

Table of Contents

Main Body of the report

Report by the Secretariat on the activities of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (March 2002-April 2003)

Report of the 8th meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

Annexes:

- Annex I: Conclusions of the seventh Meeting of the MCSD
- Annex II: Conclusions of the 6th Meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD
- Annex III: Highlights from the WSSD
- Annex IV: Proposed UNEP/MAP-MCSD Type II Partnership Initiative
- Annex V: MCSD Assessment and Prospects: Task Force Report

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE
MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
(March 2002-April 2003)**

Introduction

The present progress report is submitted by the Secretariat of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) in compliance with its Terms of Reference. It covers progress in the implementation of various decisions taken by the MCSD and its Steering Committee as well as the Contracting Parties, during the period March 2002 – April 2003.

Organization and implementation of the activities during this period were largely based on the preparation and contribution for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the intersessional activities of the thematic Working Groups, the preparation of Framework Orientations for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development as well as the Assessment and Prospects for MCSD.

The Eighth meeting of the MCSD, kindly co-financed by Croatia, will be held in Cavtat, Croatia from 14 to 16 May 2003, with three working days, the third expected to be shorter, including the adoption of the brief report of the meeting. The meeting is expected to be closed at 14.00 on 16 May 2003.

The new representatives of the fifteen non Contracting Parties members from the Major Groups will be participating for the first time to MCSD meetings; eventhough nominated by the Contracting Parties at their 12th meeting (Monaco 14-17 November 2001), they have not participated to the 7th MCSD meeting (Antalya, March 2002) as it was postponed from before the CP meeting for international geopolitical reasons. .

In order to improve the organisation and efficiency of the MCSD as requested by several members, we will attempt to move the meeting from a rather institutional to a more forum type one; One or two special guests would be invited, break out working sessions would be organised (Framework Orientations and MCSD prospects), as appropriate and necessary, and side events would be held, probably by NGOs (MIO-ECSDE), Business sector (ICC-Med) and Croatia.

Taking the opportunity of having Mediterranean Partners assuming important international responsibilities, we drew their attention to the necessity of improving MCSD's visibility and promoting its activities; these opportunities to build on are EU Presidency by Greece and then Italy in 2003, Croatia as Member of the UN-CSD Bureau and Morocco as Head of the Group of 77 and China.

In addition to the thematic issues and, as appropriate, their related findings and proposals, the agenda of the 8th MCSD meeting will focus on:

- The WSSD, its Plan of Implementation and its application to the Mediterranean level;
- The "Framework Orientations" for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development; the review of the draft report and identification of further steps;
- The Assessment of and the Prospects for the MCSD; the review of the draft report and proposals from the Task Force, and recommendations on next steps.

The contents of the report hereunder derive from the active work carried out during this intersessional period, but with an unsustainable shortness of adequate resources, ending up by affecting the quality of the results and the overall work of the Secretariat. Several information documents were prepared as a contribution to the WSSD preparatory process, a MAP/MCSD Type II Partnership Initiative was prepared, a meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee was organised, two experts meetings and one Workshop were held on "Orientations for a Mediterranean Strategy, two working sessions of the MCSD Task Force

on Assessment and Prospects were organised (and to all these meetings, pre and post documents were prepared), in addition to thematic activities undertaken by the Support Centres/Regional Activity Centres (in particular BP/RAC on Water, Free Trade, Financing, etc, – PAP/RAC on Coastal Zone Management and CP/RAC on Industry) and by Task Managers (in particular France on Natural and Cultural Heritage).

Finally, and in conformity with the decision of the 7th MCSD meeting, only a brief report would be prepared and adopted, consisting of a “reasoned record of decisions preceded by a short introduction reflecting only the spirit of the discussions, the whole of which would not be longer than ten pages”

I. Brief history of the MCSD: benchmarks and decisions

The post-Rio era was an important period in the history of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) during which the Governments of the Mediterranean region and the European Community, in cooperation with concerned partners, started the process of translating and adapting UNCED principles to the Mediterranean context through the preparation of Agenda MED 21, reorientation of MAP, the Barcelona Convention and its protocols and the creation of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD).

The MCSD was established in 1995 within the framework of MAP, as an advisory body with the following mandate:

- to identify, evaluate and examine major economic, ecological and social problems set out in Agenda MED 21, make appropriate proposals thereon to the meetings of the Contracting Parties, evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of decisions taken by the Contracting Parties and facilitate the exchange of information among institutions implementing activities related to sustainable development in the Mediterranean;
- to enhance regional cooperation and rationalise the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean basin for the integration of environment and development issues.

At their Extraordinary Meeting (Montpellier, 1-4 July 1996), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted the Terms of Reference and the Composition of the Commission. According to the Terms of Reference, the Commission is composed of 36 members, sitting on equal footing, consisting of high-level representatives from each of the Contracting Parties (21), representatives of local authorities, socio-economic actors and non-governmental organisations (15), working in the fields of environment and sustainable development.

During its first meeting (Rabat, December 1996), the Commission elected its first Steering Committee; it agreed on a programme built on activities corresponding to some of the priority needs of the Mediterranean region: sustainable management of coastal regions and management of water demand, sustainable development indicators, tourism, information, awareness and participation, free trade and environment, industry and sustainable development, management of urban and rural development.

The method of work consisted in organizing thematic Working Groups with Task Managers and Support Centres to deal with each selected theme. The MAP funds allocated to the MCSD will be considered as seed money since the task managers and support centres are expected to look for the necessary additional human and financial resources and expertise

for the activities of the thematic Working Groups.

The second meeting of the Commission (Palma de Majorca, May 1997) has mainly reviewed progress achieved and problems encountered since its first meeting.

At their third meeting (Sophia Antipolis, October 1997) the members of the MCSD agreed upon sets of recommendations and proposals for action related to management of water demand and sustainable management of coastal zones, together with MCSD's draft rules of procedure, before presenting them to the Contracting Parties that adopted them at their tenth meeting (Tunis, November 1997).

At its fourth meeting (Monaco, October 1998) the Commission examined the progress made by the six "medium-term" thematic Working Groups, as well as issues related to follow-up of recommendations, new themes, method of work and cooperation with UN agencies and other partners. Moreover and in conformity with the MCSD's specific rules of procedure, a new Steering Committee was elected.

The fifth meeting of the MCSD (Rome, July 1999) agreed on sets of recommendations and proposals for action related to "Sustainable Development Indicators" and "Information, Awareness, Environmental Education and Participation"; the ones related to "Tourism and Sustainable Development" were reviewed and finalized some weeks later; they were then all presented to the 11th meeting of the Contracting Parties (Malta, October 1999) who adopted the three sets of recommendations; moreover, the MCSD members agreed on the set of criteria to be applied for the preparation of pre-feasibility studies for and selection of possible new themes for the next programme of work of the MCSD.

The fifth Meeting of the MCSD and the 11th Meeting of the Contracting Parties have discussed aim, organisation and method of work for the preparation of the Strategic Review for the year 2000, as agreed upon in the Terms of Reference of the MCSD;

Fifteen new members representing the three Major Groups (Local Authorities, Socio-Economic Actors and NGOs) were selected by the Contracting Parties at their 11th meeting, in 1999; These members are expected to attend the 6th and 7th MCSD meeting, and participate to the intersessional activities throughout the period between the 6th and 8th MCSD meetings.

At the sixth meeting of the MCSD (Tunis November 2000), the fifteen new members representing the three Major Groups took over and participated to the meeting that was mainly devoted to the examination of the Strategic Review and its recommendations and proposals for action as well as to a draft "Tunis Declaration"; this meeting comprised an important High Level Segment with several Ministers of the Environment; it was also the occasion for a very animated debate on the follow up of MCSD proposals, possible new issues and method of work, preparing the ground for relevant discussions in the next MCSD and Contracting Parties meetings. These subjects were also taken up in the 5th meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee (Monaco, May 2001).

At its first Extraordinary Meeting (Monaco, 12 November 2001), the organization of which was decided because of the international context and the holding of the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties (Monaco, 14-17 November 2001), the MCSD members discussed and prepared four sets of findings and proposals related to: "Industry and Sustainable Development", "Urban management and Sustainable Development", "Free Trade and Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context", and "Implementation and Follow up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action"; proposed recommendations were then reviewed and approved by the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties.

The Seventh meeting of the MCSD (Antalya, March 2002) was postponed from October 2001 to March 2002 because of the international context and its impacts at the regional level; as the thematic issues from the Working Groups, and from which a set of recommendations were prepared, were dealt with by the Extraordinary MCSD meeting that had just preceded the 12th Conference of the Contracting Parties, the 7th MCSD has mostly focused on MCSD Assessment and Prospects, and the "Framework Orientations" for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development. The meeting agreed on a methodology for the "Orientations", decided to establish a Task Force to consider further MCSD Prospects, recommend the organisation of regional fora, opted for few new themes (financing, agriculture, consumption patterns and waste) and advised on activities related to other issues (such as tourism, historic sites, water, free trade and local governance). Conclusions of the 7th MCSD meeting are attached in Annex I of this report.

In order to assist and advise the Secretariat on progress on intersessional activities, the Steering Committee of the MCSD met in Calvia, Spain (6th Session, November 2002) to mainly discuss issues related to MCSD Assessment and Prospects, and Framework Orientations. Derived recommendations (attached in Annex II of this report) were then taken into account by the Task Force and the preparation for the Strategy.

II. MCSD Steering Committee

In conformity with its Rules of Procedure, a new Steering Committee is expected to be elected at the beginning of the 8th MCSD meeting; in principle, it would include the host country, and the President of the Contracting Parties. Two other members from the Contracting Parties and one member from each of the Major Groups need to be designated.

The list of present and previous members of the Steering Committees is attached in annex VIII of this report.

MCSD members have been requested by email/fax on 24 March 2003, to inform the Secretariat in due time about their interest in joining the Steering Committee;

IV. The WSSD and the Mediterranean

MAP activities and achievements in relation to Sustainable Development and mainly through the MCSD have contributed to the promotion of the exemplarity of the Mediterranean, despite the shortcomings regarding the follow up and implementation of the recommendations and proposals for action. High expectations have been created among most of the MCSD members and other partners. The various sets of recommendations, the multiple workshops, the recent publications, the Strategic Review and some thematic brochures together with the launching of the preparatory process for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, have all much contributed to MAP and MCSD's visibility, but still a lot needs to be done.

With the active support of several MCSD members, the notion of "Mediterranean Agenda 21" was introduced in the WSSD Plan of Implementation; moreover, an important Mediterranean Side Event was organized at the WSSD with the support of MIO-ECSDE and Monaco, and the active participation of several Mediterranean and European partners.

As for the Johannesburg Summit, the crucial challenges for the Mediterranean Strategy will be to present Sustainable Development as a set of choices which are relevant to all Mediterranean Partners and actors, a set of principles which can guide future action and a set of practical policies at local, national and regional levels.

From the key documents approved at the WSSD, mainly the Johannesburg Declaration and the Plan of Implementation, many issues, of high interest and relevance to the Mediterranean, ought to be given due consideration by the MCSD in its future programme of work and throughout the preparatory process of the "Orientations" and then the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy.

As preparatory documents and outputs from the WSSD were widely disseminated and easily accessible, a few selected issues would be highlighted hereunder, keeping in mind that a more complete set of highlights is attached in annex III. This set of highlights was prepared by Mr. N. Georgiades (in the framework of the activities related to MCSD assessment and prospects), using as basis the global set of highlights issued by UN/DESA on September 2002.

Considering the importance given to the Type II Partnership Initiatives, the Secretariat of MAP/MCSD has prepared a Mediterranean initiative concerning the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, entitled "Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development for the Mediterranean: Policy and Tools"; our proposal was finally endorsed by the UN CSD/WSSD Secretariat and approved in Johannesburg (attached in annex IV of this report) The main objective of this Partnership Initiative is to provide visibility and recognition to Mediterranean achievements and plans towards Sustainable Development; in fact, the Type II initiative and the preparatory process for the Mediterranean Strategy are closely related and mutually supportive. In this context, the UNEP/MAP-MCSD Partnership would be presented during the UN-CSD 11 Partnerships Fair. This would also be a good opportunity to present the Mediterranean and its MAP/MCSD, considering that otherwise we cannot express ourselves directly, if not through a Member, a Partner or UNEP.

Among these key issues, the following ones are absolutely determinant for Sustainable Development in the Region:

- collective responsibility, dialogue and cooperation;
- participatory approach and partnerships with major groups;
- mutually reinforcing pillars of Sustainable Development and access to basic and necessary requirements;
- corporate responsibility and strengthening of governance;
- poverty eradication, changing production and consumption patterns, addressing globalization.

And more specifically, the following suggestions could be considered in the context of the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy:

- develop national programmes for Sustainable Development, focusing on poverty eradication;
- promote the development of programmes in support of initiative towards sustainable consumption and production, including cleaner production, social and environmental performance of industry, energy efficiency and use of renewable energies, waste minimization
- halve by 2010 the proportion of people who have not access to basic needs;
- develop water efficiency plans by 2005 together with integrated and sustainable water resources management;
- promote integrated and sustainable coastal and sea management;
- promote preparation and implementation of strategic programmes for pollution control;
- develop sustainable fishery plans by 2010;
- promote sustainable tourism development plans by 2007;

- strengthen regional trade and cooperation agreements, including corporate responsibility and accountability , in a Sustainable Development perspective;
- elaborate specific action plans for vulnerable areas;
- develop and promote the implementation of a work programme on education for Sustainable Development;
- promote the participatory approach and develop the capacity of civil society to participate to decision making;
- develop methodologies and capacities for Sustainable Development decision making;
- promote implementation of Agenda 21 and WSSD outcomes at regional level;
- develop a strategy for mobilization of technical and financial means for Sustainable Development;
- promote cooperation and partnerships with the private sector for achieving the objectives for Sustainable Development;
- strengthen institutional arrangements for Sustainable Development at local, national and regional levels.

At their last meeting (November 2002) the members of the MCSD Steering Committee have called for the identification of concrete objectives in line with the WSSD Plan of Implementation, and as far as possible measurable objectives with the necessary means and partnerships for their implementation. It would be important to give this issue the necessary attention, so as to demonstrate the interest and importance in promoting and implementing Sustainable Development through the bridge of the Regional level, in particular eco-regions such as the Mediterranean.

V. Vision for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean

The regional review clearly shows the progress which has been made towards sustainable development and environmental protection as well as the flaws which continue to exist, since the Mediterranean Action Plan and Barcelona Convention and its Protocols were revised in 1995.

New types of growth and development which take greater account of the social well-being of the entire population and of environmental concerns need to be sought.

The environmental, economic and social cost to be borne in the short term by certain countries within a context of integration and liberalization which favors market mechanisms can only be acceptable if serious accompanying measures are adopted in order to cushion the impact on the least privileged sectors of society, and which will guarantee more long-term sustainability.

At national level, the difficulty of giving concrete expression to measures towards sustainable development decided upon by the Mediterranean community shows, on the one hand, that the new concept has not as yet managed to mobilize all spheres of Society and, on the other, that States have been slow in implementing some of the decisions taken.

Although it is highly active, co-operation in the Mediterranean is affected, on the one hand, by a lack of common vision and inadequate co-ordination between the main partners currently or potentially involved and, on the other, by a mismatch between resources available for development and investments, given the scale of the tasks to be accomplished.

This is exacerbated by the fact that the short-term effects of the Uruguay Round's decisions have not produced the expected results for the developing Mediterranean countries, judging by the worsening foreign trade deficit faced by most countries.

Apart from a clear political impetus, any shift towards sustainable development also requires reference models which identify and put across a shared vision, which takes account of the Mediterranean peculiarities, as well as a coherent strategy capable of guiding the various stages of its implementation.

Finally, the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention were invited to define a common vision of the region's future along with all of the partners concerned. For this purpose, it was agreed within the framework of MAP and with all the partners concerned, to adopt a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development. This Strategy should reflect a responsible acceptance of the medium and long-term stakes and clear commitment and solidarity at all levels (regional, national, local) and in all sectors (economic, social, environmental);

In conformity with this request, a discussion on the Vision was held during the workshop on the "Orientations" and the outlines and major components of such a vision were defined. Following the workshop and the positive reaction by the participants to related proposals, Mr. M.Ennabli was requested, as a consultant, to draft a brief note on the Vision for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean; a first draft was reviewed by a group of expert on 15 and 16 April 2003 in Tunis and a revised draft version of the Vision is proposed to the 8th MCSD for the consideration of the participants and their endorsement. The text of the draft vision is attached as annex V of this report. This vision, structured on a series of challenges for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development and derived necessary strategic "contract", provides rational and coherent framework for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development.

VI. Framework Orientations for a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development

Pursuing Sustainable Development is essentially a task of transforming governance, and preparing and implementing a Sustainable Development Strategy could be considered as a test case for good governance. Therefore, moving towards Sustainable Development will require adequate structural changes in economic, social, environmental and political sectors: reforming fiscal policies, inequity and inequality of access to assets and resources, integrating environment in development policies, decoupling environmental degradation and resource consumption from economic and social development, reorienting and increasing public and private investment towards Sustainable Development.

Sustainable Development has become an overriding national policy in most Mediterranean countries, and as there can be no "one size fits all" approach to Sustainable Development, each country must chart its own course in line with its specificities and priorities. But some critical Sustainable Development challenges are regional that require collaboration by all partners and concrete responses at local/national and regional/institutional levels.

Consequently, eventhough Sustainable Development concerns all areas of economic, social, environmental and political life, a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy would better focus on a small number of problems which pose severe or irreversible threats to the Region, to the well being of its people and regional cooperation, so as to bridge the gap between an ambitious vision and practical political action.

The Mediterranean, as an area for "North-South" partnership between Europe and other Mediterranean countries should provide the arena in which to try out and apply the Sustainable Development concept. In the interest of greater efficiency, the basic elements which could avoid the failure of any Sustainable Development Strategy in the Mediterranean could come in the following guise:

- Allowing States to play their full role and encouraging the emerging role of local authorities;
- Drawing on all elements of Society;
- Working towards economic and social justice and taking national culture and values into account;
- Promoting scientific activity and technological achievement;
- Building / strengthening human resources and institutional capacity;

There is no doubt that only reforms which constitute various packages of statutory, fiscal, financial, commercial or economic measures will allow the rules to be changes and the outcome to be co-axed through the channels intended; there national and regional Mediterranean reforms to be considered would be rendered still more beneficial and desirable by the fact that their impact would encourage growth, alleviate poverty, protect environment and reduce income inequality. Thus the aims of the reforms and decisions to be taken would look for:

- Striving for efficiency in terms of rationalizing economic activity;
- Creating equity in terms of social justice and shared well-being;
- Preserving the natural resources base in terms of recovering the real cost of their use.

Given the multiple transition process (economic, technological, social, institutional, informational) in a more and more globalized world, a new social contract is necessary between concerned partners, providing a new equilibrium between economic growth and sustained improvement in quality of life; a dynamic and constructive interaction between globalization and decentralisation should be established, especially on governance and business partners; moreover, in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the Mediterranean could be an interacting regional case.

The challenge of realising Mediterranean Sustainable Development is to translate the Strategy into concrete objectives and concrete action in openness and dialogue among authorities, citizens and experts; the active participation of all concerned actors at different levels is necessary. Adequate mechanisms and appropriate means should be identified, especially for financing sustainable development (domestic, regional and international resources, foreign direct investments, international trade, bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation).

Following the discussions, and the decisions of the 7th MCSD, the Secretariat has reviewed and finalized the terms of references for the preparation of the Strategy Orientations. Considering available human and financial resources together with the provisional timetable for the elaboration process for the Mediterranean Strategy, three qualified experts were finally identified in May 2002; in order to launch this important preparatory process on common ground without major misunderstandings, a debriefing and brainstorming working session was held in MEDU's premises on the 3^d of July 2002 with the three experts and concerned directors from the Regional Activity Centres.

The three experts that have been identified are:

- Mr. Magdi Ibrahim, Director of ENDA-Environment and Development-Maghreb, for the "Environment and Natural Resources" component;
- Mr. Azzam Mahjoub, Professor of Economics in Tunis and member of the team of experts for the National Sustainable Development Strategy of Tunisia, for the "Economic Development and Social Equity";

- Mr. Juan Prats, Director of the International Institute for Governance in Barcelona, for the “Governance, Political and Institutional issues”; Mr. Prats will also prepare a draft Orientations paper, to be based on the three “thematic” documents.

For the sake of efficiency and for providing reasonable practical and acceptable results in a short period of time, the experts were requested to identify the major and most determinant stakes that are mainly and mostly of Regional nature and that concern many key actors in the Mediterranean region. These stakes and related actions and policies would provide the blocks on which to structure and build the “Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development”. The integrated approach was expected to guide the work, focusing on policy rather than sectorial issues, considering the specific “thematic” pillar as a coherent part of a system, the Mediterranean Region in a sustainable development context.

As the Orientations and then the Sustainable Development Strategy are expected to mainly deal with policy issues that would correspond to the necessary responses for the promotion of Sustainable Development at the regional level, the work actually being undertaken by the Blue Plan/RAC for the preparation of a Mediterranean Environment and Development report will be used as background information, as it is expected to mainly deal with pressures and status issues. As the two “exercises” are almost running in parallel, a communication and consultation bridge has been established: the Secretariat participates in the Steering Committee of the “Blue Plan’s report” and BP/RAC is associated to the preparation of the Orientations; this should strengthen coherence between these two activities and their outputs.

Based on a common vision for the Region, a vision to be shared by all the Countries but also by the regional partners (IGOs, NGOs, Civil Society, Business Sectors), the framework Orientations should identify the guiding principles for the elaboration of the Strategy together with a limited number of stakes and issues of regional nature on which the Strategy would be structured. As far as possible and realistic, some measurable objectives would be identified, to be further precised by the MCSD and the Contracting Parties together with concerned partners.

First framework “thematic” papers were prepared in September 2002 by each of the consultants before they prepared, following comments by the Secretariat, their respective first drafts that were submitted to the members of the Steering Committee for their consideration.

Following an intense discussion on the contents of the first drafts of the three “thematic” reports together with the expectations from the preparatory process for the “framework orientations”, the MCSD Steering Committee considered that these documents constitute a good working basis for further steps, including their review and use in the preparatory process for the Sustainable Development Strategy, a series of conclusions and recommendations were agreed upon (attached in Annex II of this report).

The three draft papers as prepared by their respective authors, under the Secretariat’s coordination, constitute a valuable set of information that will feed in the preparation of the “Orientations”; Revised drafts were then prepared and submitted as working documents to a major workshop, organized in Barcelona, on 13-15 March 2003, with the financial support of Spain. The experts, around 50, have discussed their contents and defined a set of stakes and priorities on which to structure the Orientations and then the Regional Strategy. As such, the contents of the three draft reports provide interesting food for thought; revised versions are being prepared and they would be then made available to MCSD members and considered as information documents and no longer as working documents. These three reports are expected to be disseminated during the 8th MCSD meeting (or earlier by email if possible).

If the conceptual framework for Sustainable Development has been structured on the three "Economic, Social and Environment" pillars, the last decade since Rio has shown the crucial importance of good governance to achieve Sustainable Development. If governance is and should be integrated in each of these three pillars, governance could be as well considered as a distinctive pillar, probably the most important one as efficiency in previous ones will depend on the institutional arrangements and capacities together with partnership commitments and collective actions, and their underlying civil culture and political structure. Raising Governance capacity is definitely a must for any strategy of sustainable development, would it be at local, national or regional levels.

The framework Orientations document is not just a summary or a synthesis of the three papers. Using in an appropriate and comprehensive way the findings and proposals of each one of them, and inter-relating them through an integrated approach, the Orientations report is expected to capitalize on their respective "messages".

