on which a briefing should be delivered, and the issue of financing. It was agreed that no new doors should be opened, but that the meeting should focus on decisions already taken. The Secretariat emphasized that CSD work was relevant but needed to be adapted to the specific Mediterranean context. It was also important to recall that it had been agreed in both Cavtat and Catania that the MCSD's work programme should be reassessed once the MSSD had been approved. One speaker asked for time to be given to the 100 Sites Cultural Programme, in particular on any progress made since Catania. A number of towns and cities had shown an interest and it was suggested that the host city of the current meeting, Split, would also be an ideal candidate.

38. It was agreed that item 3 of the provisional agenda ("MCSD Informal Inter-Agency Platform: mandate, terms of reference, composition and organization") should be deleted in view of the discussion held on the issue earlier (under agenda item 4 of

the current meeting). The subject was not sufficiently important to merit an agenda item of its own and should be discussed under "Any other matters".

39. On the question of break-out sessions, it was recalled by several speakers that the experience at Cavtat had been an unhappy one. It was questioned whether such sessions were necessary or helpful and it was agreed that they should not be planned at the Genoa meeting. It was also clearly stated that should such sessions be called for at the meeting, simultaneous interpretation could not be assured, nor would there be enough report-writers to cover several sessions taking place at the same time; sessions would have to be held in English alone, and a rapporteur would report back to the plenary, with a view to inclusion of discussion in the meeting report. One problem facing many countries was that they could not afford to send more than one representative and consequently could not be present at the various sessions.

40. Ms Annalidia Pansini, representative of Italy, confirmed that her country's Ministry of the Environment would be presenting a side event, which would be on the Type II Initiative. She hoped that other countries would also be presenting side events and it was reiterated that it was expected that two or three such events would be staged at the Meeting. A suggestion was made that one of those side events should be on the subject of MCSD's synergies with other partners from the Civil Society and other agencies.

#### **Agenda item 6: Any other matters**

41. Reference was made to the request made at Catania for an MSSD timetable to be drawn up. In particular attention needed to be made to the regional strategy for coastal management. An appeal was made for coherence in all work on the MSSD. Furthermore, one speaker urged attendance at the Genoa meeting by any organization that was interested in so doing. It was stated that it was important to achieve synergy within MCSD before an attempt could be made at achieving synergies with other agencies.

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

42. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 7 p.m., on Wednesday, 7 April 2004.

**ANNEX I****Eighth Seventh meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****CROATIA - CROATIE****Mrs. Višnja Jelić Mück**

State Secretary  
 Environmental Protection Division  
 Minister of Environmental Protection,  
 Physical Planning and Construction  
 Ulica grada Vukovara 78  
 HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia  
 Tel: 385 1 6106578  
 Fax: 385 1 6118388  
 E-mail: visnja.jelic-mueck@mzopu.hr

**Ms. Margita Mastrovic**

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

**ICC/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAMBERS OF MONACO**

Did not attend

**FRANCE - FRANCE****Mr. Serge Antoine**

Délégué de la France à la CMDD  
 Comité 21, 132 rue de Rivoli  
 75001 Paris, France  
 Tel : 33 1 55347521  
 Fax : 33 1 55347520  
 Email: antoine@comite21.asso.fr  
 et  
 10, rue de la Fontaine  
 91570 Bièvres, France  
 Tel : 33 1 69412056  
 Fax : 33 1 69855233

**ITALY-ITALIE****Ms. Annalidia Pansini**

Tel.+39 06 57228116  
 Fax +39 06 57228175  
 E mail : pansini.annalidia@minambiente.it

**Ms. Angelica Carnelos**

Tel.+39 06 57228219  
 Fax +39 06 57228178  
 E mail : carnelos.angelica@minambiente.it

Ministry for the Environment and Territory  
 Via Cristoforo Colombo, 44  
 00147 Rome  
 Italy  
 Tel : 39-06-57228102  
 Fax: 39-06-57228175  
 E-mail: pia-sdg@minambiente.it

**LIBYA - LIBYE****Mr. Abdulfatah Boargob**

Environmental Advisor  
 Environmental General Authority  
 El Gheran, P.O. Box 83618, Tripoli  
 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya  
 Tel: 218 21 4831316  
 Fax: 218 21 4839991, 218 21 3338098  
 E-mail: ega@egalibya.org, aboargob@yahoo.co.uk

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

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

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

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

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

Directeur  
 PB/CAR  
 15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven  
 Sophia Antipolis  
 F-06560 Valbonne  
 France  
 Tel: 33 4 92387130/33  
 Fax: 33 4 92387131

UNEP(DEC)/MED WG. 247/3  
Annex I  
Page 2

E-mail: [planbleu@planbleu.org](mailto:planbleu@planbleu.org), [gbenoit@planbleu.org](mailto:gbenoit@planbleu.org)

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

**Mr. Marko Prem**

Deputy Director  
PAP/RAC  
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana  
P.O Box 74  
HR-21000 Split, Croatia  
Tel: 385 21 340370  
Fax: 385 21 340490  
E-mail: pap@ppa.tel.hr  
E-mail: marko.prem@ppa.htnet.hr

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

**Mr. Arab Hoballah**

Deputy Coordinator  
Tel: 30 210 7273126  
E-mail:hoballah@unepmap.gr

Coordinating Unit for the  
Mediterranean Action Plan  
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue  
P. O. Box 18019  
116 10 Athens  
Greece  
Tel: 30 210 7273100  
Fax: 30 210 7253196-7  
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr  
www.unepmap.org

**Mr. Azzam Mahjoub**

UNEP/MAP Expert  
1, passage 5, Ta'albi, Menzeh 9,  
Tunis, Tunisie  
Tel/Fax: 21671 880693  
E-mail: azmahjoub@prontomail.com

**ANNEX II****PROVISIONAL AGENDA****8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee  
Split, Croatia, 7 April 2004**

**1. Opening of the meeting;**  
The meeting will be opened by the President of the Steering Committee of the MCSD (Croatia) and the Secretariat.

**2. Refining and finalizing the MSSD Vision and Orientations;**  
Following a brief introduction by the Secretariat on related discussions at the Contracting Parties meeting, the MCSD members will discuss the possible “refinements”, if any and if necessary, of the Orientations Document, keeping in mind that this document was already approved by the previous meeting of the MCSD and that no major comments of substance were received since then.

**3. Discussing and advising on the MSSD preparatory process**

- a. challenges/priorities,
- b. specific objectives
- c. task managers
- d. partners
- e. means
- f. responsibilities

This agenda item, the most important on the agenda, as we are actually defining the preparatory process for the MSSD, will require interactive discussions on the various points listed above. The output from this discussion is expected to guide the related workshop that would be held on 7-8 May in Rabat; draft guidelines based on two of the priority issues will be introduced and discussed before using them as framework guidelines for the Rabat workshop.

**4. Discussing and advising on MCSD Inter-Agency Platform and MSSD Advisory Group;**  
At the last meeting of the Contracting Parties, it was agreed that a “MCSD Inter-Agency Platform” and a “MSSD Advisory Group” need to be established. The SC members will exchange on the role, mandate and composition of these groups of agencies/experts.

**5. Agenda for next MCSD meeting;**  
A provisional agenda will be presented for the consideration of the members that are expected to discuss also the organizational matters, in particular the plenary sessions vs the break out sessions and side-events.

**6. Any other matters;**

**7. Closure of the meeting.**

N.B. the meeting will start at 09.00 and will be ending late, around 19.00 or 20.00, if necessary

11.00-11.30 Coffee Break

13.30-15.00 Lunch Break

16.30-17.00 Coffee Break