Following the very interesting and constructive discussions during the workshop on the "Orientations" (report of the workshop will be disseminated during the 8th MCSD meeting and if possible by email a week before the meeting), where diagnostic issues, stakes and challenges, external and internal parameters, vision and fields of activities were defined and generally agreed upon, three additional experts were requested, as consultants, to contribute to the elaboration of a draft "Orientations" report. These experts, Mr. G.Corm, ex-Minister of Finance of Lebanon, Mr. M. Ennabli, ex-Minister of Environment of Tunisia and Mr. A. Laouina, UNESCO Chair of Sustainable Development in Morocco, provided very interesting insights and inputs that were discussed during a working session in Tunis on 15 and 16 April 2003 together with the three "thematic" consultants and the Secretariat. This overall exercise, undertaken with limited means and in a short period of time under extreme pressure since January 2003, has resulted in the preparation of several documents that will all constitute building blocks and basic contribution to the preparation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD).

A draft report on framework "Orientations" for a MSSD is attached in Annex VI of this report, for the review and endorsement by MCSD members and partners, together with advice on further steps, including identifications of necessary means. These would concern the communication and "marketing" activities, the preparatory process of the MSSD and if possible its structure and table of contents, identification of key partners and networking, and as far as possible voluntary interest and offers to contribute to the preparatory process.

If the Mediterranean Action Plan concerns primarily the 21 Contracting Parties, the MCSD concerns in principle the whole Mediterranean Society through the Contracting Parties and the representatives of the Major Groups. The latter applies also to the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development; in fact this Regional Strategy, eventhough prepared by and in the framework of UNEP/MAP, should concern the whole Mediterranean and its actors. This was recently confirmed by the decision of the 2nd Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment (Athens, July 2002), considering that the Barcelona Convention/MAP framework is the appropriate context to deal with a regional Sustainable Development Strategy in the Mediterranean.

Consequently, these Orientations and then the Strategy should be prepared in view of their endorsement not only by the Contracting Parties and the MCSD members including the major NGO networks, the regional Business associations and the Cities networks, but also by other partners such as the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and METAP, CEDARE and the League of Arab States, UN concerned Agencies and Offices. A good indicator for that would

be their active participation and contribution to the preparation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development.

The Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, in conformity to the Orientations that would be agreed upon, would be prepared, if necessary and adequate means are made available in due time, over the whole year of 2004, and the first half of 2005 would be devoted to its revision and finalization. To that end, partnerships and means should be clearly identified and as far as possible secured before December 2003. The preparation of the MSSD would benefit at its early stages from the international meeting of Experts to be organized by France in early 2004, following the proposal made in Johannesburg

It would be important that MCSD members and partners could provide the necessary financial assistance for the organization of working sessions with potential partners of the MSSD; in principle three working sessions to present the Orientations to the Private Sector, the NGO networks and the IGOs respectively, and get their active participation and support in the MSSD preparatory process; each of these working sessions would require 20.000 to 30.000 Euros. It is important that necessary be provided before the Secretariat mobilizes the cooperation of these partners.

VII. MCSD Assessment and Prospects

Since the first set of MCSD recommendations was prepared and adopted by the Contracting Parties in 1997, a series of questions were raised concerning its method of work, the quality and usefulness of the results, the implementation and follow up of the recommendations and the membership and participation issues.

Six years after its creation, with various institutional and intersessional meetings, a review and assessment of the MCSD organization and method of work were considered necessary in order to define options for further evolution so as to make the MCSD more efficient in advising the Contracting Parties and all other concerned partners in their respective tasks towards sustainable development.

This important issue was put on the agenda of the 7th Meeting of the MCSD (Antalya, 13-16 March 2002) so as to explore and identify at least a series of orientations and prospects for an improved, better organized and more efficient MCSD. Considering that further discussions are necessary before identifying and deciding on appropriate actions for a more efficient MCSD, a Task Force was established.

This Task Force, composed of 8 MCSD members including Italy and Spain as co-chairs, has met on the 15th of October 2002 and on 3-4 April 2003 in Barcelona. The Task Force had to consider a note by the Secretariat and mainly a draft report by an expert, member of the MCSD, Mr. Nicos Georgiades; findings and proposals were discussed in an open and constructive manner and, consequently a revised report by the Task Force was prepared and submitted for the attention of the 8th MCSD; this report is attached in Annex VIII, together with a selection of the most essential proposals from this report for easy reference at the end of the Annex.

Context and Status, facts for thought

MCSD activities and related outputs have contributed to the promotion of Sustainable Development at Mediterranean, national and local levels. Considering its obvious positive achievements, the MCSD has created many expectations but also raised various questions related to its efficiency.

If the MCSD has been working in conformity with its purpose and functions, it has not been able to fulfill them all in a satisfactory way, notably as regards the evaluation of the effectiveness of the follow up to the decisions of the Contracting Parties or the enhancement of regional cooperation and rationalization of the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean basin for the integration of environment and development issues. Moreover, as Sustainable Development issues have been put higher on the agenda of national, regional and international institutions, new stakes have arisen and more expectations have been created.

In this context, it is important to give due consideration to the following elements, which became rather commonly known facts from experience:

- The MCSD has no specific staff and almost no budget until recently as a budget line has been created mainly for follow up of MCSD recommendations and preparations for the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, in addition to the budget for MCSD and its Steering Committee meetings. Relevant budget lines from concerned MAP Support Centres were usually devoted to MCSD activities from their "usual programme of activities" and then put also on the credit of the MCSD, with the exception of new issues in MAP programme such as "free trade and environment" and "cooperation and financing for Sustainable Development" for which we usually had to re-allocate some funds. In most cases, it was possible to obtain some external funding, for specific MCSD activities or for meetings and workshops. Considering the issues tackled until now by the MCSD, the support to the Working Groups was mainly provided by the BP/RAC; MEDU, PAP/RAC, CP/RAC and MEDPOL had also provided support in their respective fields;
- Participation from MCSD members has been very unequal, representing for most of them the environment sector; moreover, many participants used to behave as representatives of their institution and not always in their own expert capacity. As MAP was not used to work with the Local Authorities and the Socio-Economic sectors, there have been difficulties in identifying and promoting interest and involvement from potential dynamic partners. For example, recent meetings and working sessions with networks of Local Authorities and business actors could not be seriously followed mainly due to the lack of appropriate means. It is obvious that a "marketing strategy" is needed but available means do not allow coping with it in a satisfactory manner. Considering the large diversity of interests for the present and potential representatives of the Major Groups, the Secretariat is expected to have a catalytic and inducing role so as to secure an active participation and useful contribution.
- Considering the context of its creation, and prime fields of interest and expertise of MAP, the MCSD was until recently driven much more by the environment interest and approach, still as a key pillar to Sustainable Development, than by the social and economic aspects. Coping efficiently with Sustainable Development, in conformity with the decisions of the Contracting Parties as reflected in their Declaration to the World Summit on Sustainable Development and in line with the outcomes of the Johannesburg Summit, would necessarily require a revised approach, with appropriate means in which economic, social, political and governance issues will be at least as important as environment ones.

From relevant discussions at the 7th MCSD meeting in Antalya, several important points were highlighted among which:

- it is time to look seriously at the questions of the effectiveness, achievements, mandate, membership and methods of work of the MCSD. It is important for the MCSD to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to the post-Johannesburg requirements of sustainable development and it is a healthy initiative for it to take stock of what had been achieved with a view to remedying its shortcomings and strengthening the MCSD for the future;
- the MCSD has had problems in identifying its precise role and means of action, because of the complexity of Sustainable Development and the Mediterranean context;
- the development of the participatory approach and the promotion of partnerships with relevant actors have been rather weak;
- the MCSD remained focused much more on the environment than on the social, economic, political, financial and structural aspects of sustainable development;
- it was necessary to broaden the dialogue within the MCSD and with other partners particularly through the involvement in its work of representatives of economic and social ministries, together with relevant private actors backed up by experts in the various fields and collaboration with other competent regional and international organizations;
- in order to improve participation and contribution to sustainable development issues, it will be necessary to define adequate profiles for MCSD members representing all categories, that should participate in their own expert capacity;
- implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations would require practical guidance and suggestions together with extensive communication; this would be improved by cooperating with and inducing relevant national institutions towards implementation;
- there is a certain ambiguity about the place and role of MCSD within MAP and its relationship with MAP components, that need to be clarified and better defined;
- additional financial resources are badly needed and further action should be taken to identify sources and partners and attract support;
- more human resources should be allocated to the work of the MCSD.

Stakes and means, towards a substantial improvement

The revised and updated legal framework together with MAP II have obviously extended the scope of MAP programme of activities, adding new fields of concern. Moreover, the economic, social and environment developments at all levels have also had their trickle down effects on the Mediterranean in general and MAP in particular. Awareness on the inter-relations between economic, social and environment issues has been increasing, with emerging stakes and necessary new partnerships.

Deriving from the Rio Agenda 21, Agenda Med 21, and the globalization phenomenon, but also from the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the Plan of Implementation of the WSSD, focus can no longer be put only or too much on environmental issues if necessary actions are to be dealt with in a sustainable manner. Economic and social issues as well as political and

governance issues deserve at least as much attention, and preferably through an integrated approach involving all concerned actors.

If MAP, including its MCSD, has already made many positive and constructive steps in this direction, much more still needs to be made, mainly with regards to economic and social policy issues, regional cooperation and partnerships, as well as practical and effective strategies and policies with relevant projects to be implemented at regional, national and local levels.

Considering the context and prime concerns of MAP, most of its capacity and expertise as well as its direct partners in concerned countries are from the environment field, even though the scope of analysis and activities has been extended to sustainable development. However, available MAP capacity has cumulated a valuable expertise on which any proposal for improvement should lean.

Taking as reference the building blocks strategies, existing MAP blocks/components (MEDU and RACs) could be strengthened so as to fulfill better their purposes and cope with the expectations with regards to Sustainable Development. The options of either, at least strengthening the MCSD Secretariat within the Coordinating Unit, or adding a new block in establishing a specific Support Unit for the MCSD with adequate autonomous means as mentioned in Mr. Georgiades's paper, should be further considered in the post-Johannesburg context.

Of course, such a new option should give due consideration to mandates, capacities, expertise and means within MAP so as to avoid conflicts, clarify respective mandates and result in an explicit added value for MAP and Mediterranean interest in promoting Sustainable Development.

In addition to the requests and expectations related to "thematic" issues of the 3 pillars of Sustainable Development, there is an obvious need for initiatives in the region that would identify and induce Mediterranean Partners to cooperate and coordinate their actions for the benefit of the region and the countries, at strategic and policy levels as well as at project level. Concerned partners would be the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership/EU, the METAP/the World Bank, the League of Arab States and CEDARE, UN and UNEP Regional Commissions and Offices as well as relevant UN institutions such as UNDP and its CAP 2015 or UNIDO and WHO. But identifying and inducing partners for Mediterranean cooperation towards Sustainable Development concerns also the private sector and the civil society for which an active "marketing" strategy would be required.

Considering that the business-as-usual scenario cannot be sustainable for the MCSD, for an efficient and satisfactory operation, participation by and contribution from the MCSD members and partners should be improved, and means of the MCSD Secretariat need to be substantially re-evaluated and improved. In this context, the sequential and evolutionary approach as proposed by the Task Force deserves due consideration as it would progressively improve the situation with increased means, promote a more efficient MAP and Regional Partners cooperation, providing also a more adequate capacity to fulfill expectations and cope with mandate; this, in addition to the various proposed improvements in the report of the Task Force.

Throughout the proposed evolution, the MCSD Secretariat would in any case keep on operating within MAP Structure, serving MAP and the Mediterranean partners with more or less financial and technical means for a more or less improved efficiency. The MCSD Secretariat is also expected to coordinate the preparation and then the implementation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, and this major task, in addition to

present ones as per the MCSD mandate, do require the urgent identification and allocation of necessary additional means to MCSD Secretariat and Support Centres.

Finally, with the goal to become more relevant and effective in the post-WSSD era, the MCSD is expected to:

- consider the content of the MCSD Assessment and Prospects report submitted by the Task Force and endorse its proposals;
- review and approve the summary of the most essential of these proposals as attached at the end of related report;
- commit themselves to immediately implement all the proposals that are of the direct responsibility of the Commission and the rest once approved by the Contracting Parties;
- invite the MAP Coordinator and MCSD Secretariat to circulate the report for comments to all other intergovernmental actors in the Mediterranean, seeking for their active participation and effective support;
- call upon the MAP Coordinator to submit the report for approval, together with any additional comments received, to the next meeting for the Contracting Parties, in Catania, November 2003.

VIII. Intersessional Thematic Activities

Information, thematic progress reports and, as appropriate, relevant proposals for recommendations, would be forwarded later on by email and/or made available during the 8th MCSD meeting.

1. Tourism and Sustainable Development

So far, expected activities related to the development by Turkey of a specific strategic programme on Tourism and Sustainable Development were not undertaken; it is hoped that related activities could be resumed soon and that this important programme be given due consideration before the 9th MCSD meeting, including the organization of a regional forum on Tourism and Sustainable Development, a major issue for a MSSD.

2. Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development

A meeting of the Working Group was recently organized by the Task Manager (France) on 10-12 April 2003, in Nice; a report by the Task Managers (France and Tunisia) on the progress together with a set of proposals will be disseminated soon.

3. Industry and Sustainable Development

Recommendations adopted by the 12th CP Conference are divided into 5 main lines of action (reinforcement of the use of existing mechanisms, tools and stakeholders; introduction of sustainable standards within companies; promotion of the transfer of knowledge; control and follow-up mechanisms and follow-up)

The Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (RAC/CP) who actively participated in the elaboration of those recommendations is already implementing some of them, by:

- Integrating sustainable industrial environmental criteria into the activities carried out under the Strategic Action Programme and the GEF project by means of developing 3 regional guidelines and 1 regional plan to be used by the countries to develop their own National Action Plans taking into account the industrial sustainable principles and approach.
- Strengthening and making coordinated use of the existing resources such as a Mediterranean expert's database; a cooperation agreement for technical assistance on environmental questions with the Mediterranean Chamber of Commerce Association (ASCAME).
- Promoting and supporting the establishment of resource centres and other relevant sources of expertise at national and local levels such as its participation in the establishment of a Bosnia Herzegovina CP centre, the organisation of capacity building activities and training of trainers to create national capacities.
- Introducing sustainable standards within companies and transfer of knowledge by means of developing methodological tools; preparing industrial case studies, guidelines, multimedia and studies on pollution prevention opportunities; carrying out databases of sector-related technologies compiling various sound options on pollution prevention techniques; exchanging information.

Likewise and according to the recommendation, *Reinforcement of the use of existing mechanisms, tools and stakeholders*, the Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (RAC/CP) convened on 26 February 2003 a get-together meeting with some of the relevant institutions working for the sustainability of the Mediterranean industry (UNEP, UNIDO, MEDPOL, ASCAME representing the industry and RAC/CP).

The main aim of the meeting was to discuss the industrial sustainable initiatives and activities that participants are promoting and carrying out in the Mediterranean region, to identify which of them correspond to the MCSD Industry and Sustainable Development recommendations and to analyse possible ways to strengthen cooperation and synergy.

4. Free Trade and Environment

Progress report and a set of recommendations are being prepared by BP/RAC

5. Cooperation and Financing for Sustainable Development

Progress report and first findings are being prepared by BP/RAC

6. Management of Water Demand

An important forum (Fiuggi, Italy, in 2002) to review the implementation of the MCSD recommendations was organised; a progress report with a set of recommendations is being prepared by BP/RAC

7. Other Issues

Information on other issues, new or follow up of previous subjects, are expected from BP/RAC and PAP/RAC.

Missing information and related documents are expected to be sent by email soon through MEDU or directly by concerned RACs to the participants of the 8th MCSD meeting and/or disseminated during the meeting in Cavtat. Concerned Support Centres and Task Managers will introduce their respective findings and proposals.

8. Major Groups Forum

The Forum that the MCSD Major Groups representatives were expected to organise to discuss ways and means for improved participation and contribution to MCSD could not be held; it is essential that such a forum, at the initiative of the Major Groups, be organised soon mainly in the framework of the preparation of the Orientations for and then the elaboration of the MSSD.

IX. Ninth MCSD Meeting

In addition to progress and proposals from “thematic” issues, the 9th MCSD meeting would have to deal with the launching and organisation of the preparation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development together with the programme of work of the MCSD for the period 2005-2015 and related method of work and necessary means;

Considering that many of the proposals from the 8th MCSD would need to be reviewed and approved by the 13th Conference of the Contracting Parties in November 2003, it is proposed to organise the 9th MCSD meeting around mid-May 2004, so that the period June 2004-March 2005 be intensively devoted for the preparation of the MSSD.

Expression of interest by MCSD members for hosting and co-organising the 9th MCSD meeting would be appreciated, with an offer to cover most or at least a substantial part of its costs.

As necessary, the MCSD Steering Committee would meet in the intersessional period to review progress and advice on further steps; the Steering Committee could meet on September 2003 to review and finalise the revised versions of the “Orientations” and “MCSD Assessment and Prospects” before submitting them to the CP Conference; it could meet again in January 2004 to review and advise on the preparatory process for the MSSD.

**REPORT OF THE 8TH MEETING OF THE
MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT
(MCSD)**

Introduction

1. In accordance with the decision taken at its Seventh Meeting (Antalya, 13-16 March, 2002) the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development held its Eighth Meeting at the Hotel Croatia, Cavtat (Croatia), from 14-16 May 2003, at the kind invitation of the Croatian Government.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by the following 20 members of the Commission: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, European Commission, France, Greece, ICC/ MED (ICC Monaco-Italy-Turkey), Israel, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, MIO-ECSDE, MEDCITIES, Principality of Monaco, Municipality of Omisalj (Croatia), RAED, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia.

3. The following Regional Activity Centres and other components of MAP also attended the Meeting: MED POL, BP/RAC, CP/RAC, PAP/RAC, SPA/RAC, 100 Historic Sites.

4. The following United Nations specialized agencies, inter-governmental organizations and other partners attended the meeting as observers: CIESM (International Commission for the Scientific Exploration of the Mediterranean Sea), European Environmental Agency, Baltic 21 Secretariat, UNEP/ Division of Environmental Conventions (GPA).

5. A full list of participants is contained in Annex I to this report.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting

6. Mr Bozo Kovacevic, Minister of Environment and Physical Planning of Croatia, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to his country. As a member of the MCSD and a member of the Bureau of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), his country was keen to promote the Mediterranean region as a vital bridge between the global, national and local levels in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals and the decisions of the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD). The Mediterranean Sea and its coastal countries faced heavy pressure from uncontrolled and rapid development, which disturbed the delicate Mediterranean ecosystem in a number of ways, from fish contamination by industrial effluents to the destruction of habitats of endangered species by tourism. The Mediterranean was particularly vulnerable to environmental accidents such as that of the "Prestige". With its very long coastline and large number of islands, Croatia had a natural interest in cooperation and joint activities for the protection of marine and coastal areas. In this respect, the preparation of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD) was the only correct approach to the preservation of this outstanding area.

7. Mr Pero Miskovic, Deputy Prefect of the County of Dubrovnik, expressed pride and honour that the MCSD meeting was being held in a county which boasted 44 specially protected nature areas, as well as a number of nature parks that would soon be declared protected. In this very historical area, where the first statutes of Dubrovnik had been issued in 1272, there was broad recognition of the need for economic development to take into account the protection of nature. The process of bringing development plans into line with European Union standards would be instrumental in preventing negative environmental developments. In this connection, he emphasized that the present generation had a particularly important responsibility in ensuring that future generations were not endangered. The work of the MCSD would contribute to preventing development that was alienated from nature.

8. Mr Frano Matusic, Deputy Mayor of the City of Dubrovnik, recalled that the statute of Dubrovnik adopted in the 13th Century also covered the protection of nature and urban planning. With its tradition of international trade and cultural contacts, Dubrovnik recognized its duty to conserve natural resources, and particularly the sea, through close cooperation with all the peoples of the Mediterranean.

9. Mr Bernard Fautrier, Minister of Environment of Monaco, President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties and Vice-President of the MCSD Steering Committee, described the environmental problem which had occurred the previous day off the coast of his country, probably as a result of the degassing of an oil tanker, as an illustration of the fragility of the Mediterranean ecosystem. He emphasized that the MCSD was at a crossroads. The WSSD had adopted new orientations and the UNCSD had developed a very detailed schedule for the years to come. These would serve as benchmarks for the MCSD in building the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD), for which its thematic work would need to be organized very precisely and the various actors brought together effectively to guarantee success.

10. Mr Arab Hoballah, MAP Deputy Coordinator, read out a letter from Mr Lucien Chabason, who regretted that he could not be present at the meeting for health reasons, but recalled that the MCSD was one of the main achievements of the Barcelona system for the attainment of sustainable development in the region. The work of the Task Force, which had evaluated the contribution of the MCSD, would be of importance in the renovation of the MCSD. He also hoped that the meeting would contribute to the adoption of a realistic and concrete regional sustainable development strategy which would put the MCSD on the right road. He wished the MCSD much success in its work for the future.

11. Mr Hoballah recalled that the programme of work of the MCSD had become more intensive as expectations had risen and sustainable development had been put higher on the agendas of local, national and regional institutions. In addition to the intensive work undertaken by the support centres, the Secretariat had prepared a Strategic Review, followed by the MCSD Assessment and Prospects and the preparatory work for MSSD. These latter issues constituted the bulk of the meeting's agenda and important decisions would have to be taken which would determine the future of the MCSD, its efficiency, usefulness and sustainability. The proposals and decisions on these issues needed to enhance and rationalize cooperation, particularly with the major groups, namely local authorities, the business sector and NGOs. It was not only important to determine *what* was to be done, but also *how* and *by whom*, giving due consideration to the crucial question of the necessary and adequate ways and means of implementation. Finally, he thanked the Croatian authorities, particularly the Minister of Environment and Physical Planning, for hosting and cost-sharing the meeting, and the Director and staff of PAP/RAC for their assistance and organization.

Agenda Item 2: Election of the Steering Committee

12. In accordance with rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure and following the customary consultations, the Commission elected its new Steering Committee, the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Monaco) being a member *ex officio*. The composition of the Steering Committee was as follows:

President:	H.E. Mr B. Kovacevic	(Croatia)
Vice-Presidents:	H.E. Mr B. Fautrier	(Monaco)
	Mr S. Antoine	(France)
	Mr A. M. Boargob	(Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)
	Mr Z. Skala	(Municipality of Omisalj)
	Mr J. P. Fonteneau	(ICC-Med)
Rapporteur	Mr E. Adly	(RAED)

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda and organization of the meeting

13. In a discussion of the provisional agenda set out in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/2, it was agreed that, particularly in view of the fact that delegations consisting of a single member could not follow the work of both proposed break-out sessions simultaneously, more emphasis would be placed on discussion in plenary, with less time allotted to the parallel break-out sessions. In addition, sufficient time should be allocated to the discussion of both the older and more recent thematic issues in view of their importance in the work of the MCSD. The agenda was adopted, as amended.

14. Concern was expressed at the fact that, as of the beginning of the meeting, one-third of the members of the MCSD were absent, including a number of countries, but in particular the members representing the socio-economic actors and local authorities. It was emphasized that the very future of the MCSD depended upon the active participation and support of all of its members and that the issue of representation should be examined closely in the discussion on MCSD Assessment and Prospects. It was added that the host country had made every effort to eliminate any obstacles to the provision of visas for members from countries for which they were required.

Agenda Item 4: WSSD and the Mediterranean

15. Mr Hoballah, introducing the discussion with reference to Annex IV of document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3, recalled that the preparatory process for the WSSD had moved concern at the international level away from simple environmental issues and towards the overall question of sustainable development, based on an integrated approach incorporating the environmental, economic and social dimensions. This in turn had raised the issue of governance to prominence as the primary means of efficient implementation of the related strategies. With the emphasis that was now being placed on implementation at the regional level, particularly in relation to eco-regions such as the Mediterranean, the progress made at the Mediterranean level could provide an example for other regions. In this respect, it was important to reaffirm that little progress would be achieved in promoting sustainable development in the region without giving due consideration to essential issues such as: poverty and basic needs; globalization and production and consumption patterns; collective responsibility and partnerships; and governance.

16. In the discussion on this subject it was agreed that those initiatives adopted at the global level (WSSD) or other levels (such as the European Union) which were of relevance to the Mediterranean should be examined and adapted to Mediterranean conditions with a view to their implementation. Initiatives of particular importance included those relating to water and energy, with particular reference to renewable sources of energy. This should be done in coordination and synergy with the other actors concerned, including FAO, UNDP, the World Bank, the European Union and the private sector. For each objective identified, care should be taken to determine who would be responsible, how it would be given effect, by when and by which means. It was also important to realize the difficulties involved in considering the

Mediterranean as an eco-region, particularly since many of the Contracting Parties participated in other groupings at the international level (with particular reference to the expanded membership of the European Union), and a realistic assessment would need to be made of whether all the States and other parties concerned were in practice, and over and above their other allegiances, prepared to act as part of a group based on the Mediterranean eco-region. It was also agreed that care should be taken in organizing awareness raising initiatives, such as side-events at the various meetings, so that they were optimally targeted to achieve the highest possible level of visibility for the region. With regard to the highlights of the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation, as summarized in Annex III to document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3, it was also agreed that more concrete targets should be specified for each item using baseline data, which could perhaps be provided by the Regional Activity Centres in their specific fields of competence.

Agenda Item 5: Vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean

17. Mr Hoballah introduced the discussion on this subject by recalling that the Strategic Review endorsed in 2001 had assessed the progress made towards environmental protection and sustainable development in the region, as well as the challenges and weaknesses to be overcome. Although the Contracting Parties and other partners in the MAP and MCSD framework had been progressively moving towards the promotion of sustainable development through an integrated approach that incorporated economic and social concerns, little progress had yet been made in the region in the implementation of this approach in practice. Moreover, environmental, economic and social difficulties had been exacerbated by the high short-term costs of economic liberalization and integration into global markets. A strategic regional framework, based on a shared vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean, was therefore needed to provide a basis for cooperation between the countries and partners concerned to build and maintain a shared future. The first elements of such a vision had been presented during the workshop on strategic orientations held in Barcelona in March 2003, and the comments made at that workshop had been incorporated into the document contained in Annex V of UNEP(DEC)/MED WG 217/3.

18. Mr Ennabli, former Minister of Environment of Tunisia, presenting the Mediterranean vision of sustainable development set forth in Annex V, emphasized that the first deficit of sustainable development in the Mediterranean lay in the region's economic and social decline. However, this was counterbalanced by the feeling of belonging to the same community and of a shared destiny, as well as the hope of a better future based on co-development and mutual trust between the various parts of the Mediterranean. This presupposed a shared vision of the future and a willingness to cooperate in the context of an effective consensual process. Such a vision needed to be strategic and express the long-term aspirations of all the stakeholders. It therefore had to go beyond national frontiers and set forth the objective of an eco-region that was more diversified and in which the environment was healthy, natural diversity protected and there was greater prosperity, more democracy and the common cultural heritage was cherished. However, current development in the region was far from being sustainable. The vision was therefore an invitation for intervention at the political level with a view to undertaking reforms, assuming responsibilities, developing new ideas and discussing economic solutions. Sustainable development was the opposite of the "everything, immediately" culture that characterized ultra-liberalism. Indeed, it was only in association with sustainable development that globalization could generate an acceptable system of trade. The starting point for the vision was an extension of all the initiatives already taken at the regional level (MED 21, the revised Barcelona Convention, MAP II and the MCSD) and the Strategic Review, which had revealed the difficulties encountered in the transition towards sustainable development in Mediterranean coastal States.

19. He described the six major challenges set out in the Annex, namely: *peace; poverty and equality; development and its impact on the environment; globalization; productivity and innovation; and governance*. Progress on these challenges, and particularly in relation to governance, would have to be based on an *ethical contract*, that would give meaning and perspective to a Mediterranean sustainable development process that respected a shared ethical view of sustainability responding to a moral imperative and transcending utilitarian considerations. The participation of organizations from civil society, which represented a wide variety of cultural values and traditions in the region, would be necessary. The principles of the Rio Declaration would evidently be an integral part of the process, which would also be designed to protect the physical and human capital of the Mediterranean in the long-term, based on reducing the disparities between the living standards of the populations of the region, mobilizing actors at all levels and strengthening regional cooperation in the fields of research and development, the transfer of technology, training and information. The vision should be such as to raise awareness of what was truly at stake in the development of the region, its environmental problems, social concerns and the major challenges that would need to be taken up.

20. In the discussion of the proposed vision, broad appreciation was expressed of the quality of Mr Ennabli's contribution on this very important subject. It was widely agreed that an ethical vision was required before progress could be made in specific technical areas. The proposed vision constituted a good synthesis of the various discussions on this subject and a sound basis for progress in the development, promotion and implementation of a sustainable development strategy for the region, subject to qualifications on certain of the subjects covered by the vision. One of these concerned the references to globalization, which were in general too negative. It was agreed that globalization could not be reversed and that a positive attitude was needed to draw out the benefits of the globalization process in a manner and based on conditions adapted to the distinctive cultural, economic and social characteristics of the Mediterranean region. Greater emphasis should also be placed on ensuring that economic development and growth in the region were based on the principles set out by the WSSD and UNCSD, with particular reference to the modification of consumption and production patterns and the sustainable management of the scarcity of natural resources. The references to the education and employment of women should also be reviewed to ensure that they were in full accordance with the principles of equality of opportunity and treatment for men and women.

21. All speakers agreed on the importance of the governance dimension in the vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Progress could only be made in this respect when broad participation was assured by all stakeholders at the regional, national and local levels. Sustainable development was by its nature multisectoral, and it was therefore agreed that priority needed to be given to the active involvement of the actors responsible at all levels in the various sectors. At the regional level, these included, for example, the FAO in relation to agriculture and UNDP for poverty alleviation. It was also important to strengthen participation and synergies with the European Union, particularly in the context of its current enlargement, which directly concerned several Mediterranean countries. It was recalled that the need for sustainable development had already been under discussion for several years, but that very little progress had yet been made in its implementation in practice. Indeed, the present generation might be the last that could take decisions and action to secure the environmental conditions essential for future generations. It was therefore urgent to make progress in the development and implementation of the strategy for sustainable development in the region, for which a road map should be developed setting out the actions to be taken in the short term to ensure the involvement and ownership of the vision and the strategy by all the main actors in the principal sectors concerned. Subject to these clarifications, the meeting took note of the proposed vision for sustainable development in the Mediterranean and requested the Secretariat to transmit it to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties.

Agenda Item 6: MSSD Orientations

22. The meeting examined the draft report on Orientations for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy (MSSD) (Annex VI of document UNEP(DEC)/MED/WG.217/3), both in a break-out session and in plenary. Appreciation of the work done was expressed, and it was agreed that two texts on MSSD Orientations should be presented to the Contracting Parties in November 2003: a short and succinct text of Recommendations for adoption by the Contracting Parties, and a Synthesis Report (information document), integrating the content of Mr Ennabli's presentation and reflecting the comments made at the meeting. Members of the MCSD were invited to provide the Secretariat with proposals or suggestions in writing, by the end of May 2003, on the Synthesis Report. It was made clear that the entire draft report required numerous editing improvements to make it more balanced and accurate.

23. When specific shortcomings were discussed, attention was drawn to the fact that some titles unusually took the form of declarations, while others did not correspond to the content of the respective sub-section (e.g. Water and Fisheries). With regard to the fields of "priorities for action", the rationale for their selection should be clearly reflected in the Synthesis Report. It would also be useful to refer to any major obstacles faced in implementation when future actions were being identified. As regards the means, it was recalled that the Outline proposed in Barcelona had covered in a more appropriate manner the different categories, going clearly beyond "partners" to include funding, institutional aspects, reforms, etc. Comments were also made about ambiguous references to sensitive issues like the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership or the role of MAP compared to that of the Contracting Parties. The misleading term "environmentally sensitive products" needed to be replaced by a more accurate term; and the use of the term *governance* had led to misunderstandings over a perceived criticism of certain *governments* in the region. Finally, it was thought that it was premature to refer to "conclusions"; instead, the final chapter of the Synthesis Report might refer to "the next steps".

24. Mrs Mourmouris, who chaired the break-out session, made an oral presentation in plenary of the results of the discussion. The written report of this session is contained in Annex II. This report includes already a number of comments on the Synthesis Report. Once more the need to involve the stakeholders in the process of elaboration of the MSSD has been underlined. Mrs Mourmouris indicated that, given the rather initial current stage of this long process leading to the MSSD, it was not possible to propose substantive recommendations for the Contracting Parties during this meeting. It was therefore for the MCSD to choose if it preferred to present to the CP a short and succinct text with the key points identified so far to orient the next steps, or to entrust the Steering Committee the task of preparing draft recommendations when additional elements would be available from the experts work, or if there was no need at all for recommendations at the next meeting of the CP.

25. A debate was triggered on MCSD's working methods. Several speakers expressed concerns at the practice of break-out groups, suggesting that issues of such importance as MSSD Orientations should be discussed in plenary session only. It was recalled that no rules or guidelines had been laid down before the two break-out sessions were held, which had led to different approaches being taken. Nonetheless since the two break-out sessions had addressed different activities, it was to be expected that the respective outcomes should also be different, especially since preparation of MSSD had only begun recently and was still in progress. Moreover when concern was voiced that, if the MCSD merely mandated other bodies, such as the Steering Committee, to authorize texts produced outside MCSD meetings, the MCSD itself would be weakened and its very existence called into question. In this respect, assurances were given that there was no question of the MCSD being

circumvented. It was also agreed that all documents should be made available to all participants well in advance. The meeting agreed on the crucial importance of involving non-governmental partners, which might otherwise be dissuaded from attending MCSD meetings; non-governmental organizations might find it hard to justify attendance at future MCSD meetings, for example, if there were no concrete results to show.

26. It was decided that a drafting group from the break-out session would prepare a brief text of guidelines for the preparation of the MSSD, which would be submitted for the attention of the Contracting Parties. These guidelines, as amended by the meeting, are attached to this report as Annex II. In this respect, it was specified that a constructive approach should be followed when preparing the strategy, bringing to the fore positive elements such as MAP implementation and the SAPs, as well as regional challenges, and employing balanced language on sensitive issues. The definition of sustainable development provided in the Bruntland Report (as approved by all countries) should be used as a basis in this process. In addition, clear explanations should be provided of the geopolitical changes in the region, without overlooking initiatives, programmes and possibilities relating to the Balkan countries.

Agenda Item 7: MCSD Assessment and Prospects

26. The meeting examined the proposals contained in the report of the Task Force on MCSD Assessment and Prospects (Annex VII to document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.217/3) both in a break-out session and in plenary. Following the presentation of the report by Mr N. Georgiades, many speakers commended the work of the Task Force, but felt that the report called for further examination, particularly with regard to existing MAP structures and the causes of the shortcomings identified. There was broad agreement concerning the important role of the MCSD as a think tank and high-level policy forum, but also on the need to improve its functioning and to ensure that it was more responsive to the new world environment. It was agreed that emphasis should be placed on improved internal efficiency, including the establishment of a timetable for the MCSD's work, rather than institutional expansion. It was also agreed that now was not the time to change the membership structure of the MCSD, but that there should be flexibility in calling upon experts to participate in its work. Efforts also needed to be made to identify the reasons why certain of its members were failing to participate in its meetings and work so that this situation could be remedied.

27. The meeting discussed the importance of providing sufficient resources for the MCSD to carry out the specific tasks entrusted to it. The financing of the MCSD itself needed to be seen within the context of the overall financing of MAP and its components. With regard to the possibility of identifying the total resources within the MAP context allocated to activities related to sustainable development, it was explained that, although it would be possible in the context of the MAP budget to indicate a number of specific items in this connection, all MAP activities were related more or less directly to sustainable development, and it would therefore be extremely difficult to indicate in a single budget line all the resources utilized for this purpose.

28. There was a feeling that proposals for the reform of the MCSD needed to ensure that its work was more practical and focused on specific issues, so that its recommendations could be realistically implemented and would attract greater interest from a wider range of stakeholders, including intergovernmental agencies. The need was expressed for a more systematic follow-up of the implementation of the MCSD recommendations approved by the Contracting Parties, either through reporting or the organization of specific forums and activities, where appropriate in the context of the work of the Regional Activity Centres. The MCSD should also be more proactive in taking into account the information available through MAP structures and other channels and in producing evaluations of the attainment of

sustainable development goals, the identification of weaknesses in this respect and the formulation of recommendations for improvement.

29. The proposals for recommendations concerning the MCSD assessment and prospects, including the changes agreed upon by the meeting, are contained in Annex III to this report.

Agenda Item 8: Presentation and discussion of MCSD “thematic” issues: Progress and proposals

Cultural heritage and sustainable development

30. Mr S. Antoine, France, recalled that this theme had been entrusted to the MCSD by the Contracting Parties following the audit undertaken in July 2001 of the work carried out since 1989 on the Programme of the 100 Historic Sites. At the previous meeting of the MCSD, it had been decided that a programme on the cultural heritage of the Mediterranean would be undertaken based on the 100 Historic Sites network, but that it would be substantially renewed in the perspective of sustainable development and would be related to the problems of the development of tourism. The activities carried out under the guidance of France and Tunisia had involved Croatia, Monaco, Morocco and Turkey, as well as MedCities and the City of Naples. A workshop had been held on this subject in Nice in April 2003 and had developed proposals on the scope of cooperation, a three year programme of work and the organization of a structure within the framework of MAP. It had been envisaged in this respect that the activities would only be launched after an agreement had been reached with MAP and examined by the MCSD, and that the proposed structure would be neither an activity centre nor an institution subsidized by MAP. Instead, the support of cities, universities and research institutions would be sought and a balance would be maintained between the various shores of the Mediterranean. The structure would develop relations with UNESCO and ICOMOS.

31. The meeting welcomed the proposed initiative and agreed that Tunisia and France should continue the project and present the progress achieved at a future meeting of the MCSD, if possible in 2004. It noted that the City of Marseilles, which had cooperated in the implementation of the 100 Historic Sites programme for over 14 years, would continue to provide support for the transformation of the programme, thereby avoiding any interruption in MAP's activities in the field of culture. It emphasized that cultural heritage was essential for the Mediterranean and important for sustainable development.

Industry and sustainable development

32. Mr V. Macia, Director, Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (CP/RAC), described the role of the centre in promoting the concept of cleaner production among industry partners, particularly within the framework of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) for the implementation of the LBS Protocol. The recommendations of the thematic working group on industry and sustainable development had been approved by the Contracting Parties in 2001 and, in view of the fact that the working group had not continued its work, the centre had found that the SAP offered a good framework for developing the implementation of some of these recommendations, particularly in relation to the introduction of sustainable standards within companies and the transfer of knowledge. The activities of the centre to give effect to these recommendations included the preparation of three regional guidelines and one regional plan for use by countries to develop their own national action plans taking into account the principles of sustainable development in industrial activities. It had also developed coordination with other similar centres and UNIDO on this subject, as well as collaborating in the establishment of a cleaner production centre in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

A meeting had been organized with other institutions working in the field of sustainability in Mediterranean industry, including UNEP, UNIDO, MED POL and the Mediterranean Chamber of Commerce Association (ASCAME), to review and confirm the approach proposed to give effect to the relevant recommendations in the framework of the SAP. Knowledge had also been disseminated, particularly through contacts with organizations representing industry.

33. The meeting agreed that CP/RAC had been very active in undertaking work that was broadly appreciated. It was proposed that contact be established between the International Chamber of Commerce and the centre with a view to future collaboration. The meeting noted the role played by the centre in the context of the SAP. It also requested more complete information in future on the implementation of the recommendations of the MCSD on this subject and on any follow-up activities.

Local governance (and follow-up of previous themes)

34. Mr I. Trumbic, Director of the Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC), reviewed the activities of the centre in implementing the relevant recommendations of the MCSD, particularly as they related to coastal and urban management, as well as sustainable tourism. Continuing the work commenced under an earlier working group on urban management and sustainable development, importance had been assigned to the development of a legal context for Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) and a feasibility study was being prepared on a regional protocol for coastal management. The centre had also continued with the preparation of new Coastal Area Management Projects (CAMPs) in a number of countries, through which local stakeholders had been identified, especially in Lebanon. In the field of capacity building, a clearing house for information had been established on the centre's website. The implementation of the MCSD's recommendations on urban management and sustainable development was being pursued through urban regeneration activities, including a project that was being implemented with the support of the European Union. These activities had led to reinforced contacts with relevant NGOs. With regard to local governance, it was recalled that the previous meeting of the MCSD had agreed that preliminary work only would be carried out on this theme with a view to the establishment of a thematic working group on the subject at a later date. It was therefore hoped that more substantive activities on this theme could be presented at the next meeting of the MCSD.

35. The meeting noted the activities carried out by the centre. It was proposed that consideration should be given to the organization of a forum on local governance.

Management of water demand

36. Mr G. Benoit, Director of Blue Plan, recalled the activities carried out over several years in the field of the management of water demand, including the Fréjus meeting in 1997 and the recent Fiuggi Forum on "Advances of Water Demand Management in the Mediterranean", attended by various concerned stakeholders and organized with the support of the Global Water Partnership. He recalled that water was a rare resource almost throughout the Mediterranean basin, especially in view of the constantly increasing demand for water as the population rose and tourism developed. According to the available prospective analyses, a real crisis could be foreseen within 25 years if current consumption patterns continued. Nevertheless, the management of water demand offered considerable savings. Indeed, one scenario suggested that over 70 km³ of water could be saved through the application of effective water demand management by the year 2025, which constituted almost one-fourth of the 300 km³ of water currently used in the region. He cited a number of cases in which the relevant techniques had been employed to very good effect, including

Tunisia and the Rabat-Casablanca conurbation. However, there was still a widespread tendency to apply supply-side policies rather than endeavouring to manage demand, which required a profound change in policies and practice. The relevant organizations tended to have little awareness or training. A series of case studies had provided indications of the measures needed to promote greater use of water demand management, including the rallying of organizational effort, economic instruments, administrative tools and training. The Fiuggi Forum had developed a series of recommendations addressed to the MCSD and covering the fields of government action, the strengthening of regional partnerships, support for the adoption of water demand management by local organizations and the dissemination of the necessary practices.

37. The meeting welcomed the presentation of the activities carried out by Blue Plan on water demand management, which had provided very full information and clearly indicated to potential partners, including the business sector, the fields in which cooperation could be established. It recognized that Blue Plan was an important partner in Mediterranean water management efforts. The Fiuggi Forum was a useful tool for creating partnerships and promoting awareness among decision-makers of the relevant scientific knowledge. Similar initiatives should be considered in other MCSD activities. It was pointed out that several initiatives were active at the Mediterranean level in the field of water and that partnerships should therefore be promoted. Considerable funding had also been made available in the context of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership in the field of water, and it was therefore disappointing to note that no projects had been submitted on water demand management. Nevertheless, the progress made demonstrated what could be achieved when MAP and the MCSD continued to be active in a specific field.

38. The meeting commended Blue Plan on the activities carried out and the contacts established with professional networks. It noted the recommendations of the Fiuggi Forum and hoped that this type of forum would be organized in relation to other themes covered by the MCSD.

Free trade and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context

39. Mr G. Benoit, Director, Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC) and Mr A. Jorio (BP/RAC expert) described the further action taken on the impact of free trade on the Mediterranean environment since the first action phase. The focus of work had been on the impact of free trade on agriculture, a particularly important sector in view of the ongoing multilateral and regional negotiations – but one not hitherto included in proposals for a Euro-Mediterranean free-trade area – and of the vulnerability of the agricultural sector in the diverse Mediterranean context. In addition to country case studies, notably one on agriculture in Morocco, an especially important development had been the holding of a regional forum, organized jointly with the International Centre for Advanced Research in Mediterranean Agronomy (CIHEAM), in Montpellier in May 2002.

40. Among the main findings of the forum was the very great diversity of conditions between countries and regions, with high risks of a serious negative social, economic and environmental impact on some vulnerable countries of the south and east Mediterranean, and of instability in those countries and in the region in the event of unregulated free trade that was not accompanied by strong support measures to help countries over the transition period. In the context of the move towards extended free trade in agricultural markets, the decline in State support for agriculture and the failure hitherto to take account of sustainability in the current negotiations, and in the light of the multiple role (“multifunctionality”) of agriculture and the potential wider social, economic and environmental consequences of expanded free trade, the forum had proposed several courses of action, some of which had been taken up in the recommendations now before the MCSD.

41. A shared vision of the multiple roles of Mediterranean agriculture and rural areas and concrete accompanying measures for the transition in the countries of the south and east should be developed. Further consideration should be given to the future for Euro-Mediterranean agriculture and ways and means of ensuring sustainable agricultural and rural development. The joint holding of a regional forum in 2005 was proposed. A further recommendation concerned the MCSD/Blue Plan's involvement in the consultation committee for the sustainability impact assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean free-trade area, to be undertaken by the European Commission.

42. In the ensuing discussion, speakers stressed the need, as of 2003, to undertake practical action and further studies on the environmental aspects and multiple roles of agriculture, with a precise time-frame, and to prepare proposals for concrete action programmes for sustainable rural development in the Mediterranean. It was suggested that meetings at ministerial level might be organized to discuss the full range of agricultural issues as they related to the environment and sustainable development in general. In response to misgivings expressed about the capacity to influence the impact assessment process, it was explained that consultations were still under way and there was still ample room for input by the MCSD. Moreover, the introduction of environmental language into such assessments was an important novelty and an opportunity not to be missed.

43. The recommendations presented were briefly discussed but the meeting felt that, as they stood, they were premature. Following a review, proposals for recommendations on free trade and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context were adopted, as below:

Agriculture and Rural Areas

MCSD takes note with interest of the work carried out in the field of free trade, agriculture and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context. It takes note of the risks of social and environmental repercussions facing fragile rural areas in the southern and eastern Mediterranean and the instabilities that might result in certain countries and on a regional scale, in the event of expanding free trade that is unregulated and unaccompanied by adequate support policies for the transition. Taking into account the extent of the economic, social and environmental challenges at stake, the negotiation timetables and the urgent need for a shared vision and to improve the integration and adaptation of policies, it proposes:

- that MAP, the International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies (CIHEAM) and the Contracting Parties ensure that the work done is widely disseminated among the public and professional actors,
- that the Contracting Parties might organize *ad hoc* interministerial meetings and that they take into account the full set of economic, social and environmental aspects in the meetings and negotiations under way on agriculture and trade, in particular in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership,
- that MAP, in cooperation with CIHEAM and the other regional partners, and in synergy with the relevant initiatives, study in greater depth the environmental aspects and the multiple roles of agriculture, organize in 2005 a forum together with CIHEAM and frame proposals for concrete action programmes for the sustainable rural development of the Euro-Mediterranean area.

Sustainability impact assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area

MCSO takes note of the launch by the European Commission of the sustainability impact assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area and asks the Contracting Parties to be fully involved in the process directly and through the MCSO Secretariat and concerned Support Centres, in particular the Blue Plan by participating in the consultation committee to be created by the European Commission in order to ensure a broad consensus by all parties concerned.

Financing and cooperation for sustainable development in the Mediterranean

44. Mr G. Benoit and Mr A. Jorio gave a brief presentation of a Blue Plan document setting out the context and the main findings and conclusions of the work carried out on the subject. A few sets of additional statistics were also presented, referring for example to the concentration of aid and investment in certain Mediterranean countries. Emphasis was laid on the usefulness of organizing a regional forum in 2004 to report back on the completed work and hold a debate. It ought to be attended by a broad range of participants to include, in addition to representatives of the countries, qualified experts, sponsors and NGOs. An appeal was made for a country or city to volunteer to host and help to finance the forum. No specific recommendations were put to the meeting in the light of the limited time left for the presentation and discussion of this thematic issue.

Ninth meeting of the MCSO

45. Mr Hoballah called for offers from any of the members of the MCSO to host and cost share the next meeting of the MCSO in May 2004. The meeting would be held over a period of three or four days and its agenda would include a maximum of four items, which could include the preparation of the MSSD, the programme of work of the MCSO for the period 2005-15, cooperation and financing and free trade, agriculture and environment.

Any other business

46. For the first time, side-events were organized in the context of MCSO meetings with a view to enhancing interaction, the exchange of experience, common understanding and effective joint action in relation to shared concerns for the promotion of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Three side-events were organized on the following subjects: inspection systems, by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of Croatia on the evening of 14 May; the business sector and the MCSO, by ICC-Med on the evening of 15 May; and NGOs and the MCSO, by MIO-ECSDE on the afternoon of 16 May. The three side-events were attended by most of the MCSO members and were very interactive with constructive discussions. It was considered that such side-events were useful and the Secretariat was encouraged to renew this experience in so far as possible in future MCSO meetings. Side events in the Ninth meeting of the MCSO could be related to local Agenda 21s and regional cooperation, such as with the Baltic 21.

Closure of the meeting

48. Mrs Mourmouris announced that she would no more follow the MCSO work in the capacity of EC representative because she would change post soon. She thanked all members for the good co-operation during all these years and promised to continue supporting the MCSO on any occasion. M. Hoballah, on behalf of the MCSO Secretariat and MCSO members, thanked her for her active participation in the MCSO activities that have benefited a lot from her very constructive contributions, wishing her the best for her future endeavours.

49. Following the usual exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 2 pm on Friday 16 May 2003.

ANNEX I

Record of decisions of the Seventh Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) Antalya, 13-16 March, 2002

Election of the Steering Committee

The Commission elected its new Steering Committee, the composition of which was as follows: President: H.E. Mr F. Aytekin (Turkey), Vice-Presidents: H.E. Mr B. Fautrier (Monaco), Mr J. Echirk (Algeria), Mr V. Escobar (Spain), Ms M. Najera Aranzabal (Municipality of Calvia), Mr A. Benhallou (MEDENER), Rapporteur: Mr M. Ibrahim (ENDA)

MCSD assessment and prospects

After examining the report presented by the Secretariat, the Meeting agreed that a task force of the MCSD should be established to examine ways in which the MCSD could be strengthened and its action refocused in the post-Johannesburg era. The task force should take into account developments in other regions and prepare comprehensive proposals. (The terms of reference for the task force, prepared by Italy and Spain in collaboration with the Secretariat, are attached as Annex IV, Appendix II to the report of the Meeting.). Moreover, a revised version of the summary of conclusions and recommendations was agreed upon, incorporating the comments made during the discussion, and reworded in language more suitable to a text intended for wide distribution. (This revised version is attached as Annex IV, Appendix I to the report of the Meeting.)

Assessment of implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action

Considering that this issue was previously discussed at the Extraordinary meeting of the MCSD and examining related recommendations as adopted by the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties, the Meeting agreed that regional thematic forums should be organized in the context of the MCSD for those responsible at the national level in the various fields covered by its recommendations, as well as other concerned actors. Such regional forums should then be followed up by further activities within countries to ensure that a large number of stakeholders were aware of the MCSD's guidance and recommendations and were involved in their implementation. It was agreed that this methodology should be first tested in the field of tourism, which was of immense importance in the region and where little had yet been done to follow-up the MCSD's recommendations.

"Framework orientations" for a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development

The Meeting recalled that the terms of reference of the MCSD included the provision of assistance to the Contracting Parties in formulating and implementing a regional sustainable development strategy. It was recalled in this respect that, to be effective, in view of the breadth of the subject, such a strategy would need to focus on a small number of issues related, for example, to severe or irreversible threats, the well-being of the people and regional cooperation. In this context, the Meeting agreed that the holding of an expert meeting in October in Spain to prepare the orientations based on the above three key pillars by applying the proposed

methodology was a sound way to establish a coherent framework, a detailed table of contents and a related agenda for the formulation of a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development, with a view to preparing a brief preliminary draft taking into account other relevant initiatives for submission to the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD.

Tourism and sustainable development: A regional programme

In response to a proposal by Turkey to establish a MAP Regional Activity Centre/Eco-Tourism (RAC/ET) in Antalya, Turkey, subsequently modified to a programme on tourism and sustainable development, the Meeting agreed that Turkey would review its proposals for the development of a programme on tourism and sustainable development, giving due consideration to the comments made by the MCSD, with a view to presenting a more detailed proposal to the next meeting of the MCSD so that it could make its recommendations to the Contracting Parties for a final decision on this issue.

Historic sites and sustainable development

The Meeting noted that, at their 12th Ordinary Meeting and following an evaluation of the 100 Historic Sites Programme, the Contracting Parties had requested the Secretariat to prepare, using the MCSD framework as appropriate, a draft of a new programme on cultural heritage. The Meeting decided that a programme on the Cultural Heritage of the Mediterranean would be undertaken by MAP; this programme would be based on the 100 Historic Sites network, but substantially recast in the context of sustainable development; and that linkages would be established with tourism development problems. It was decided that France and Tunisia would co-chair a working group. Monaco, Turkey, Morocco, Croatia and Greece agreed to participate in the group, which would remain open-ended; the Municipality of Naples and the MEDCITES network would be invited to participate; at the invitation of the representative of France, an initial meeting would be organized by France within one year.

New issues and reexamination of some already studied

Reexamination of issues already studied

Management of water demand

The Meeting recalled the importance of what was at stake with regard to the management of water demand for the region, the proposals emerging from the MCSD's deliberations in 1997, and the activities carried out since then by MAP, by the major international partners (the Euro-Mediterranean Conference in Turin, the World Forum in the Hague), as well as by certain countries. The Meeting emphasized the importance of the regional forum which would take place in Rome at the beginning of October 2003 and which was being organized by MAP-BP/RAC in partnership with the Global Water Partnership and with the support of France and Italy. It would provide an opportunity to assess in detail the progress made and the difficulties encountered, as well as the tools to be preferred for the implementation of the recommendations. The forum would therefore also be under the aegis of the MCSD.

Free trade and environment

The Meeting reviewed progress on this issue and recalled that the European Commission was about to call for tenders for a sustainability impact assessment of free trade in the region. The Meeting hoped that MAP, which had the capacity to contribute to the assessment, and through the participatory approach of the MCSD, could be fully associated with it. It was agreed that the forthcoming meeting of the Bureau should discuss this matter, establish the relevant contacts with the European Commission and decide on the steps that MAP could take in this respect.

Local governance

Following a proposal that a working group on local governance should be set up to identify the main problems concerning sustainability at local level, set the rationale for action, establish priorities, decide who were the main stakeholders, form partner coalitions and consensus building in specific policy areas, operationalize manageable tasks and implement, assess and establish benchmarks, the Meeting agreed that, with the support of PAP/RAC, the working group should focus on a few identifiable outputs, with a view to the holding of a forum in 2003 bringing together a wide range of actors.

New issues

Agriculture and rural development

Considering the importance of agriculture and rural development for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development, the Meeting agreed that the MCSD could produce added value by working in partnership with other actors, notably ICAMAS, FAO and IAMF, as well as with national expertise. BP/RAC was given a mandate to do the preparatory work establishing the necessary contacts and partnerships. It was agreed that the issue would then be taken up in depth and the network would be operational in some 18 months' time.

Consumption patterns and urban waste management

On consumption patterns and urban waste management, the consensus of the Meeting was that there was no need to embark on a full-scale programme immediately, but that work should be focused on building on the extensive knowledge that existed, particularly in the field of waste management, reviewing achievements to date and assessing what needed to be done in the future. The added value that the MCSD could bring to the issue would lie in networking and exchanging experience, and also in reinforcing capacities, since local authorities all too often lacked the necessary technical and financial resources. It was agreed that PAP/RAC would undertake efforts to identify partners. This would be done taking into account existing organizations, such as METAP. Progress in this respect would be reported to the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD, prior to defining a clearer orientation for the added value and expected achievements in this important area.

Financing and cooperation for sustainable development

Being a key issue for sustainable development in the Mediterranean Region, for which the MCSD could provide a useful contribution to the debate by serving as a legitimate forum for bringing together concerned partners for a joint reflection and to put forward relevant strategies and proposals, the Meeting decided that the theme "Financing and cooperation for sustainable

development in the Mediterranean” would be launched without delay. It would proceed on the basis of the report presented by Blue Plan, supplemented by a number of considerations put forward at the Meeting, in particular the question of the mobilization of domestic resources and recourse to more appropriate international and bilateral mechanisms, such as debt swap arrangements for sustainable development projects. In order to carry out these activities, the Secretariat would seek expertise available at the regional level and in volunteer countries, and also in relevant financial organizations and among the main European and international donors from whom support was requested. A steering committee bringing together these partners would provide guidance for the studies and the preparation of the forum scheduled to be held before the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD.

Finally, in view of the fact that the issues of agricultural and rural development, consumption patterns and urban waste management and financing and cooperation for sustainable development were all new issues, the Meeting agreed that all three would be dealt with but at a different pace and at different levels, as follows: financing and cooperation as a full-scale new programme on which work would proceed immediately; consumption patterns and waste management through networking and partnerships; and agriculture and rural development by building on the work of existing institutions pending the launching of a full-scale programme.

Major groups: Participation and contribution to MCSD activities

The Meeting noted the information provided by the representatives of the Major groups on this subject and hoped that issues discussed in relation to ways and means for improving their participation and contribution to MCSD activities would be further elaborated at the Major Groups Forum to be held in Naples around May 2002.

MAP/MCSD participation and contribution to the WSSD preparatory process

Noting MAP/MCSD progress in this context, the Meeting agreed that information on the MCSD's activities and MAP should be more widely disseminated throughout the WSSD process. It was also decided that the members of the MCSD should ensure their active participation in the WSSD to promote the visibility of the region and its active contribution to sustainable development.

Eighth MCSD Meeting

It was noted that the Eighth Meeting of the MCSD would be held around April 2003 in Algiers. The agenda proposed in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/2 would be refined to take into account the discussions at the present meeting. Two meetings of the Steering Committee were planned before the Eighth Meeting. Finally, a two-day forum of experts on finance and cooperation for sustainable development would be held immediately prior to the MCSD meeting.

Adoption of the report

Following the discussions concerning the adoption of the report, the Meeting decided that the product of the MCSD's meetings would henceforth consist principally of a reasoned record of decisions preceded by a short introduction reflecting only the spirit of the discussions, the whole of which would not be longer than ten pages. The lessons to be learned from this new type of report would be drawn at the next session of the MCSD.

ANNEX II

6th Meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD Calvià, 21 and 22 November 2002

Summary of Decisions

At the opening of the meeting the members of the Steering Committee declared themselves deeply preoccupied by the accidental marine pollution currently affecting the Spanish coasts and expressed their solidarity with the Authorities and population of Galicia. They took this opportunity to reaffirm the need for the Contracting Parties to ratify and implement as soon as possible the Barcelona Convention and its protocols, and in particular the new "Protocol concerning Cooperation in Preventing Pollution from Ships and, in cases of Emergency, Combating Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea".

Lessons from the Johannesburg Summit for the MCSD

- Taking note of the set of objectives and recommendations agreed upon by the WSSD, the Steering Committee decided that more concrete and as far as possible measurable objectives at the regional level should be defined together with the necessary means and partnerships for their implementation; due attention should be given to this throughout the elaboration process for the Strategy, the finalization of which is foreseen for the year 2005.
- Among the set of objectives proposed in the Secretariat's report, based on the WSSD conclusions, the Steering Committee has insisted notably on education for sustainable development, considered as one of the most essential crosscutting themes. Due attention should also be given to the specificity of the problems related to the Mediterranean eco-region, in particular concerning fisheries, management of water resources, pollutions, ICZM and tourism. In the field of energy the Steering Committee agreed on the necessity to improve the existing practices in terms of energy efficiency and a more systematic use of renewable energies.
- Moreover, in accordance with the Plan of Implementation of the WSSD, the issue of poverty can no longer be ignored at the regional level. Therefore, Type II initiatives contributing to its reduction, should be given priority, as well as the identification of partnerships for the implementation of the decisions through a participatory approach with the civil society, the private sector the local authorities and all other relevant actors.

Orientations for the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development

- The three orientation documents submitted by the experts constitute a good working basis but require some adjustments. The experts are therefore required to ensure more coherence with the Environment and Development Report actually being prepared by the Blue Plan and that should be used as an information background together with any relevant document from MAP or other Mediterranean or international entities, throughout the preparatory process of the Strategy.

- Concerning the document “environment and natural resources”: better define the priority issues with specific objectives in accordance with the thematic issues being considered in the framework of MAP and in particular by BP/RAC.
- Concerning the document “economic development and social equity”: the macroeconomic concerns are well identified with an interesting system of using “lights”; they however require to be better defined through the sectorial concerns.
- Concerning the document “governance, political and institutional issues”: an unnecessary academic debate should be avoided by clearly distinguishing between the process and the concept itself; governance should be applied for the thematic approaches as well as the general and crosscutting ones. It is important to identify the necessary institutional reforms together with the required capacities and partnerships so as to define the relevant approach in view of achieving the objectives agreed upon in the framework of the Orientations. Moreover it has been recommended to draw appropriate lessons in terms of governance from the thematic approaches in particular those related to water or ICZM and tourism.
- These Strategic Orientations should concern the whole of the Mediterranean, its institutions and actors beyond MAP framework. It is therefore necessary to induce and motivate other actors to get involved in the Strategy in view of developing a common sense of ownership. This is particularly true for the EU and the EMP.
- It would be useful to apply the signaletic approach of indicators to the whole of the work concerning the orientations to get a more coherent overview.
- The meeting of experts on the orientations for the MSSD must elaborate the methodological frame for the preparation of the Strategy while selecting a set of realistic and feasible objectives. This meeting of experts must also propose a detailed table of contents of the Strategy including the necessary processes and means, partnerships, accompanying measures and specific responsibilities in view of their examination by the MCSD at its next meeting and then by the Contracting Parties, it being understood that the preparation of the Strategy itself will take place during the year 2004.

MCSD Assessment and Prospects

- It has been recognized that the MCSD Secretariat needs to be strengthened with more adequate means at its disposal while keeping its financial and operational autonomy in order to meet the requirements of sustainable development.
- In view of the coming meeting of the Contracting Parties and in the wake of the WSSD, the time seems particularly appropriate to reinforce the action of the Commission in the social and economic fields, with due attention to the necessary resources and supporting structure. In that respect, the Steering Committee approved the idea of reinforcing the Secretariat or with the possibility of a Support Unit which would be relatively autonomous in the framework of MAP.

- In view of the calendar of scheduled meetings, it was felt that the Task Force should meet quickly and more at length in order to define with clarity the two options it envisaged for the reinforcement of the Commission Secretariat, including the prospect of creating a distinct Support Unit with a quantified identification of the means required in term of financing and partnerships, together with a draft detailed mandate while giving due consideration to the mandates of MAP components. Accordingly the Steering Committee felt it was necessary to start making contacts with potential partners including the EU, hosting local authorities and Contracting Parties in order to appraise the feasibility of these proposals.
- These proposals will have to be examined by the MCSD, before being submitted to the Bureau and the Contracting Parties in the overall framework of the general evaluation of MAP.

Dates of meetings

Considering the need to coordinate with the Bureau of the Contracting Parties for issues of common interest related to MAP evaluation, the dates of some meetings, were changed as follows:

- Meeting of the Task Force: end of January-beginning of February 2003
- Meeting of Experts (Orientations): first half (13-15) of March 2003
- 8th Meeting of the MCSD: during the week of the 7-9 of May 2003

Follow up of MCSD Proposals and review of progress

- The Steering Committee confirmed the interest and willingness of the MCSD to be involved and have an active role, and not just being consulted, in the implementation of the EC Sustainability Impact Analysis.

Eighth MCSD meeting

- The Steering Committee welcome with interest the Secretariat's proposal to improve the organization of the MCSD meeting with, as far as possible, a few side events related to the agenda items and by having a few keynote speakers.
- The Secretariat is requested to identify new partners, with the assistance of the MCSD members, and invite the most relevant ones in relation to the agenda items; in this respect and as an example, a side event could be organized by ICC/Monaco and ICC/Croatia on behalf of ICC.

The members of the Steering Committee expressed their appreciation to the warm hospitality by the Municipality of Calvià and for the excellent support and cooperation in the organization of the meeting.

ANNEX III

A. HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE JOHANNESBURG DECLARATION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Broader commitment

- collective responsibility to advance and strengthen the interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development – economic development, social development and environmental protection– at local, national, regional and global levels

Overarching objectives

- poverty eradication
- changing consumption and production patterns
- protecting and managing the natural resource base
- address globalization

Commitment to Sustainable Development

- dialogue and cooperation
- access to basic requirements such as clean water, sanitation, shelter, energy, health care, food security and the protection of bio-diversity
- access to financial resources, benefit from the opening of markets, ensure capacity building, use modern technology to bring about development, and make sure that there is technology transfer, human resource development, education and training

Stronger regional groupings and alliances

- broad-based participation
- stable partnerships with all major groups
- corporate responsibility
- strengthen and improve governance at all levels

Multilateralism is the Future

- effective, democratic and accountable international and multilateral institutions.
- monitor progress at regular intervals

Making it Happen!

- an inclusive process, involving all the major groups and governments

B. HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE JOHANNESBURG PLAN OF IMPLEMENTATION, AS THEY RELATE TO THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE MAP/MCSD

I. INTRODUCTION

- Involve all relevant actors through *partnerships*, especially between Governments of the North and South, on the one hand, and between Governments and major groups, on the other, to achieve the widely shared goals of sustainable development

II. POVERTY ERADICATION

- Develop *national programmes for sustainable development*
- Combat *desertification* and mitigate the effects of drought and floods
- Provide access to *safe drinking water* and to *basic sanitation*
- Achieve a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million *slum dwellers*

III. CHANGING UNSUSTAINABLE PATTERNS OF CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION

- Promote the development of a *10-year framework of programmes in support of regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production*
- Establish and support *cleaner production programmes and centres*
- Encourage *industry to improve social and environmental performance*
- *Integrate energy considerations, including energy efficiency, affordability and accessibility, into socio-economic programmes*
- *substantially increase the global share of renewable energy sources*
- Promote *waste prevention and minimization*
- Promote efforts to *prevent international illegal trafficking of hazardous chemicals and hazardous wastes*

IV. PROTECTING AND MANAGING THE NATURAL RESOURCE BASE OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

- Halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford *safe drinking water* as outlined in the Millennium Declaration and the proportion of people without access to *basic sanitation*
- Develop *integrated water resources management and water efficiency plans* by 2005
- Encourage the application by 2010 of the *ecosystem approach in fisheries management*
- Promote *integrated coastal and ocean management*
- Maintain or restore *fish stocks* not later than 2015
- Support the sustainable development of *aquaculture*
- Maintain the productivity and biodiversity of important and vulnerable *marine and coastal areas*

- Elaborate regional programmes of action for the sustainable development of *coastal and marine resources*
- Accelerate the development of measures to address *invasive alien species* in ballast water
- Build capacity in *marine science, information and management*
- Support the establishment of effective regional, subregional and national strategies and scientific and technical institutional support for *disaster management*
- Reduce the risks of *flooding and drought* in vulnerable countries
- Increase understanding of the sustainable use, protection and management of *water resources*
- Promote the conservation, and sustainable use and management of *traditional and indigenous agricultural systems*
- Integrate measures to prevent and combat *desertification* as well as to mitigate the effects of drought
- Develop and promote programmes, policies and approaches that integrate environmental, economic and social components of *sustainable mountain development*
- Promote *sustainable tourism developmen*;
- Develop programmes, including education and training programmes, that encourage people to participate in *eco-tourism*
- Integrate the objectives of the *Convention (on Biological Diversity)* into global, regional and national sectoral and cross-sectoral programmes and policies
- Promote the wide implementation and further development of the *ecosystem approach*, as being elaborated in the ongoing work of the Convention
- Support efforts to address the environmental, economic, health and social impacts and benefits of *mining, minerals and metals* throughout their life cycle, including workers' health and safety

V. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN A GLOBALIZING WORLD

- Enhance the capacities of developing countries to benefit from *liberalized trade opportunities*
- Actively promote *corporate responsibility and accountability*
- Strengthen *regional trade and cooperation agreements*....with a view to achieving the objectives of sustainable development

VI. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES

- Assist small island developing States, including through the elaboration of specific initiatives, in *delimiting and managing in a sustainable manner their coastal areas and exclusive economic zones and the continental shelf*
- Develop community-based initiatives on *sustainable tourism* by 2004
- Support the finalization and subsequent early operationalization, ...of *vulnerability indices*

VII. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FOR AFRICA

- Develop projects, programmes and partnerships.....for the effective implementation of the outcome of the *African Process for the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment*
- Provide financial and technical support for Africa's efforts to implement the *Convention to Combat Desertification* at the national level
- Develop and implement *integrated river basin and watershed management* strategies and plans

VIII. MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- Promote *mutual supportiveness between the multilateral trading system and the multilateral environmental agreements*
- Promote and improve *science-based decision-making* and reaffirm the *precautionary approach*
- Continue to implement the work programme of the Commission on Sustainable Development on *education for sustainable development*
- Develop the capacity of civil society to participate in decision- making
- Promote and further develop methodologies at policy, strategy and project levels for *sustainable development decision-making at the local and national levels, and where relevant at the regional level*

IX. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- Strengthen the institutional framework for sustainable development at the international level
- Strengthen and better integrate the three dimensions of sustainable development policies and programmes, and promote the full integration of sustainable development objectives into programmes and policies of bodies that have a primary focus on social issues
- **Role and function of the Commission on Sustainable Development**
 - Review progress and promote the further implementation of Agenda 21
 - Serve as a focal point for the discussion of partnerships that promote sustainable development
 - Provide a forum for analysis and exchange of experience on measures that assist sustainable development planning, decision-making and the implementation of sustainable development strategies
 - Furthering the contribution of educators to sustainable development
 - Role of international institutions
- *Strengthen cooperation among UNEP and other United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, the Bretton Woods institutions and WTO, within their mandates*
- UNEP, UN-Habitat, UNDP and UNCTAD, within their mandates, should strengthen their contribution to sustainable development programmes and the

- implementation of Agenda 21 at all levels, particularly in the area of promoting capacity-building
- **Strengthening institutional arrangements for sustainable development at the regional level**
 - Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit should be effectively pursued at the regional and subregional levels, through the regional commissions and other regional and subregional institutions and bodies
 - *Intraregional coordination and cooperation on sustainable development should be improved* among the regional commissions, United Nations Funds, programmes and agencies, regional development banks, and other regional and subregional institutions and bodies
 - Facilitate and promote a balanced *integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development into the work of regional, subregional and other bodies*
 - *Assist in the mobilization of technical and financial assistance, and facilitate the provision of adequate financing for the implementation of regionally and subregionally agreed sustainable development programmes and projects*
 - Continue to promote *multi-stakeholder participation* and encourage partnerships
 - Strengthening institutional frameworks for sustainable development at the national level
 - Take immediate steps to make progress in the *formulation and elaboration of national strategies for sustainable development* and begin their implementation by 2005
 - Further promote the *establishment or enhancement of sustainable development councils* and/or coordination structures at the national level, including at the local level
 - *Enhance the role and capacity of local authorities* as well as stakeholders in implementing Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit

Participation of major groups

Enhance partnerships between governmental and non-governmental actors, including all major groups, as well as volunteer groups, on programmes and activities for the achievement of sustainable development at all levels.

C. HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMITMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION INITIATIVES AT THE WSSD

The following is a list of some of the agreements reached and initiatives announced during the Johannesburg Summit. This list is not exhaustive, but reflects some key highlights of the Summit process. The commitments shown are those agreed in the Implementation Plan adopted by Governments at the close of the Summit.

Water & Sanitation

Commitments

- Commitment to halve the proportion of people without access to sanitation by 2015; this matches the goal of halving the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water by 2015.

Initiatives

- The United States announced \$970 million in investments over the next three years on water and sanitation projects.
- The European Union announced the "Water for Life" initiative that seeks to engage partners to meet goals for water and sanitation, primarily in Africa and Central Asia. The Asia Development Bank provided a \$5 million grant to UN Habitat and \$500 million in fast-track credit for the Water for Asian Cities Programme.
- The UN has received 21 other water and sanitation initiatives with at least \$20 million in extra resources.

Energy

Commitments

- Commitment to increase access to modern energy services increase energy efficiency and to increase the use of renewable energy
- To phase out, where appropriate, energy subsidies.
- To support the NEPAD objective of ensuring access to energy for at least 35% of the African population within 20 years

Initiatives

- The nine major electricity companies of the E7 signed a range of agreements with the UN to facilitate technical cooperation for sustainable energy projects in developing countries.
- The European Union announced a \$700 million partnership initiative on energy and the United States announced that it would invest up to \$43 million in 2003.
- The South African energy utility Eskom announced a partnership to extend modern energy services to neighboring countries.
- The UN has received 32 partnership submissions for energy projects with at least \$26 million in resources.

Health

Commitments

- Commitment that by 2020, chemicals should be used and produced in ways that do not harm human health and the environment.
- To enhance cooperation to reduce air pollution.
- To improve developing countries' access to environmentally sound alternatives to ozone depleting chemicals by 2010.

Initiatives

- United States announced commitment to spend \$2.3 billion through 2003 on health, some of which was earmarked earlier for the Global Fund.
- The UN has received 16 partnership submissions for health projects with \$3 million in resources.

Agriculture

Commitments

- The GEF will consider inclusion of the Convention to Combat Desertification as a focal area for funding.
- In Africa, development of food security strategies by 2005.

Initiatives

- The United States will invest \$90 million in 2003 for sustainable agriculture programmes.
- The UN has received 17 partnership submissions with at least \$2 million in additional resources.

Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management

Commitments

- Commitment to reduce biodiversity loss by 2010.
- Commitment to reverse the current trend in natural resource degradation.
- Commitment to restore fisheries to their maximum sustainable yields by 2015.
- Commitment to establish a representative network of marine protected areas by 2012.
- Commitment to improve developing countries' access to environmentally-sound alternatives to ozone depleting chemicals by 2010.
- Undertake initiatives by 2004 to implement the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land Based Sources of Pollution.

Initiatives

- The UN has received 32 partnership initiatives with \$100 million in resources.
- The United States has announced \$53 million for forests in 2002-2005.

Cross-Cutting Issues

Commitments

- Recognition that opening up access to markets is a key to development for many countries.
- Support the phase out of all forms of export subsidies.
- Commitment to establish a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production.
- Commitment to actively promote corporate responsibility and accountability.
- Commitments to develop and strengthen a range of activities to improve natural disaster preparedness and response.

Initiative

- Agreement to the replenishment of the Global Environment Facility, with a total of \$3 billion (\$2.92 billion announced pre-Summit and \$80 million added by EU in Johannesburg).

*(Issued by the United Nations Department of Public Information
Revised 12 September 2002)*

ANNEX IV

REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN: POLICY AND TOOLS

A Mediterranean Partnership Initiative in the framework of the World Summit on Sustainable Development

The Mediterranean is potentially one of the eco-regions in which the concept of sustainable development could be implemented, as a regional test case, due to its rapid development, the scarcity of its natural resources, the different levels of development between riparian States, and also because of certain quite spectacular developments which are very specific to the region, such as tourism development and competition for the coastal region.

The Mediterranean context

Both the Mediterranean Sea and the countries fringing it, particularly their coastal areas, face heavy pressures, most of them the result of human activities related to uncontrolled and rapid development. The resident population of the Mediterranean countries has jumped from 246 million in 1960 to 427 million in the year 2000. Urbanisation, overcrowding in coastal regions, evolution of consumption patterns, intensive agriculture, mass tourism, and unrestricted coastal area development combine to assault the natural environment –marine, terrestrial and water resources. These factors interact to cause pollution loads that endanger peoples' quality of life. Pollution hot spots are typically found in coastal areas with semi-enclosed gulfs and bays near important harbours, big cities and industrial areas. They constitute a major Mediterranean problem and a potential threat.

An important quantity of untreated wastewater and many toxic substances are discharged into the semi-enclosed Mediterranean Sea. Transport and industries cause atmospheric pollution that is damaging to human health, nature and archaeological sites. Increasing sea transportation of oil and hazardous materials poses threats of accidental pollution. The delicate Mediterranean ecosystem is disturbed in a variety of ways from the contamination of fish by industrial effluents to the destruction of the habitats of endangered species by tourism.

Through the United Nations Environment Programme / Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP), countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea and the European Union have been cooperating since 1975 to improve their common Mediterranean environment.

Over the past 27 years, UNEP/MAP has evolved in response to the improved understanding of the close relationships between environment, conservation and development. It has expanded its remit, and no longer focuses solely on Mediterranean sea pollution but also concerns itself with pollution generated on land due to the development process with integrated coastal zone planning and natural resource management as the key tools through which solutions are being sought. In the late '80s and early '90s, global developments in environmental approaches confirmed and supported MAP's widening scope, in particular, Agenda 21. MAP responded in 1994 with the presentation of Agenda MED 21, adapting Agenda 21 to the Mediterranean context and incorporating the Rio Declaration Principles in the revised Barcelona Convention (1995).

Throughout the history, the regular and intense exchanges and inter-relations between the riparian countries, which created a series of common concerns and a certain sense of Mediterranean identity, have characterized the Mediterranean. This provided a solid basis for the cooperation in the region, notably through UNEP/MAP, for the protection of the sea in the beginning and progressively for the protection of the marine and coastal environment as well as for the promotion

of sustainable development. Early enough and certainly in the '90s, the Contracting Parties have developed a real sense of ownership for their MAP, providing it with regular financial support and showing real interest in the preparation, planning, monitoring and evaluation of its programme of activities. This positive situation has then provided opportunities for substantial additional financial resources either from partners on a voluntary basis or through projects, mainly from the European Union and the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

Since the creation of MAP and mainly since the result of its activities in late '80s and early '90s, several regional programmes were established, aiming at further promoting MAP objectives through more practical projects; among these programmes the most visible ones are the Mediterranean Environment Technical Assistance Programme (METAP) and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) and its Short and Medium Term Priority Environmental Action Programme (SMAP).

The establishment of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) in 1996 demonstrated the commitment of MAP Contracting Parties to further working towards integrating environment and development in the entire region. The MCSD is composed of 36 members representing the 20 Mediterranean Countries and the European Community (EC); the NGOs (5); the Socio-Economic Actors (5) and the Local Authorities (5), the later 15 being renewed every two years to ensure a wider representation of the Civil Society and Major Groups. The preparation and endorsement in 2001 of the Strategic Review for sustainable development in the Mediterranean together with the decision to prepare a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development as a contribution to the implementation of Agenda 21, Agenda MED 21 and the follow up of the WSSD, are two other indicators of the willingness of Mediterranean Partners to protect their environment and promote sustainable development.

These commitments were clearly expressed in the Mediterranean Declaration for the Johannesburg Summit prepared by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention at their 12th conference (Monaco, 14-17 November 2001).

A quarter-century of activities has seen lot of progress and achievements, but there is still a long way to go towards a satisfactory protection of the environment and the promotion of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. To progress further towards our goals, a series of achievements are required; the present Partnership Initiative is expected to contribute to the further promotion and implementation of sustainable development in the Mediterranean Region, in conformity with the Agenda 21 and the Millennium Declaration goals.

This new partnership initiative, agreed upon by concerned parties and their partners, is a contribution to the implementation of Agenda 21, Agenda MED 21 and the follow up of WSSD and its Plan of Implementation, in particular regarding its application at Regional levels, in this case the Mediterranean Eco-Region.

Name of Partnership Initiative: Preparation of a Regional Sustainable Development Strategy for the Mediterranean: Policy and Tools

Date of initiation: September 2002

Expected date of completion:

- December 2005 for the preparation and adoption of the Strategy by concerned Partners;
- December 2010 for the implementation of specific time-bound targets (could be reviewed throughout the process).

Partners involved:

Governments: 20 Mediterranean bordering Countries, Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention.

Intergovernmental Organisations: UNEP/MAP, European Commission, as Contracting Party to the Barcelona Convention and Partner to METAP and EMP/SMAP, World Bank, UNDP and EIB as METAP Partners. Other partners would join this Initiative during the preparation and implementation of the Strategy.

Major Groups: Some 20 Organisations from the Major Groups and Civil Society will be involved in the preparation of the Strategy, most of them being already active Partners to MAP and the MCSD such as the networks of the Mediterranean NGOs (MIO-ECSDE, MEDFORUM, ENDA, Friends Of the Earth, RAED, most of them already accredited to ECOSOC), network of Local Authorities (MEDCITIES) and of Private Sector (ASCAME, ICC, etc).

Leading Partner: UNEP/MAP

Focal Point: Lucien Chabason, Coordinator of UNEP/MAP

Address: 48, Vassileos Konstantinou Ave.

GR-11635 Athens

Tel: 0030 210 7273123

Fax: 0030 210 7253196/7

E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Main objectives of the Partnership Initiative:

The main objective of this proposal is to prepare and then implement a Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development for the Mediterranean, involving all concerned actors, most of them already active partners in MAP and the MCSD; in addition to the Mediterranean Countries, this initiative will be actively supported by Mediterranean representatives of the Major Groups and Civil Society, as well as, Regional Actors such as EMP/SMAP and METAP (these Partners are expected to provide financial support for the preparation and later on the implementation of the Regional Strategy).

The preparatory process of this Regional Strategy makes appropriate use of relevant information and analysis, available at regional and national levels, notably the Strategic Review prepared recently as an assessment of activities related to Sustainable Development at national and regional levels in relation with the implementation of Agenda 21, following the Commission on Sustainable Development request in the framework of the preparatory process for the WSSD. The preparation for this Strategy will also make adequate use of the indicators and prospective analysis to be included in the Mediterranean Environment and Development Report, being elaborated by the UNEP/MAP Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre. This Regional Strategy will

focus on relevant policies and practical tools necessary for building up a coherent Strategic Programme with time bound and implementable results.

Moreover, building on its large knowledge of the environment and development inter-relations in the Region, as well as the commitments of the Mediterranean Partners, the preparatory process of the Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development will be a participatory one, involving all concerned actors, most of them being members of or partners to the MCSD; such process will then induce countries and concerned partners to prepare National / Local Sustainable Development Strategies. The Regional Strategy will also include a series of time-bound targets.

The MCSD has proved to be an interesting forum for dialogue and partnership. By promoting its visibility at the global level, the MCSD could be strengthened and its regional case as a bridge between global and national / local levels could be shared with other regions that could draw lessons and adapt similar structures to their contexts.

Expected results:

- Improved Governance for regional and national sustainable development;
- Better preparation at national and regional levels to ensure that the environment and trade policies are mutually supportive, in view of the Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade area;
- Better coordination and use of national and external investments in the Region;
- Strengthening of the MCSD through a stronger implication of concerned Major Groups;
- Exchange of experience among multi-stakeholders on sustainable development;
- Publications related to and international workshops on the Mediterranean Regional case for exchange of experience and possible replication;
- Awareness raising and capacity building in the field of sustainable development;
- Coherence between regional and national approaches for sustainable development;
- Strengthening of existing networks (MAP, METAP, SMAP, Major Groups networks) and interlinkages among them.
- Specific targets of the Partnership Initiative and timeframe for their achievements:
- To induce and assist Mediterranean Countries and partners in (to be reviewed throughout the preparatory process of the Strategy and better defined in 2005):
- Establishing National Environment and Development Observatories or similar information and decision making tool (5–8 countries by 2010);
- Establishing Cleaner Production Centres (7–10 countries by 2010);
- Preparing and implementing Local Governance through coastal management and participatory approach (5–8 countries by 2010);
- Halting the decline of biodiversity by managing specially protected areas of Mediterranean importance;
- Developing and implementing plans for integrated management of the water demand, putting special emphasis on drinking water and irrigation;
- Encouraging the establishment of National Commissions on Sustainable Development and the adoption of National Sustainable Development Strategies;
- Developing and implementing a Regional Strategic Action Plan on Tourism and Sustainable Development (by 2006);
- Preparing and implementing a Regional Information, Awareness and Public Participation Strategy (by 2006).

Coordination and Implementation mechanisms (UPDATED APRIL 2003):

All 36 MCSD members (representing Mediterranean countries: 20; European Commission and the Majors Groups: 15) are committed to this partnership as the preparation of the Regional Strategy and then the follow up of its implementation constitute a commonly agreed task for the MCSD.

Under the supervision of the Steering Committee (SC) of the MCSD, the implementation will be coordinated by the Secretariat of MAP and MCSD with the support of its members and the assistance of a team of eminent and highly qualified experts.

Following the WSSD in Johannesburg, a group of 3 experts has been appointed. The preparatory process, launched in September 2002 for the preparation of a Mediterranean Strategy starting with the elaboration of coherent framework "orientations" related to the three pillars.

In order to carefully prepare the Regional Strategy, it was decided to first define and agree on an "orientations framework" for the Strategy to be based on a limited set of key stakes and priority issues, with as far as possible some quantifiable and time-bound results; in this context, three background "thematic" studies related to the three pillars have been undertaken on "economic development and social equity", "environment and natural resources" and "governance, policy and institutional issues", all three giving due consideration to relevant contents of the WSSD Plan of Implementation and the Millenium Development Goals as well as to decisions taken by concerned partners and relevant to the Mediterranean regional context.

Progress and Further steps:

The SC, composed of four representatives of countries, and of one representing each of the private sector, the NGOs and the Local Authorities (actually the SC of the MCSD), until a more specific and appropriate SC is formed for this partnership) has reviewed a first draft for these three studies and discussed the framework orientations together with next steps; a workshop of some 50 qualified experts was then organized on 13–15 March 2003 in Barcelona, Spain, to further discuss the findings of the three studies and define the framework orientations that will be then reviewed by the members of the MCSD (representing countries and major groups) during the 8th meeting of the MCSD on 14–16 May 2003 in Cavtat, Croatia.

Interest from the IGOs (the World Bank, UNDP, EC and EIB) to contributing to this Regional Strategy has been confirmed during meetings in Brussels (December 2002), Barcelona (March 2003) and Brussels (April 2003) when progress on preparatory process was presented; more partners will be identified through the preparatory process with the objective of securing their effective participation and commitment in the elaboration and implementation of the Regional Sustainable Development Strategy.

In order to ensure active participation and contribution to the preparation and implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy by concerned Regional Actors, a more pro-active information and communication mechanism will be defined and followed so as to secure partnerships, commitments and ownership, with necessary means, once the first draft of the "Orientations" for the Regional Strategy will be finalized (end of May 2003).

Arrangements for funding:

Announced seed money for launching this Partnership Initiative has been received, so far US\$ 180,000 (from the UNEP / Mediterranean Trust Fund, Spain and Monaco); and already largely engaged / spent and once the "framework orientations" for the Regional Strategy will be agreed

upon (May 2003), the required amount of necessary funds for next steps will be assessed and a funding strategy will be defined.

Similar amounts and even more could be reasonably expected from MAP budget and from donor countries in addition to projects to be submitted to relevant funding agencies and partners.

Arrangements for capacity building and technology transfer:

Throughout the period of the project, several workshops for exchange of information, awareness raising and capacity building will be organized on specific issues such as:

- Preparation of national Sustainable Development Strategies;
- Exchange of experience on governance for sustainable development at the national and local level, with focus on participatory approach;
- Planning for sustainable development policies in relation to some critical fields: tourism, transport, energy, urban and rural development, coastal management, water and waste management.

Links of Partnership Initiative with on-going sustainable development activities at the international and / or regional:

The preparation of the Regional Sustainable Development Strategy will take into account the developments within the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, more specifically the establishment of a Free Trade Area in the Region, the Enlargement of EU, the Euro-Arab cooperation, the East-Adriatic and Arab Subregional initiatives, as well as the GWP Med Initiative on "Water and Poverty" in the Mediterranean, the Promotion of Renewable Energy in the Mediterranean Region, Mediterranean Education Initiative / MEDIES, local Agenda 21 Initiatives, and other regional Partnerships. It will benefit from the international meeting to be organized by France early 2004 as a contribution to this Regional Strategy.

Monitoring arrangements:

A set of monitoring and performance indicators will be identified and a reporting system established, to be regularly reviewed, assessed and evaluated by the MCSD and the SC and members / partners at the regular institutional meetings.

Other relevant information:

Considering the WSSD Plan of Implementation, it is important that the Commission on Sustainable Development gives adequate visibility to Partnerships and facilitates the exchange of experiences between those that address some common concerns.

In the particular case of this Partnership, it is necessary that the Commission on Sustainable Development gives more importance to regional approaches, not just through the classical UN regions but also through eco-regions such as the UNEP Regional Seas and in particular the Mediterranean Region;

Identifying, informing and inducing new potential partners to join and support some of the Partnership initiatives could also be of great support.

Website: www.unepmap.org

Leading Partner: UNEP/MAP

Contact Person: Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator of UNEP/MAP

Address: 48, Vassileos Konstantinou Ave., GR-11635 Athens

Tel: 0030 210 7273126, Fax: 0030 210 7253196/7

E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

Preparation of a Regional Sustainable Development Strategy for the Mediterranean: Policy and Tools

Summary:

The main objective of this proposal is to prepare a Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development for the Mediterranean, involving all concerned actors, most of them already active partners in MAP and the MCSD. In addition to the Mediterranean Countries, this initiative will be actively supported by Mediterranean representatives of the Major Groups and Civil Society, as well as, Regional Actors such as EMP/SMAP and METAP (these last two Partners are expected to provide substantial financial support for the preparation and later on the implementation of the Regional Strategy).

The preparatory process of this Regional Strategy will make appropriate use of relevant information and analysis, available at regional and national levels, notably the Strategic Review prepared recently as an assessment of activities related to Sustainable Development at national and regional levels in relation with the implementation of Agenda 21.

This Regional Strategy will focus on relevant policies and practical tools necessary for building up a coherent Strategic Programme with time bound and implementable results.

The expected results include the following:

- Better preparation at national and regional levels to ensure that the environment and trade policies are mutually supportive, in view of the Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade area;
- Better coordination and use of national and external investments in the Region;
- Strengthening of the MCSD through a stronger implication of concerned Major Groups;
- Exchange of experience among multi-stakeholders on sustainable development;
- Publications related to and international workshops on the Mediterranean Regional case for exchange of experience and possible replication;
- Awareness raising and capacity building in the field of sustainable development;
- Coherence between regional and national approached for sustainable development; and
- Strengthening of existing networks (MAP, METAP, SMAP, Major Groups networks) and inter-linkages among them.

Leading Partner: UNEP/MAP

Contact Person: Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator of UNEP/MAP

Address: 48, Vassileos Konstantinou Ave., GR-11635 Athens

Tel: 0030 210 7273126, Fax: 0030 210 7253196/7

E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr, Website: www.unepmap.org

Dates:

- September 2002 – December 2005 for the preparation and adoption of the Strategy by concerned partners;
- December 2010 for the implementation of specific time-bound targets.

Links: Capacity-Building, technology transfer.

ANNEX V

**REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE FOR
THE ASSESSMENT AND PROSPECTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

April 2003

CONTENTS

A. Introduction	1
B. Major mandate of the task force	1
C. The MCSD within the context of the post WSSD era	1
D. Proposals for the way forward	3
Scope	3
Areas of intervention	3
Stakeholders/ILinks	3
Follow- up and monitoring	4
Composition/ involvement of actors	5
Intersessional coordination	6
Action programme	7
Guidance/ Steering	8
Better participation of major groups	8
National counterpart action	8
Issues already tackled	8
Post- recommendations process	8
Thematic working groups	9
Outside experts	9
Meetings	10
Funding means	10
Partnerships	11
Improvement of institutional arrangements	11
Cooperation/ coordination	13
Mediterranean Interagency Platform on Sustainable Development	13
Visibility/ communication	15
E. Interrelationship of the proposals with the current set-up	15
Co-ordinating Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MEDU)	16
Regional Activity Centres	17
G. Conclusion	18
F. Next step	18
Appendices	
I. Mediterranean priority issues emerging out of global or regional processes	19
II. Proposed indicative MCSD's future work programme	23
III. Mediterranean- related partnerships for sustainable development	27
IV. Guiding principles for partnerships for sustainable development	28
V. Strengthening the MCSD through the establishment of a dedicated, full-time, fully-functioning secretariat)	30
VI. Regional bodies active in the Mediterranean in the field of sustainable development	33
Summary: Most essential elements from the Task Force report on the MCSD Assessment and Prospects, adopted by the MCSD	

ANNEX V

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE¹ ON THE ASSESSMENT AND PROSPECTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

Over the last few years, issues relating to the activities of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) (e.g., method of work; quality and usefulness of the results; implementation and follow up of the recommendations; membership and participation; etc.), have been raised and discussed on several occasions, either at MCSD meetings, or at meetings of the Contracting Parties (CPs).

MAJOR MANDATE OF THE TASK FORCE

The main outcome of the above was a report on the MCSD Assessment and Prospects debated during the 7th Meeting of the Commission, in Antalya, leading to an in-depth assessment of the MCSD activities and explaining/ justifying the need for improvement, changes, and additional means, for which appropriate recommendations were made by the Commission.

Based on the above, as well as on several decisions from the parallel process on the follow up of recommendations and a contribution from the main groups within the MCSD, a decision was also taken in Antalya for the establishment of the present Task Force, to examine ways in which the MCSD could be further strengthened and its action refocused in the post-Johannesburg era.

The Task Force met twice in Barcelona, in October 15, 2002 and April 3-4, 2003. Drawing heavily from the above debate as well as from comments by the MCSD Steering Committee meeting in Calvia, of 21-22 November 2002, the Task Force submits the present report for consideration and endorsement by the 8th MCSD meeting, with the goal of subsequently submitting it for approval at the 13th meeting of the Contracting Parties.

The report is guided by the broader concerns arising out of the Antalya recommendations, calling for-

- improved effectiveness
- improved performance
- greater resources
- more cooperation between partners
- more effective participation
- more strategic proposals
- identifying measures for implementing recommendations

¹ MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE: Victor Escobar, Co-chair (Spain), Nicos Georgiades (Cyprus), Magdi Ibrahim (ENDA Maghreb), Aldo Iacomelli, Co-chair (Italy), Patrick Van Klaveren (Monaco), Joan Parpal Marfà (MedCités), Khalil Attia (Tunisia), Nouri Soussi (Tunisia), Adrian Vecino Varela (Spain), Guzin Arat (Turkey)-SECRETARIAT: Arab Hoballah (UNEP/MAP), Guillaume Benoit (BP/RAC), Ivica Trumbic (PAP/RAC), Victor Macia and Esther Monfa (CP/RAC)

THE MCSD WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE POST WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WSSD) ERA

The MCSD is a regional forum for dialogue and a framework for defining a regional direction and perspective. Its composition, pluralism and participatory approach give to the Commission a distinctive character as a reference in the region, promoting sustainable development issues. However, it has so far not been adequately utilized by many fora and partners operating in the Mediterranean in the broad field of sustainable development, partly due to the 'confinement' of the Commission within the MAP structure.

The above has to change, as the MCSD remains more relevant than ever in the post WSSD era. All three major outcomes of WSSD (Political declaration, Plan of implementation, Partnerships initiatives), are a testimony to the wisdom of establishing the Commission, 8 years ago.

The broader commitment of the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development refers to the global *collective responsibility* to advance and strengthen the interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development at local, national, regional and global levels.

From the four overarching objectives of the Declaration (*poverty eradication, changing consumption and production patterns, protecting and managing the natural resource base, addressing globalization*) the MCSD has so far tackled issues relating to the two, but all four are at the forefront of the concerns of Mediterranean civil society.

The Declaration also calls for a real *commitment to sustainable development* and for the necessity for *stronger regional groupings and alliances* characterized by broad-based participation and stable partnerships, 'Making it all Happen' through an inclusive process, *involving all the major groups and governments*.

If a close look is taken at the Plan of Implementation, the relevancy of the MCSD becomes apparent, together, however, with the necessity to re-orient its vision towards the other pillars of sustainable development (economic and social development) as well, when preparing and adopting its new programme of action, as proposed later on. The following pertinent issues are highlighted, as they relate to or should relate to the Mediterranean and MAP's and MCSD's work-

- *poverty eradication* (e.g. national programmes for sustainable development)
- *changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production* (e.g. 10-year framework of programmes in support of regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production; substantially increase the global share of renewable energy sources)
- *protecting and managing the natural resource base* (e.g. integrated water resources management; ecosystem approach; sustainable fisheries management; integrated coastal and ocean management; protection of marine and coastal areas; prevention and combating desertification; sustainable tourism development)
- *sustainable development in a globalizing world* (e.g. strengthen regional trade and cooperation agreements)
- *sustainable development of small island developing states* (e.g. managing coastal areas; vulnerability indices)
- *sustainable development for Africa* (e.g. financial and technical support for Africa's efforts to implement the Convention to Combat Desertification at the national level)
- *means of implementation* (supportiveness between the multilateral trading system and multilateral environmental agreements; science-based decision-making and reaffirming the precautionary approach; education for sustainable development)

- *institutional framework for sustainable development* (strengthen the institutional framework for sustainable development at the international level; strengthen cooperation among UNEP and other United Nations bodies and specialized agencies; actively pursue at the regional and sub-regional levels the implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the Summit through a balanced integration of the dimensions of sustainable development into the work of regional, sub-regional and other bodies; mobilization of technical and financial assistance; provision of adequate financing for the implementation of regionally and sub-regionally agreed sustainable development programmes and projects)

Finally, the hundreds of *Initiatives* for partnerships in the major priority sectors of water and sanitation; energy (efficiency, renewables, subsidies); health (chemicals, air pollution); agriculture (desertification); and biological diversity (forests, protected areas); as well as in the cross-cutting issues (access to markets, consumption/production, corporate responsibility), allow for new opportunities, not only for the MCSD, but for the CPs, MAP and its bodies as well.

PROPOSALS FOR THE WAY FORWARD

In order to assist the MCSD become more relevant and effective in the post- WSSD era, the Task Force invites the members of the MCSD to adopt the following, which should guide the Commission at least during the first decade of the Millennium.

Mandate after Johannesburg

The MCSD should remain within MAP. Owing, however, to its function, mandate and composition, the MCSD is not, should not, be considered as just a representative of the MAP CPs. It is a body aimed to serve all partners in the sustainable development process in the Mediterranean, including other intergovernmental organizations. Thus, the renewed scope of the Commission should aim to promote this wider role and ensure that other partners,

- are convinced about the Commission's credibility
- do feel that the Commission can assist them in fulfilling their mandates
- be assured that they will have "ownership" of the Commission

The MCSD should not be seen as simply an advisory body but rather as a think tank/ high level policy forum for identifying, evaluating and examining major environmental, economic and social issues in the region, reflecting on them, exchanging views and providing multidimensional advice on strategic issues, the ultimate goal being to secure the integration desired so much. .

Areas of intervention

The Commission should concentrate on the following issues, as they relate to the Mediterranean priorities:

- integrating environmental concerns into the social and economic aspects of development
- operationalizing and defining the process of sustainable development
- providing sensitization, guidance and leadership into concrete aspects of sustainable development, particularly in 'localizing' regional approaches and proposals

Stakeholders/Links

The advise of the MCSD should be addressed to and reach wider sectors in international and regional agencies and national governments, as well as all the bodies within MAP, regional institutions of civil society and the public- at- large.

The Commission would act upon direct request from all institutions of MAP as well as international and regional agencies, and take initiatives to attract the attention of any of the above bodies to the necessity and usefulness of consulting the Commission on any relevant matter.

Follow- up and monitoring

Concerns on the real lack of follow-up and implementation of the Commission's findings and recommendations were taken up in a parallel process and have led to a series of recommendations already approved by the CPs, which need to be rigorously pursued.

Follow up in the sense of taking up and implementing the Commission's recommendations is not the responsibility of the MCSD. Responsibility to deliver, that is to implement, should be the concern of all actors and institutions involved. Certainly, governments would have the major implementation responsibility, but the responsibilities of civil society are equally important.

Follow-up responsibility should mainly be entrusted to MEDU, which should be empowered, utilizing the services of the Commission's Secretariat², to pursue the following:

- integrate into the MAP's programme the recommendations already approved by the CPs in Monaco, for improving communications, preparing national plans, promoting twinning projects and using other instruments and means of implementation
- take initiatives and utilize its existing channels for disseminating and providing information on the MCSD activities; pursue voluntary or bilateral agreements for the implementation of proposals; pursue pilot activities
- define the actual steps and measures that the CPs should take so as to improve communication and dissemination of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action to concerned actors in national and local public and private sectors as well as major groups from society
- advice on the content of the national plans that either need to be prepared for the implementation and follow up of the recommendations or for their integration in national Sustainable Development Strategies
- prepare specific guidelines for implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations for each of the MCSD thematic sets, including where possible and appropriate, human, technical and financial requirements
- assist the CPs and partners in disseminating the information to concerned actors at all levels within and beyond states and implementing the MCSD recommendations

Major Groups should also commit to undertake to disseminate results and act to ensure follow up and be assisted to prepare brochures for dissemination of information at national and regional levels.

MAP NFPs and MCSD state members should undertake the joint responsibility, in consultation and co-ordination, to disseminate information nationally, inform accordingly and act on implementation and generally be obliged to take initiatives for implementation and follow up, nationally. In particular, every effort needs to be made to draw in the process Ministries beyond those of the environment, especially those with responsibilities on sustainable development issues.

The Commission needs to periodically devote time to be briefed upon and review and assess how things develop, but it should not be burdened with the requirement for actually directly monitoring

² Throughout the text, the term 'MCSD Secretariat' is freely used, denoting either current secretariat arrangements or future ones, as proposed in the report.

the progress made with regards to its recommendations. In order for the MCSD to be enabled to fulfil this function, the following could be adopted:

- the MCSD Secretariat to request short reports from governments and the other actors on progress made
- the MCSD Secretariat to prepare a common reporting format, not only on issues arising directly from the terms of the Convention and its Protocols, but on other issues arising from resolutions and recommendations adopted as well, unifying reporting of the legal with the non-legal components of the MAP
- the Secretariat to assess the implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations every 3-5 years and report to the meetings of the MCSD and the CPs
- selected Working or ad-hoc Groups could be allowed to reconvene from time to time in order to assess the results from the periodic monitoring of the implementation of recommendations

Composition/ involvement of actors

The Commission's composition is its main strength, and any changes should maintain its open, autonomous, advisory and representative nature, with members that are informed experts from various sectors and civil society in general.

The MCSD should continue to consist of 36 members, 21 for the Contracting Parties and 15 seats allocated for the non- governmental sector, but introducing flexibility in their allocation. The general goal could be to allocate 5 seats each to local/regional authorities, industry/business, environmental protection/ consumer associations. The balance could shift, however, depending on the interest exhibited and the suitability of those proposed. At any one time, there should not be more than 6 or less than 2 persons from any of the above sectors.

A maximum of 3 additional seats could be allocated to intergovernmental organizations and/or broadly accepted professionals coming from any sector, governmental or not, the academia or professional associations. The Secretariat could, in addition, be empowered to invite, to each session and as ad hoc members, 2-3 persons having special competence in a matter included on the agenda of a meeting.

Although the informal nature of the Commission and the wide range of representation do not allow the adoption of specific criteria for the selection or the appointment of members, the following relevant guidelines should at least be followed:

- members should participate on their personal capacity as experts and not serve as representatives of any institution, although it cannot be overlooked that they would be nominated by institutions for state members, in particular it would be difficult to wear two hats
- state members in the MCSD meetings should be high caliber personalities coming from sectors such as environment, sustainable development, land use planning, economic and social development, either ministries, departments, agencies or commissions or equivalent structures; they should be prepared to serve as impartial experts not promoting government lines, and be committed to the goals of sustainable development and the work of the MCSD
- membership from environmental and development NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors should continue, but the basis of selection needs to be broadened (e.g. trade unions, federations of professionals, consumers groups, women, youth, etc.)
- members proposed by non- governmental partners should accept that they have a responsibility to consult with their peers on any particular issue

- proposals for membership should not relate to agencies or organizations, but to personalities well known in their respective fields, taking into consideration their ability and time to participate effectively
- every effort should be made to attract members from major networks of industry or large chambers of commerce
- all members need to bring with them particular competence in the field of the environment and sustainable development
- all members should undertake to widely consult nationally on an issue and be required to broadly disseminate decisions; this is particularly important for state members coming from those Ministries of the Environment that have a rather limited mandate: they would have to make every effort to draw into the process other Ministries as well, particularly in those important issues dealt with by the MCSD that are not within a specific member's sphere of competence

A simple, preferably not repetitive, procedure for the renewal of members has to be agreed upon, e.g. adoption of a 3 year term of service of non- governmental members, with the option for renewal in exceptional cases justified only by the work programme of the Commission.

Candidatures or proposals for candidates from the non- governmental sector should be submitted directly to MEDU but MAP NFPs and MCSD state members should be kept informed and have the right to express opinion on their nationals.

Groups should have full independence to propose members through their federations and networks.

Former members of MCSD should be associated selectively in information exchange, consultations and voluntary work.

The MCSD Secretariat as well as any other MAP NFP, MCSD member or member of the Interagency Platform (see below) could identify relevant candidates.

MEDU should take account of the proposals as assessed by the secretariat, include in the list its own candidates, seek the advice of the serving intersessional committee, take the final decision, and inform all MAP and other Mediterranean bodies accordingly.

Intersessional coordination

The practice that the host country of the next meeting and the President of the CPs should be represented in the MCSD's Steering Committee (or the proposed interim committee hereunder) is not actually necessary and should be discontinued.

Considering the Commission's method of work, the current multi-member Steering Committee does not appear to be necessary. On the other hand, not all intersessional issues can be left to the Commission's Secretariat.

An interim, 3-member committee, comprised of the Chair and the 2 Vice-Chairs of a concluding Session, could hold office for the intersessional period, to decide, liaise with, and advise the Secretariat on important issues that might arise, such as the following:

- situations for which the UNEP/MAP/MCSD rules do not provide guidance
- issues referred to the CPs, for which the Secretariat has to prepare documents not approved by the MCSD
- requests for advice referred to the secretariat by a working group
- advice to MEDU on the final selection of MCSD members
- draft agenda for a meeting based upon a proposal prepared by the Secretariat
- consulting relevant working group chairmen concerning progress on intersessional work; particular difficulties encountered and possible means to resolve them
- (if necessary) through the Chair, attend, and report to, the meeting of the CPs, on issues relating to factual reports; difficulties encountered together with any proposals on the means to resolve them; highlighting any aspects of a long-term work plan where co-ordination is required; reporting progress on intersessional work
- the convening of an extraordinary meeting of the Commission

Action programme

The Commission should adopt a Programme of work for the period 2005-2015. This Programme should be based on the WSSD Plan of Implementation, the outcome of the Athens Euro-Mediterranean Ministers Conference for the Environment (July 2002), the evolving Mediterranean Strategy on Sustainable Development and other initiatives, as they relate to the Mediterranean situation. The priorities adopted during these initiatives are summarized in Appendix I, to help decide on the priorities to be tackled.

The Programme will provide vision and perspective to the MCSD and thus overcome the problem of constantly shifting directions, emphasis and approaches, in response to ad-hoc initiatives of some of its members.

The Programme should be adopted during the 2004 session of the Commission, after it is developed by MEDU, in consultation with NFPs, the RACs and other actors in the Mediterranean. Apart from the sectoral priority issues (Appendix I), the following cross-cutting ones could be targeted:

- integration of the environment in sectoral policies
- operationalization of the principles of joint responsibility, precaution, prudent avoidance
- enhancement of public participation in decision-making

The following broader concepts could guide the process for the Programme's formulation:

- all MAP sectors, including the mainstream ones such as those on pollution and protected areas, should reconsider their mandates and activities, so as to help steer MAP's activities towards the broader aspects of sustainable development
- topics for consideration that are too broad and conceptual and necessitate the carrying out of costly and lengthy comparative studies or of original research, should be avoided
- issues should be selected in accordance with their significance
- issues already tackled could be reconsidered, either to complete assessment or to draw up new proposals in the light of contemporary concerns
- the Programme should incorporate timetables, cost estimates and indication of sources of financing
- issues should be regional in extent, but also of widespread local concerns
- coordination with the CSD issues needs to be secured, in those issues where the two processes are relevant

Further general guidelines about the Programme are submitted for consideration in Appendix II.

Until the Programme's adoption, the MCSD, during its 2003 meeting, should take interim decisions on its activities during 2003- 2004.

Guidance/ Steering

The MAP Coordinator should assume the responsibility to keep the whole process within the policy and strategic aspects of the issues and steer it away from any tendencies towards technical and downstream aspects. When necessary, he/she would seek the assistance of the intersessional committee.

Better participation of major groups

The reasons that restrict the effective and active participation of local authorities and socio-economic actors need to be identified, most possibly by an appropriate questionnaire to be filled by current and former members. The weaknesses thus identified should then be rectified, so as to allow all groups take advantage of, and contribute to, the opportunities and challenges offered by the setting up of the MCSD.

Members should be encouraged to address issues rather informally so that the distinction between members of the various groups becomes more blurred. This could be done, for example, by simplifying procedures, delegating to non-state members a more substantive role in contributing, encouraging them to make their participation visible, etc.

National counterpart action

Links of MCSD and the MAP structure with national commissions for sustainable development should be strengthened.

Pressure needs to be constantly exercised upon members (not just states, but local authorities and major socio- economic actors as well), for the preparation of appropriate sustainable development strategies.

Regional and thematic workshops to raise national awareness should be organized.

National state members could be assisted to organize national awareness- raising seminars.

Issues already tackled

The recommendations already made and adopted could be taken up with a view to their adaptation and operationalization to sub-regional and/or national/local circumstances through the MAP structure.

Post- recommendations process

The conclusions, suggestions and recommendations of the MCSD should not be restricted to a mere formal approval by the CPs, which have the major responsibility to deliver.

Not all proposals will have to be addressed to or be endorsed by the CPs, anyway.

The MCSD needs to identify the specific bodies to which its recommendations are being addressed.

All members of the MCSD proposed by major groups should undertake to disseminate the recommendations and proposals to the groups that proposed them.

Recommendations of the MCSD should not be submitted for approval at meetings of MAP NFPs, but only for information and follow up purposes.

The MCSD Secretariat and other MAP bodies, through external resources if necessary, should elaborate on the strategic recommendations, making them more explicit and strengthening them with detailed guidelines.

The outcome of the work of the MCSD should take the form of manuals, guidelines, other publications, seminars, forums, etc., dedicated to the Mediterranean region as a whole, groups of countries or to specific problems of individual countries, providing concrete advice (e.g. specific means, technologies, institutional arrangements) for solving problems. These texts will not be prepared by the MCSD, but the resources of MEDU, including the MCSD Secretariat, the RACs, the CPs, and the other actors should be utilized instead.

Thematic working groups

The practice of setting up thematic Working Groups with Task Managers and Support Centres to deal with each selected theme should be maintained, but it does not, by necessity, have to be followed in all cases. Enough flexibility should be maintained for adapting approaches.

Each major group will have a task manager/coordinator and a rapporteur, and be facilitated by one RAC or another intergovernmental or other resource agency, which would also provide the necessary scientific support to the group.

The Working Groups will be allowed to follow various paths, depending on the issue, the personalities of their leaders, their commitment, the support they receive from concerned MAP components or other agencies, as well as the funds available.

In order to secure more sense of ownership of the results by the group members and the MCSD, planning and actual work should not rely extensively on the RACs, the task manager, or an outside expert. Full participation and contribution should be secured from the beginning for all members of a group.

The activities of the Working Groups should not be prolonged for more than it is necessary (12- 18 months).

A new approach that could be followed is that of utilizing a more structured system characterized by the following elements:

- standing Working Groups could be established composed only from among the MCSD's members and focusing on broader issues to be agreed upon
- ad-hoc groups could be established in cases where there is no luxury for spending a lot of time on an issue or for going ahead with a full analysis, when an issue is not covered by a Standing group
- activities of the ad hoc Working Groups will be considered as completed with the adoption of the proposed recommendations
- the Standing Working Groups would deal with major issues of concern of particular significance to the Mediterranean that need constant attention; such issues could be broader cross-cutting ones, in order to secure focusing and involvement of members, provide opportunity for more consistent follow up efforts, and enable quick response to requests for

action; the Groups would also be able to deal with any subject associated with the major issue of their concern

Outside experts

External experts should not be heavily involved in the Commission's work.

New players such as international organizations or leading Mediterranean experts on questions where MAP does not have the requisite expertise should be brought in.

Other Centres outside MAP are also operating in the Mediterranean on MAP-related issues and they should be appropriately involved.

MEDU, including the dedicated MCSD Secretariat and the RACs, as well as other partners in the Mediterranean should also identify leading experts on the topic under consideration.

Meetings

The plenaries should be run as brainstorming and interactive sessions between experts, who are there to contribute, with free exchange of ideas, comments and suggestions.

In the reports of the meetings, specific reference should be made to the members intervening and contributing to the discussion. The debate should take the form of a structured dialogue between the members, not aimed to reach consensus, but rather to identify the most widely accepted concerns, issues or suggestions.

For every issue, one member, preferably a group rapporteur or a concerned professional from within MAP, should undertake to present basic talking points in order to initiate discussion.

Rapporteurs of groups would present their evaluations as working papers for consideration.

The holding of break- out sessions during the MCSD meetings (not in parallel with plenary sessions), should be pursued with more determination, so as to provide the plenary with results on issues thoroughly discussed.

The Commission should hold ordinary meetings once every year. Meetings should not last for more than three days. Issues to be debated at any one time should be restricted. Discussion texts should be distributed 2 months in advance.

The practice of holding meetings in various countries should be maintained, but proposals to host such meetings should be accompanied by a real commitment from the host country to make every effort to secure visibility of the MCSD and its meeting, highlight what has been achieved in the country through the implementation of MCSD recommendations, and support the meeting with a substantial financial contribution.

In the absence of feasible alternatives as above, meetings should be held in Athens, to be better served by MEDU's resources, or where the Commission's Secretariat would operate, if this eventuality becomes reality.

Funding means

In the post- Johannesburg era and taking advantage of the outcome of the Athens Ministerial Conference, it is advisable for the MEDU to undertake a concerted effort to identify sources, ways

and means to secure more stable and dedicated financing for the functioning of the MCSD and its supporting centres.

In the MAP's Budget, there should be a separate budget line for the Commission, including all the activities of MEDU and the RAC's wholly or partly related to the Commission's work and to sustainable development.

Priorities under the Convention and MAP need to be reconsidered, in light of the outcome of the WSSD and of the final orientations of the new Strategy for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean and funds allocated to MCSD-related and sustainable development activities need to be increased appropriately.

RAC support centres, in close co-operation with the MCSD Secretariat and task managers, are expected to look for the necessary additional human and financial resources and expertise for the MCSD activities they support.

For implementing the recommendations approved, MEDU, the MCSD Secretariat and the RACs should be encouraged to secure funds from other sources as well.

All the above do also point out to the necessity for the development of a fund-raising strategy (both from within as well as from outside MAP), as an indispensable ingredient of the other strategies developed under MAP auspices. MEDU should thus be mandated appropriately.

Partnerships

The MCSD is in a particular position to consolidate in the Mediterranean the regional dimension of Johannesburg.

Every effort needs to be exerted to establish connections with those commitments and implementation initiatives announced in Johannesburg or later which are of special interest to the Mediterranean or for which work already done and expertise accumulated presents the partners with a value added through the participation of Mediterranean institutions as well. An indicative list of such, Type II Initiatives, is provided in Appendix III.

The Commission should also strongly encourage its members to develop additional initiatives to promote the development of partnerships between Mediterranean countries and actors, enhance regional co-operation, rationalize inter-governmental decision-making capacity and strengthen sub-regional cooperation on issues of common concern. To this respect, the process could be guided by the so-called 'Bali criteria' for the WSSD Partnerships (Appendix IV).

Improvement of institutional arrangements

A no action policy on the institutional issues is not an alternative open to the Commission and the CPs, as this issues may undermine the whole structure. The business-as-usual scenario cannot be sustainable within the new framework proposed, as present MAP and mainly MEDU means in staff and funds will not be able to even maintain the existing level of the MCSD activities.

The MCSD Secretariat and the RACs that support it through the undertaking of sustainable development related activities need to be enhanced if the Commission is to rise up to the challenges of the times, and deliver on expectations.

A sequential, evolutionary, 2 or 3-stage process of strengthening the institutional set-up is proposed, in order to considerably improve the situation:

First stage: one new professional with necessary support to be appointed, as soon as practicable (2004), in MEDU for full time MCSD secretariat support, requiring an increase of about 100.000 € of MAP/ MEDU budget. This would somehow ease the burden on the existing resources, and partly ameliorate weaknesses in regional cooperation, visibility and communication, strategic and policy issues, etc.

Second stage: MEDU, will continue to provide the secretariat to the MCSD and its associated bodies, through a more dedicated, identifiable, unit. Under the guidance of the Co-ordinator, it would manage the whole process, coordinate activities, look for satisfactory results and proposals, follow up the implementation of the recommendations, induce concerned members through specific projects, promote visibility of the MCSD and get more active partners in addition to the necessary fund- raising activity. Those support centres primarily involved in sustainable development activities would also be supported.

It is estimated that an increase of staff will be required, to be completed between 2005- 2006. Not less than 4 professionals (2 for the MCSD Secretariat, to be covered by MAP budget and 2-3 to be seconded to MCSD Secretariat and support centres by countries/partners), with necessary support and relevant operational budget, would definitely improve the efficiency of the institutional set up, allow for effective implementation of the Commission's remit and overcome most of the present weaknesses. This would require an increase of appr. 250.000€ of MAP/MEDU budget, keeping in mind that the seconded experts would be hosted by concerned support centres (RACs) and MEDU. In this case, the risk for conflicts between the secretariat servicing the MCSD and the mainstream MAP activities would mainly be in the nature of differences in their respective priorities, method of work and type of results pursued. It will be the Co-ordinator's job to ensure that such concerns do not materialize.

Third stage: The feasibility of establishing, by 2007, within the MAP system, a full-fledged MCSD Secretariat, could be further explored, including the ascertaining of any interest by potential host country/ municipality/funding partners.

It is provisionally estimated that this Secretariat would require a budget of about 1.000.000 € per year.

This Secretariat will have its own means while giving due consideration to relevant MEDU responsibilities as defined in MAP II. It would be solely devoted to the MCSD and sustainable development and, even though within the MAP framework, it would be for the whole Mediterranean, including for the proposed Interagency Platform. Thus, it would require an international/UN status to be eventually more able to attract other partners; it would also require some autonomy of action so as to have more open discussions, bringing in high-level, eminent, qualified experts for relevant strategic and policy issues.

The Secretariat could be physically located either in MEDU, in Athens, or elsewhere, if a country and/ or municipality accept to host it and cover for at least 1/4 of its costs together with a clear partnership with the European Commission (that would accept to pay for 1/4 also).

The MCSD Secretariat, would deal with coordination issues, catalyzing between partners and groups, increasing awareness, accompanying countries on Sustainable Development Strategic and Policy issues, looking for rationalizing regional cooperation, raising funds, providing a framework for the activities, following the regional SD Strategy, etc.

The MCSD would continue to draw upon MEDU and its RACs, utilizing guidance, advice, support and follow up initiatives.

The Secretariat would bring about improved organizational effectiveness and productivity and increased quality of work and it is also expected to assist the supporting RACs, by improving coordination, looking for additional means, securing active partnerships, etc.

The mandate, tasks, management structure/ mechanism and budget breakdown for an eventual fully developed MCSD Secretariat are further considered in Appendix V.

Co- operation/ coordination

Representatives from the RACs should take part in the meetings of the MCSD and the groups, when their contribution is required, in consultation with MEDU/MCSD Secretariat.

A closer exchange of views and experiences should be secured with UNCSD and other bodies on sustainable development operating at national or international level. As a first step contacts should aim to ascertain what kept some of them away from the process.

The MCSD Secretariat could take initiatives to improve co-operation with international financial institutions, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund or regional banks, such as the European Investment Bank.

The relationships of the MCSD with MAP NFPs need to be closely looked at for improvement, especially by MEDU/MCSD Secretariat. Better interaction, joint meetings, more outreach efforts, will contribute to removing the present skepticism and antagonism felt, particularly with regards to certain initiatives.

MEDU should encourage CPs to take up the potentials of the MCSD to their full extent.

Mediterranean Interagency Platform on Sustainable Development

The MCSD is not a regional United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development. However, it should continue aiming to establish better working relations with the latter, becoming more pressing and demanding on UNCSD and UNEP, with the support of the Permanent Representations of the CPs to these bodies.

The work of the Commission could greatly facilitate the work of the other bodies operating in the Mediterranean and, in accordance with the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, assist them to strengthen their contribution to sustainable development and help them meet the need for a coherent approach to the consideration of regional environmental change.

Moreover, cooperation between the multifarious United Nations agencies in their programmes and activities is still at a low ebb, leading to duplication and increased running costs. It is no easy task to assess their work in the Mediterranean, given that the programmes are specific to each of the countries in the region, and that the projects hail from various specialised agencies, without there being any built-in coordination between them.

Therefore, as far as interaction with other intergovernmental organizations active in the Region is concerned, the issue should now be approached within the context of the overall concern for improving global environmental governance, as evidenced by UNEP's Cartagena agreement on governance and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.

Regarding the Cartagena decision on Governance, it is pointed out that UNEP attempted to do through this global environmental governance issue by Governing Council Decision_SS.VII/1 of 15.2.2002, which adopted the report on International Environmental Governance, covering, inter alia, proposals for improved coherence in international environmental policy-making, improved

coordination among and effectiveness of multilateral environmental agreements, and enhanced coordination across the United Nations system.

Para. 134 of the WSSD Plan of Implementation 'Request the Secretary-General of the United Nations, utilizing the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, including through informal collaborative efforts, to further promote system-wide inter-agency cooperation and coordination on sustainable development.....' Other relevant paras. of the same text are: 66 (welcomes regional and subregional forums to promote sustainable development and calls for their further development); 120 (calls for strengthening of international bodies and organizations dealing with sustainable development); 141 (provides for implementationat the regional and subregional levels, throughother regional and subregional institutions and bodies); etc.

Fully in line with the above developments and taking under consideration the preparation and further establishment of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, it is proposed to pursue the establishment of a Mediterranean Interagency Platform on Sustainable Development, to provide a clear mechanism and a forum to encourage agencies involved in sustainable development to work together and promote greater coherence, co-ordination, interaction and integration of policies, programmes, plans and projects at the regional level.

MEDU is thus strongly advised to act as a catalyst and renew initiatives for the establishment of an informal Interagency Platform in the Mediterranean in consultation with the regional offices of agencies active in the region on sustainable development issues, a non-exhaustive list of which is attached as Appendix VI.

To this respect, any successful initiatives by MEDU and RACs to draw in other partners should be very closely drawn upon in order to be replicated.

The Platform could be established based on the model of the IACSD, which was a direct result of Agenda 21, but avoiding the main factor that led to its replacement, which was the opposition from those that took a negative attitude to it making suggestions about the work they should be engaged in, or in analysing and monitoring their effectiveness.

For coordination it would rely more on informal and flexible mechanisms rather than formal subsidiary bodies.

Over time and building on the confidence gradually secured, the Platform could jointly with MAP oversee the MCSD and its Secretariat, utilizing the former's comparative advantages in the respective fields of concern of each participating partner and the latter as a facilitator. The MCSD could thus also focus its work on the cross-sectoral aspects of specific sectoral issues.

The *modus operandi* of the platform would naturally have to be worked out in consultations between the bodies concerned. With regards to its objectives, they could partly be drawn from paras. 129 and 130 of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, that is, to-

- promote inter- agency coordination
- increase effectiveness and efficiency through limiting overlap and duplication of activities
- exchange information on progress and promote further implementation of sustainable development
- serve as a focal point for the discussion of partnerships that promote sustainable development
- identify points of leverage for key issues within the WEHAB themes and new and emerging issues, especially on social and economic issues
- provide a forum for analysis and exchange of experience on measures that assist sustainable development planning, decision-making and the implementation of sustainable development strategies

- keep under periodic review environmental and sustainable issues in the Mediterranean, in order to ensure that emerging environmental problems of wide international significance received appropriate and adequate considerations
- advice on MCSD membership
- select Working Groups to facilitate their work
- promote complementarity among the work programmes of the various agencies that deal with specific aspects of sustainable development
- secure synergies between programmes and processes and better integration of policies, time frames, emphasis, priorities and objectives
- interface with the Euro-Med partnership
- identify new and emerging issues
- identify overall policy issues, major gaps and constraints affecting sustainable development in the Mediterranean

Whatever action is pursued, however, such intergovernmental partners should be convinced that they will be equal players in the process and that they would be associated with a system which is characterized by credibility. Such a credibility can only be secured by the Commission's actual output.

Irrespective of the fate of the above suggestion, representatives of the various agencies to MCSD meetings should be invited as a rule and on the basis of the relevance of the issues under consideration to their interests and activities and even be extended to meetings of Working Groups, depending on the issues tackled in any one meeting and their sphere of competence or expertise. Right of attendance should be expanded to equality of interaction as stakeholders, right of substantial contribution and active intervention at any time during the debate.

Visibility/ communication

Placing of information on the MCSD's activities on national web sites and the preparation of national brochures should be a priority activity.

Regional thematic forums should be organized, followed by further activities within countries.

The exchange of experience with other similar initiatives in other regions, particularly sub-regional ones, should be pursued.

The secretariat should provide assistance in disseminating information to NFPs.

The potentials offered by current manpower resources and relevant arrangements within MEDU should be fully utilized, with outside professional advice if necessary, in order to promote a programme to give greater visibility not only to the MCSD but to MAP itself, which still remains relatively not well known by national administrations and civil society.

The MCSD Secretariat should act for, results dissemination, monitoring the progress of action undertaken, encouraging all actors to engage in the process, fostering the flow of information, launching an MCSD awareness campaign and encouraging CPs to adopt national environmental framework programmes

The above should form part of a structured communications strategy and MEDU should be mandated to further pursue such an activity.

E. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF THE PROPOSALS WITH THE CURRENT SET-UP

All attempts towards organizational development and change potentially contain the seeds of discontent and cause concerns that they will upset established systems which are composed of interrelated and interdependent subsystems in dynamic interactions.

The proposals in this text could not be an exception to the above rule. Similar attempts within the UN system have steered controversies. Some of them have also been 'killed' by the reactions. Resistance to change is after all one of the main factors in causing bottlenecks to attempts for organizational renewal, as change causes perceived threats, leading to implicit defensive behaviours.

In this particular case, there is no explicit reason to suggest that such concerns will ultimately prove to be of substance. The MCSD has been in place for only a short time as institutional structures go and there has not been enough time for 'clientelle' relationships to be established and entrenched. Also, the proposals start from where the system is, and are aimed to bring about change which has been specifically requested by the people involved, a change pursued through a fully participatory and transparent process.

The consideration of the interrelationships of this report's proposals with the existing system is therefore approached within the above context.

Co-ordinating Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MEDU)

The MAP Co-ordinating Unit (MEDU) is based on the Regional Activity Centres and any enhanced arrangements for the MCSD's Secretariat, would definitely strengthen MEDU's role, whereas the Secretariat, as it would mostly be characterized by similar institutional/ organizational connections/links with the MEDU as the RACs, will not necessarily require substantial changes, neither will it cause any significant upsets.

However, consistent international and national experiences with such attempts have in many cases backfired, as they have led to empire-building tendencies by the new actors, thus becoming an ultimate source of conflict, upsetting the functioning of the whole system. Therefore and especially if the Secretariat is ultimately physically outside the MEDU, care should be taken to formally ensure that this will in no way mean independence: it will have to remain and work in the framework of MAP, even if it is successful in bringing in as close partners other institutions, exactly as the RACs are actually operating.

The relationships of MEDU with the other Centres may also be ultimately affected, as they might be tempted to establish closer ties with the Secretariat, particularly if the latter is hosted by a country committed to its success and prepared to invest considerably in its functioning.

MEDU should be empowered to supervise the Secretariat's activities and ensure their coordination with those of the RACs. This co-ordination action by the MEDU should ensure the integration and harmonious distribution of the various activities of the Centres and the Secretariat's, so that they act in synergy in the MAP framework. In a similar way, any tendencies for turf wars that might compromise the efficiency and effectiveness of MAP will have to be addressed and removed as soon they are noticed. MEDU should thus be given a very clear mandate, to act whenever there is a need for a determination as to whether there are overlaps in the activities of the Secretariat's with those of any RAC.

MEDU would also retain all of its current functions/mandate, such as the following:

- planning, organisation, information, and cooperation with inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations
- relationships with international programmes, including MEAs
- coordination of the Information Strategy
- managing diplomatic/political issues
- co-ordination and implementation of :
 - Programme for the Assessment and Control of Pollution in the Mediterranean Region (MEDPOL)
 - Related legal instruments (LBS, Dumping and Hazardous Wastes Protocols)
 - Strategic Action Plan
 - development and follow up of national monitoring programmes
 - technical follow up to the implementation of LBS, Dumping and Hazardous Wastes Protocols
 - technical follow up to the implementation of SAP
 - follow up of the MAP legal framework
 - co-operation with NGOs
 - implementation of information programme
 - implementation of the Mediterranean GEF project

Regional Activity Centres

The Centres' functions, responsibilities and spheres of competence are well defined and should not be affected in any serious way by the proposals.

It is very important to emphasize the clear distinction that needs to be maintained between the functions of the MCSD Secretariat (coordination, policy and strategic issues, etc.) and the function of the RAC support centres (basically for "thematic issues" and related activities including some kind of follow up).

Nevertheless, the RACs should find the right partnership with the MCSD and the Secretariat, and this can only happen when they are encouraged by MEDU to refocus their programmes towards more sustainable development issues. This would enable them to broaden currently mostly sectoral approaches, without, however, losing their initial focus.

All the RACs should be better drawn in the process, as they have a lot to offer and a lot to gain. They should remain Support Centres for the scientific and technical aspects of the MCSD's "thematic" activities and continue to facilitate the MCSD and its groups by, inter alia,

- reviewing [not researching] particular issues in order to establish baseline conditions
- identifying policy gaps and concerns so as to serve as background contribution to the actual work of the Commission
- providing insights and comments on the recommendations produced
- rendering some secretariat support to the groups they deal with
- raising issues for advice and consideration
- synthesizing and integrating the findings of thematic assessments in order to develop a better understanding of the scientific interlinkages and the policy and technology trade-offs among different issues
- reporting on status of implementation
- monitoring, analysing and evaluating
- feeding back lessons learned and experiences gained from the country level

- maintaining country-specific information and data bases
- providing MAP and the MCSD with scientific and technical advice related to implementation in spheres within their mandate

The proposed changes also offer a unique opportunity to take a closer, independent, review into the mandate and activities of the Centres, particularly those established long time ago and targeted towards the traditional role and goals of the MAP and the Convention. It may be that renewal in roles and mandates is required and a refocusing of programmes may prove to the benefit of MAP. For example, traditional training components and programmes may have successfully served their purpose and countries may now be able to stand on their own or through bilateral arrangements. Funds could then be diverted to issues of integration in a horizontal manner (i.e. introducing biodiversity concerns and areas and species protection into national policies for agriculture, tourism, etc).

Thus, by being properly defined and efficiently implemented, the change options should be to the benefit of the MAP Support Centres and not create conflicts.

F. CONCLUSION

The original aims for the setting up of the MCSD are even more valid today.

The present MAP structure is not in a position to handle all the issues relating to sustainable development, particularly those relating to the pillars of social and economic development. The MCSD enables the MAP approach to the protection of the Mediterranean to be brought up to date and respond to contemporary global concerns and is bringing it closer towards a better understanding of sustainable development.

The renewed MCSD needs to be provided with a clear elaboration of its mandate and adequate support to carry out its task.

The emerging driving forces in the new millennium are all positive, and the revised model proposed to be pursued is aimed to capitalize on them. These forces are, the overwhelming public environmental awareness; changes in peoples' values and priorities; highly pluralistic decision-making systems; transparency; new actors; grassroots initiatives; strong national political agendas; and the post- WSSD process.

G. NEXT STEP

As a next step, the Coordinating Unit should take up the proposals of the Task Force to be finally approved in the 8th MCSD meeting in Cavtat, Croatia and circulate them for comments to all other intergovernmental actors in the Mediterranean, with a view to submitting the proposals to the CPs in Catania, in November 2003, together with the comments and proposals received. In the assessment of the latter, MEDU could be assisted by the intersessional committee.

APPENDIX I

MEDITERRANEAN PRIORITY ISSUES EMERGING OUT OF GLOBAL OR REGIONAL PROCESSES

The following priority issues are highlighted, as they relate to or should relate to the Mediterranean specificities:

Athens Declaration by the Euro-Mediterranean Ministers for the Environment

- retain the existing SMAP priority fields of action
- environmental integration in agriculture and tourism
- promoting environmental integration in all priority sectors of the regional economic co-operation (water, industry, energy, transport, and information society)
- mutual supportiveness between trade and environmental protection
- endorsement of the Sustainability Impact Assessment
- climate change/ sea level rise
- promoting sustainable integrated water resources management and water-efficiency
- promoting renewable energy and energy conservation and efficiency
- promoting sustainable urban management in coastal areas, including through Local Agendas 21
- halting and reversing the decline of biodiversity in the Mediterranean region
- addressing the causes of desertification and soil degradation

CEDARE

The priority programmes within CEDARE concern:

- the management of soil and water resources
- the management of coastal zone resources
- urbanisation and human settlements
- the socio-economic aspects of sustainable development

6th EAP Priorities

The 6th EAP determines four environmental themes that require urgent action:

Climate change (assessments to prepare regional adaptation measures such as water resources management, conservation of biodiversity, desertification and flood prevention).

Nature and biodiversity (promoting the integration of biodiversity considerations in agricultural policies and encouraging sustainable rural development; organic farming and agro-biodiversity; a balanced approach to the multifunctional role of rural communities).

Environment and health and quality of life (reducing negative impact of the environmental factors on human health and quality of life through enhanced consideration of linkages between environmental degradation and health risks).

Sustainable use and management of natural resources and wastes (impact of subsidies relating to natural resources and waste).

In addition to these four sectors, the 6th EAP defines three cross-sectoral themes: *Strategic approaches* (integration, sustainable production/consumption, partnerships); *International issues*

(achieving mutual supportiveness between trade and the needs for environmental protection by taking due account of the environmental dimension in Sustainability Impact Assessments of multilateral trade agreements); and *Environmental policy-making*.

Johannesburg Declaration

The broader commitment of the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development refers to global *collective responsibility* to advance and strengthen the interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development at local, national, regional and global levels.

The Declaration has four overarching objectives: *poverty eradication, changing consumption and production patterns, protecting and managing the natural resource base, addressing globalization*.

The Declaration also calls for a real *commitment to sustainable development* and the necessity for *stronger regional groupings and alliances* characterized by broad-based participation and stable partnerships, *Making it all Happen* through an inclusive process, *involving all the major groups and governments*.

Johannesburg Plan of Implementation

- *poverty eradication* (e.g. national programmes for sustainable development)
- *changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production* (e.g. 10-year framework of programmes in support of regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production; substantially increase the global share of renewable energy sources; correct unsustainable patterns of production and consumption in developed countries; help developing countries put in place policies and tools to this end. A 10-year framework for programmes needs to be developed and promoted as the main instrument to achieve that goal)
- *protecting and managing the natural resource base* (e.g. integrated water resources management; ecosystem approach; sustainable fisheries management; integrated coastal and ocean management; protection of marine and coastal areas; prevention and combating desertification; sustainable tourism development)
- *sustainable development in a globalizing world* (e.g. strengthen regional trade and cooperation agreements)
- *sustainable development of small island developing states* (e.g. managing coastal areas; vulnerability indices)
- *sustainable development for Africa* (e.g. financial and technical support for Africa's efforts to implement the Convention to Combat Desertification at the national level)
- *means of implementation* (science-based decision-making and reaffirming the precautionary approach; education for sustainable development)

MAP II Priority fields of activities

- integration of environment and development (national strategies for sustainable development)
- integrated management of natural resources (integrated water management; measures against erosion and desertification; code of conduct for responsible fishing)
- integrated management of coastal areas
- agriculture (sustainable agricultural and rural development)
- industry and energy (promote and facilitate the use of new and renewable sources of energy)
- tourism (diversification of tourism)
- urban development and the environment (encourage town decision-makers to apply sustainable development policies)

- conservation of nature, landscape and sites (prepare and approve national strategies for the conservation of biodiversity)

Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development

- management of water demand
- sustainable management of coastal zones
- information, awareness, environmental education and public participation
- tourism and sustainable development
- indicators for sustainable development
- free trade and environment
- industry and sustainable development
- urban management
- cooperation and financing for Sustainable Development
- local governance
- agriculture and rural development
- consumption patterns and waste management

Mediterranean Declaration for the Johannesburg Summit

- management of natural resources and pollution combating (sustainable agriculture, environmentally friendly consumption)
- institutional and legal framework (Rio principles- precautionary principle, polluter pays principle, common and differentiated responsibility)
- cooperation, partnership and financing (incentives for environmentally and socially responsible investments; removal of environmentally damaging subsidies, debt for nature and sustainable development swaps)

METAP IV

- waste management including solid and hazardous waste
- water quality management, including integrated coastal zone management
- policy and legislation tools, including costs of environmental degradation, strengthening of environmental assessment, and environment and trade
- knowledge management

Millennium Goals

To ensure environmental sustainability by the year 2015, through the integration of the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and to reverse loss of environmental resources.

Partnership Initiatives

The hundreds of initiatives for partnerships adopted refer to the major priority sectors of water and sanitation; energy (efficiency, renewables, subsidies); health (chemicals, air pollution); agriculture (desertification); and biological diversity (forests, protected areas); as well as in the cross cutting issues (access to markets, consumption/production, corporate responsibility).

SMAP

- integrated water management (establishment of river basin and catchment area management plans)
- integrated coastal zone management (integrated environmental management plans and sustainable development programmes for Mediterranean islands)
- combating desertification (promoting changes of attitude and participatory processes, in particular of farmers, stock-breeders and other interested social groups)

Strategic Review Priorities

- water demand management
- tourism
- agriculture
- energy
- transport
- free trade and the environment
- information and awareness raising
- indicators for sustainable development
- land use planning
- coastal management and urban development
- national strategies towards impetus and implementation

WEHAB Initiative

This initiative complements the Plan of Implementation and has also helped to make the Summit outcomes more relevant to the world at large. Five key areas for action were identified: water and sanitation; energy; health; agriculture; and biodiversity and ecosystem management.

Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development: (work in progress – section to be completed in June 2003)

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED INDICATIVE MCSD's FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The Commission's programme is necessary in order to provide vision and perspective to the MCSD and thus overcome the current problem of constantly shifting directions, emphasis and approaches, in response to ad-hoc initiatives of some of its members.

Focus is essential to make the Commission's work programme manageable and to ensure that it is effective and relevant.

The MCSD's work programme should thus develop within the framework of a more focused agenda than the previous one, but with enough flexibility for the selection of issues in future, taking on board new and emerging issues as they are identified.

However, the range of issues to be tackled is very extensive, whilst most are discussed in various inter-governmental forums. Hence the Commission cannot, should not, be expected to address all aspects of all issues. Cross-sectoral, overarching issues, such as poverty eradication, globalization, gender, enabling environment, technology transfer, means of implementation, are the subject of broad policy deliberations in more specialized fora. Such issues should be considered as core elements in the analyses of each issue and not tackled in isolation.

Criteria for the selection of issues

The MCSD is expected to provide an integrated perspective, while avoiding duplication, on the inter-linkages between the three components of sustainable development and between natural resource issues and socio-economic ones.

The following broader concepts and primary considerations could guide the process for the design of the programme and organization of work of the MCSD:

- avoid duplicating the work of other forums or specialized bodies
- all MAP sectors should benefit from re-examination from outsiders and civil society
- topics for consideration that are too broad and conceptual and necessitate the carrying out of costly and lengthy comparative studies or of original research, should be avoided
- issues should be selected in accordance with their significance
- issues relating to natural resources and relevant economic sectors such as water, energy, biodiversity, land and agriculture, tourism, etc., are of primary concern
- issues already tackled could be reconsidered, either to complete assessment or to draw up new proposals in the light of new concerns
- issues should be regional in extent, but also of widespread local concerns, such as sustainable consumption and production patterns and governance
- the programme should incorporate timetables, cost estimates and indication of sources of financing

Priority Issues

Priorities should be selected taking into consideration those already adopted at various global and regional initiatives as they relate to the Mediterranean (Appendix I), as well as the ones to be established by the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy.

Organization of work

The need to narrow the focus within the future CSD work cycles could be addressed in a variety of ways. There is a need to avoid the rigid preselection of themes, that would set in advance the agenda for the next 10 years, leaving little room for flexibility and postponing vital issues for many years. Similarly, having no pre-set thematic programme of work, but selecting some sectors every few years would allow a maximum of flexibility but selection of sectors may prove to be difficult without agreement on issues to be addressed subsequently.

The programme for the next decade should have some degree of flexibility to allow the Commission to address emerging challenges, This would require provisions for changing and modifying the programme of work over the years. At the same time, there is need to ensure some level of predictability and flexibility in the programme of work, to allow longer-term preparations.

The UN CSD is expected to alternate implementation reviews in one year with policy discussions and negotiations the next. The MCSD could follow an extended pattern of this version, that is policy reviews with implementation ones in-between.

The programme could be based on assuming that there will be around 30-32 active members at any one time, providing the Commission with the option to establish 4-7 groups of a varied membership, 3 of which could be Standing ones.

It is advisable to pre-select 2 to 4 broad areas (new and revisiting of earlier ones) for each review, while 1 or 2 areas could be left to be determined by future sessions. This would provide a mix of “predictability” and “flexibility”.

The Commission could thus establish in 2004 its multi-year work programme, by deciding on the sectors it would consider over the next ten years but also leaving room for emerging issues or challenges that could be addressed at relatively short notice or looking again at issues discussed earlier cycles, if it is so required.

An purely indicative model for the programme is proposed below:

Year	Nature of session	General goal of session	Proposed issues for consideration
2004	Organization/ Review Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set up Standing Working Groups • select issues for consideration in 2005 and 2006 • set up ad hoc WGs • review previous issues 	<p><u>New</u> 5 issues selected in 2004</p> <p><u>Previous</u> 1 issue selected in 2004</p>
2005	Policy Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2005 issues/adoption of recommendations 	

2006	Organization/Policy Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2006 issues/adoption of recommendations • select issues for consideration in 2007 and 2008 • set up ad hoc WGs 	<p><u>New</u> 5 issues selected in 2004 2 issues selected in 2006</p>
2007	Policy/Review Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2007 issues/adoption of recommendations • review previous issues 	<p><u>Previous</u> 1 issue selected in 2004</p>
2008	Organization/Policy/Review Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2008 issues/adoption of recommendations • select issues for consideration in 2009 and 2010 • set up ad hoc WGs • review previous issues • review progress in implementing o the 2005 issues 	<p><u>New</u> 5 issues selected in 2004 2 issues selected in 2008</p> <p><u>Previous</u> 1 issue selected in 2004</p>
2009	Policy/Review Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2009 issues/adoption of recommendations • review previous issues 	<p><u>Previous</u> 1 issue selected in 2004</p>
2010	Organisation/Policy Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2010 issues/adoption of recommendations • select issues for consideration in 2011 and 2012 • set up ad hoc WGs 	<p><u>New</u> 3 issues selected in 2004 2 issues selected in 2010</p> <p><u>Previous</u> 1 issue selected in 2004</p>
2011	Policy/Review Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs on 2011 issues/adoption of recommendations • review previous issues • review progress in implementing 2006 issues 	<p><u>Previous</u> 1 issue selected in 2004</p>
2012	Organisation/Policy Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs for 2012 issues/adoption of recommendations • select issues for consideration in 2013 and 2014 • set up ad hoc WGs 	<p><u>New</u> 2 issues selected in 2004 3 issues selected in 2012</p>

2013	Review Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review progress in implementing 2007, 2008, 2009 issues 	
2014	Policy/Review Session/Earth Summit 2015 Contributing Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report of WGs for 2013, 2014 issues/adoption of recommendations • review progress in implementing 2010, 2011 issues • contribution to the Earth Summit 	
2015	Earth Summit 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment/reconsideration of the MCSD role 	

APPENDIX III

MEDITERRANEAN - RELATED PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Partnership between the Belgian Government, Belgian Scientific institutions, the CGIAR centres and Southern partners in the promotion of agricultural research for development.
Leading partners: CGIAR-centers.

Promoting Sustainable Development in Southern Agricultural research Systems.
Leading partner: AGROPOLIS, France/GFAR Secretariat, Rome.

Promotion of Renewable Energy in the Mediterranean Region.
Leading Partner: Italian Ministry of the Environment and Territory, Rome.

Euro-Mediterranean Water and Poverty Facility (EuroMed WPF).
Leading Partner: Global Water Partnership Mediterranean, Athens, Greece.

EU Water Initiative: Water for Life.
Leading Partner: European Commission, EU Member States and others.

Sustainable Water Management in the Balkan and Southeast Mediterranean Area.
Leading partner: region of Crete.

ADRICOSM – ADRIatic sea integrated Coastal AreaS and river basin Management system pilot project.
Leading partner: Italian Ministry of Environment and Territory

Integrated Framework of Tools for Implementing Sustainable Development in Small Islands (SUSTIS)
Leading partner: Malta Environment and Planning Authority.

African Process for the Development and Protection of the Marine and Coastal Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa.
Leading Partner: Advisory Committee on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS), London.

Capacity-Building on the applications of ICT for the establishment of Environmental Information Systems for Sustainable Development in Africa – SISEI.
Leading Partner: UNITAR/OSS, Switzerland/Tunisia.

SIRMA: Water economy in irrigated Systems in North Africa.
Leading Partner: French Government.

Mediterranean Education Initiative for Environment and Sustainability (MEDIES).
Leading Partners: Government of Greece, MIO-ECSDE/UNESCO.

A21Adriatic Sea Forum – Local Agenda 21 for Adriatic Sea Region.
Leading partner: City of Ancona, Italy.

Regional Sustainable Cities and Towns Campaigns promoting local Agenda 21.
Leading partner: European Commission, Directorate General Environment.

Preparation of a Regional Sustainable Development Strategy in the Mediterranean.
Leading partner: UNEP/MAP Athens, Greece.

APPENDIX IV

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

These guiding principles, as presented at the WSSD Prep.Com.4 in Bali, could serve as reference and be applied/adapted to the preparation and development of additional Mediterranean Partnerships for the promotion of Sustainable Development in the Region.

“The following guiding principles for partnerships should be adhered to in the design and implementation of all partnerships to be recognized as part of the WSSD outcomes:

Objective of partnerships

Partnerships for sustainable development are specific commitments by various partners intended to contribute to and reinforce the implementation of the outcomes of the intergovernmental negotiations of the WSSD (Programme of Action and Political Declaration) and to help achieve the further implementation of Agenda 21 and the Millennium Development Goals.

Voluntary nature/respect for fundamental principles and values

Partnerships are of a voluntary, ‘self-organizing’ nature; they are based on mutual respect and shared responsibility of the partners involved, taking into account the Rio Declaration Principles and the values expressed in the Millennium Declaration.

Link with globally agreed outcomes

Partnerships are to complement the intergovernmentally agreed outcomes of WSSD: they are not intended to substitute commitments made by governments. Rather they should serve as mechanisms for the delivery of the globally agreed commitments by mobilizing the capacity for producing action on the ground. Partnerships should be anchored in the intergovernmentally agreed outcomes of WSSD (Programme of Action and Political Declaration) and help achieve the further implementation of Agenda 21 and the Millennium Development Goals.

Integrated approach to sustainable development

Partnerships should integrate the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development in their design and implementation. They should be consistent, where applicable, with sustainable development strategies and poverty reduction strategies of the countries, regions and communities where their implementation takes place.

Multi-stakeholder approach

Partnerships should have a multi-stakeholder approach and preferably involve a range of significant actors in a given area of work. They can be arranged among any combination of partners, including governments, regional groups, local authorities, non-governmental actors, international institutions and private sector partners. All partners should be involved in the development of a partnership from an early stage, so that it is genuinely participatory in approach. Yet as partnerships evolve, there should be an opportunity for additional partners to join on an equal basis.

Transparency and accountability

Partnerships should be developed and implemented in an open and transparent manner and in good faith, so that ownership of the partnership process and its outcomes is shared among all partners, and all partners are equally accountable. They should specify arrangements to monitor and review their performance against the objectives and targets they set and report in regular intervals ('self-reporting'). These reports should be made accessible to the public.

Tangible Results

Each partnership should define its intended outcome and benefits. Partnerships should have clear objectives and set specific measurable targets and timeframes for their achievement. All partners should explicitly commit to their role in achieving the aims and objectives of the partnerships.

Funding arrangements

Available and /or expected sources of funding should be identified. At least the initial funding should be assured at the time of the Summit, if the partnership is to be recognized there.

New/value added partnerships

Ideally, partnerships for sustainable development should be "new", i.e. developed within the framework of the WSSD process. In case of on-going partnerships, there has to be a significant added value to these partnerships in the context of the WSSD (e.g. more partners taken on board, replicating an initiative or extending it to another geographical region, increasing financial resources, etc.)

Local involvement and international impact

While the active involvement of local communities in the design and implementation of partnerships is strongly encouraged (bottom-up approach), partnerships should be international in their impact, which means their impact should extend beyond the national level (global, regional and/or sub-regional).

Follow-up process

Partnerships should keep the Commission on Sustainable Development informed about their activities and progress in achieving their targets. The CSD should serve as a focal point for discussion of partnerships that promote sustainable development, including sharing lessons learnt, progress made and best practices.

Opportunities to develop partnerships for sustainable development will continue after the WSSD. Submissions of partnerships after the Summit will be considered in the follow-up process."

APPENDIX V

STRENGTHENING THE MCSD THROUGH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEDICATED FULL-TIME, FULLY-FUNCTIONING SECRETARIAT

Functions of the Secretariat

Activities of an effectively operational nature should be avoided, to prevent overlaps with the remit and work plan of the RACs and unnecessary institutional and staff upsets within MEDU.

The Secretariat would-

- help identify policy-relevant gaps in the sustainable development assessment structure
- support the MCSD's day-to-day functioning
- strengthen linkages with civil society and develop innovative modes of partnership
- coordinate system-wide response to the work of the MCSD
- promote an active and continuous dialogue with governments, civil society and other international organisations aimed at building partnerships to solve key issues and problems related to sustainable development
- forge close links between the current parallel and independent processes and those of the MCSD
- service joint meetings of various bodies
- support the Mediterranean Interagency Platform on Sustainable Development
- deal with Working Group coordination issues
- increase awareness
- raise funds
- report back to the MCSD sessions, in order to help monitor the process more transparently
- pursue the implementation of activities by actors, members or RACs, in accordance with the Work-plan and the recommendations
- formulate recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of implementation
- prepare reports on sustainable development issues
- prepare reports on achievements in eliminating obstacles and difficulties
- contribute socioeconomic development perspectives to the work of other mechanisms
- carry out representation functions in intergovernmental and interagency processes outside of MCSD

Staff of the MCSD Secretariat **Head**

Planning and coordination of the MCSD's work programme; supervision of the work assignments of staff; management of the Secretariat's strategic support; government agencies and inter- MAP liaison; external relations; programme/budget/planning; legal aspects.

Socio-economic Development

Socio-economic aspects; consumption and production patterns; trade and sustainable development; finance and sustainable development; industry; tourism; energy; transport; national sustainable development strategies.

Policy integration, institutions and programme coordination

Policy development work; review of documentation for consistence; liaison with others; interaction with major groups; public outreach/ publications; general programme support; national, regional, international institutions.

Environment/ Natural resources

Integrated management and development of freshwater resources; policy advisory services and technical cooperation on water resources development and management; coastal areas; sectoral issues of natural resources; oceans and land.

Information/ communications assistant

Information; indicators; reporting guidelines; analysis of submitted information; information website.

Thematic assistants to RAC-related issues

Functions of Staff

- elaboration of documents and reports, background information, workplans and timetables related to their fields of activity
- preparation of contracts for consultants and following their work
- pursuing working arrangements with other agencies
- contribution in the preparation and organisation of meetings
- collaboration with the RACs in the preparation of progress reports
- following up day to day supervision of work
- preparation of annual budget reports and ad-hoc financial reports
- assisting MEDU in preparations for major intergovernmental deliberations and conferences on issues of common interest
- assisting in the preparation of expert meetings and of their outcomes, including the selection of experts and topics to be addressed; logistics of meetings including drafting agendas, invitation letters, proceedings and final reports; administrative arrangements with relevant government ministry
- contributing to public outreach and awareness activities
- maintaining working contacts with delegations, outside experts and other international organizations
- preparing and/or reviewing comments, studies, statements, concerning sustainable development
- providing advisory services on reporting and identifying areas for improvement
- approaching donors to provide support; developing options/strategies for financing; ensuring involvement of donors to support relevant components which fall under priority in implementation
- evaluation of the extent to which objectives have been realized
- assisting relevant institutions to develop national and regional networks with civil society organizations and NGOs dealing with environment issues
- reviewing country documents

The Secretariat does not require any Management Board, as this would entail substantial additional costs (cost of meetings, including interpretation, documentation and travel; review of documentation; additional secretarial support; documentation costs; summaries; election procedures; etc.).

If within MEDU, it would be the responsibility of the MAP Coordinator to oversee activities, pursue assessment and monitoring and take decisions on substantive issues. If the Secretariat is physically outside MEDU, it could be overseen by the MAP Co-ordinator, with the participation of 2 of the agencies from the ones participating in the Interagency Platform on a rotational, 2-year, basis.

Costs of the Secretariat

Ideally, the Secretariat would require a budget of about 1.000.000 € per year³ (slightly less if established within MEDU in Athens which would entail some savings in support/operating costs) that could be divided roughly as follows:

4 professional staff (Head, Environment/ National Resources Expert, Economic/ Social Development Expert, Political/ Institutions Expert); <i>all professionals with fund raising expertise and good communication capabilities.</i>	400.000 €
3 assistants (1 on information and communication to be covered by the project, and 2 assistants on thematic issues to be seconded by countries or Mediterranean/European partners, that could work directly with concerned RACs as Support Centres for related issues)	100.000 €
Support Staff (2 Secretaries, 1 technician/computer issues, 1 admin/finance issues)	150.000 €
Activities: preparation and dissemination of position papers, working sessions and workshops, all related to regional coordination and strategy/policy issues, the scientific and technical "thematic" activities being carried out directly by Support Centres (generally MAP RACs but also by other partners as appropriate)	150.000 €
MCSD major sessions ⁴ and meetings of Steering Committee	50.000 €
Travel	50.000 €
Operating Cost (telephones, electricity cost, publications, translations, communication, miscellaneous)	100.000 €
Total	1.000.000 €

APPENDIX VI

³ In the 2002-2003 MAP Budget, about 175.000 € were allocated yearly to the Secretariat/MEDU for MCSD related activities; in case that a specific support unit is established, this amount would increase to 250.000€. It is important to note that some 155.000 € were also allocated to RAC/BP and RAC/PAP mainly as Support Centres for MCSD related activities; these amounts should of course be maintained and if possible increased.

⁴ From experience, it would be realistic to consider that countries and partners would provide additional financial support for MCSD activities and meetings for about 100.000 € or more per year.

RELEVANT BODIES ACTIVE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN IN THE FIELD OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (list not exhaustive-to be completed)**CEDARE**

CEDARE concerns 32 Arab and European countries. Several of the Arab countries are Contracting Parties and members of the MCSD. It has an environmental information and a documentation unit, both of which are operational and would benefit from using its Mediterranean anchor point.

European Union (and its institutions, e.g EEA)

The work of the European Union in the Mediterranean, as a Contracting Party to MAP, one of METAP's partners, a promoter of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and with 6 Mediterranean countries as members, is of strategic importance.

EIB

The EIB's interest in protecting the environment is shown through the funding of projects related to water mobilization, air pollution, the urban environment, controlling erosion, and the supply of natural gas.

FAO

It is the focal point of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development for soil, forests, mountains and agriculture, marine environment and fisheries, management of water resources, genetic resources and river basin management.

GEF

The Fund targets global environment issues: climate change, biodiversity, international waters and the protection of the ozone layer. In the Mediterranean it has funded global studies on biodiversity, the conservation of wetlands and coastal eco-systems, climate change, controlling gases which threaten the ozone layer, international waters, etc.

IAEA

The IAEA works alongside MAP through its Laboratory for the Marine Environment in Monaco, in evaluating radioactive substances, organic compounds, and in providing reference standards for analysing main contaminants. With the support of the United Nations Programme for the Environment, it has developed different forms of surveillance of the marine environment on a worldwide scale.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

The IFAD supports certain inter-governmental cooperation projects towards sustainable development in shared river basins. It has also conducted a food aid programme to support environmental conservation and to develop certain agricultural activities.

IMO

The IMO is active in the Mediterranean through close collaboration with MAP in terms of supporting and supervising the REMPEC in Malta.

Islamic Development Bank

It aims at the economic development and social advancement of its 53 members, 9 of them Mediterranean. Although it recognizes the importance of taking account of the environmental dimension in the projects which it finances, this element is still not the object of any specifically established strategy.

League of Arab States

Created in 1945, it acts as an instrument of concertation between its 22 member states. It works alongside various regional organisations in implementing activities related to sustainable development, although it is not easy for it to work out any real strategy of its own with its concerns being first and foremost of a political nature. In this respect, the Council of Arab Ministers for the Environment could play an important driving role towards regional cooperation and sustainable development.

METAP

Launched in 1989 at the initiative of the World Bank as an operational instrument within the Mediterranean Environment Programme (MEP) involving the EIB, UNDP and the EC, the METAP (Mediterranean Environment Technical Assistance Programme) has developed a specific strategy on sustainable development for 14 countries in the region.

OECD

OECD supports its governments primarily through the work of its [Environment Policy Committee](#), through Joint Working Parties on Agriculture and Environment and on Trade and Environment and through Joint Meetings of Tax and Environment Experts. Overall, these activities contribute to the cross-cutting work of the OECD on sustainable development.

UNCED

The 'Mediterranean 2000' programme is a three-year capacity building programme for SMEs and stimulating their growth and competitiveness in six developing countries around the Mediterranean basin. The "Globalisation, Liberalisation and Sustainable Development" programme is run jointly with the UNDP.

UNDP

The UNDP has shown a clear commitment to the environment and sustainable development, both directly through its own programmes at regional and national level, as well as indirectly by financing specific activities implemented by other agencies within the United Nations system.

UNESCO

UNESCO has a Mediterranean component in all its programmes, such as the MAB and its network of biosphere reserves and the BRIM (biosphere reserves integrated monitoring). The INSULA programme facilitates, *inter alia*, the inter-linkage of Mediterranean biosphere reserves and is developing programmes related to energy issues in the islands. MED-GOOS deals with

data on environmental degradation, climate change and coastal area management. The IOC is actively involved in various of MAP's pollution assessment activities.

UNPF

The UNPF supports work in the region related to child health, the setting up of maternity units, the analysis of factors which determine women's health, access to family planning, making childbirth safer, and combating discriminatory practices towards women.

WHO

Within the MAP framework, the WHO participates directly in MEDPOL activities as well as in the preparation and implementation of the Strategic Actions Programme; other WHO programmes also affect the Mediterranean region, such as *The towns and health programme and the programme for zoonosis control in the Mediterranean*.

WMO

The WMO was able to work with MAP on monitoring, modeling and assessing pollution from the atmosphere in the Mediterranean Sea. It has also contributed to assessing long-term changes to the marine and coastal environment resulting from climate change.

World Bank

The initiatives of the World Bank have targeted five major problems in the region: overuse of water resources; desertification of arable land; uncontrolled urbanisation; air pollution in the most densely populated areas; and threatened marine and coastal resources.

UN and UNEP Regional Commissions/Offices

SUMMARY

MOST ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FROM THE TASK FORCE REPORT ON THE MCSD ASSESSMENT AND PROSPECTS, ADOPTED BY THE MCSD

1. The MCSD should be a think tank/ high level policy forum for identifying, evaluating and examining major environmental, economic and social issues in the region. The Commission should aim to extend its advise to international and regional agencies and national governments, as well as all the bodies within MAP and civil society.
2. The work of the Commission needs to facilitate the work of the other bodies operating in the Mediterranean, assist them strengthen their contribution to sustainable development and help them meet the need for a more coherent regional approach. Within the context of the overall concern for improving global environmental governance, as evidenced by UNEP's Cartagena agreement on governance and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, MEDU is urged to act as a catalyst and renew initiatives for the establishment of an informal Interagency Platform in the Mediterranean in consultation with the regional offices of agencies active in the region on sustainable development issues.
3. The recommendations of the MCSD should not be restricted to a mere formal approval by the CPs, which have the major responsibility to deliver. The MCSD Secretariat and other MAP bodies, through external resources if necessary, should elaborate on the strategic recommendations, making them more explicit and strengthening them with detailed guidelines.
4. Responsibility to implement remains the concern of all actors and institutions involved. Follow-up responsibility should mainly be entrusted to MEDU. The MCSD Secretariat should assess the implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations every 3-5 years and report to the meetings of the MCSD and the CPs
5. The MCSD should continue to consist of 36 members, with 15 seats allocated for the non-governmental sectors, but introducing flexibility in their allocation. At any one time, there should not be more than 6 or less than 2 persons from any of the above sectors. A maximum of 3 additional seats need to be allocated to intergovernmental organizations. To each session, 2-3 ad hoc members could be invited, having special competence in the matters included in the agenda of a meeting.
6. The Commission will hold ordinary meetings once every year, to last for three days and consider a limited number of issues each time. The practice of holding meetings in various countries will be maintained, but proposals to host such meetings should be accompanied by a substantial contribution of the host country towards the logistics of the meeting.
7. The reasons that restrict the effective and active participation of some groups will be identified and weaknesses rectified, so as to allow all groups take advantage of, and contribute to, the opportunities and challenges offered by the setting up of the MCSD.
8. Representatives of the various agencies to MCSD meetings should be invited not only to MCSD meetings but also, on the basis of the relevance of the issues to their interests, to meetings of Working Groups as well, participating with equality of interaction as stakeholders.
9. Standing Working Groups will be established, focusing on broader issues to be agreed upon, with ad-hoc groups formulated to consider specific ones. International organizations

or leading Mediterranean experts will be brought in the process. Other Centres outside MAP also operating in the Mediterranean will be appropriately involved.

10. An 3-member committee, comprised of the Chair and the 2 Vice-Chairs of a concluding Session, should hold office for the intersessional period, to decide, liaise with, and advice the Secretariat on important issues that might arise. The MAP Coordinator should assume the responsibility to keep the whole process within the policy and strategic aspects of the issues.
11. Every effort will be exerted to establish connections with the Johannesburg Type II initiatives which are of special interest to the Mediterranean. The Commission will also strongly encourage its members to develop additional partnership initiatives guided by the 'Bali criteria' for the WSSD Partnerships.
12. A sequential, evolutionary, process of establishing an MCSD Secretariat is proposed. Initially (2004) one new professional with necessary support needs to be appointed in MEDU for full time MCSD secretariat work. This to be followed (2005-2006) with the setting up of a more dedicated, identifiable, secretariat unit, estimated to require not less than 4 professionals (2 for the MCSD Secretariat, to be covered by MAP budget and 3 to be seconded to support centres by countries/partners), with necessary support and relevant operational budget. The feasibility of establishing, by 2007, within the MAP system, a full-fledged MCSD Secretariat, needs to be further explored, including the ascertaining of any interest by potential host country/ municipality/funding partners. This Secretariat would be solely devoted to the MCSD and sustainable development and, even though within the MAP framework, it would be for the whole Mediterranean. The Secretariat could be physically located either in MEDU, in Athens, or elsewhere, if a country and/ or municipality accept to host it.
13. In addition to its current functions/mandate, MEDU should oversee the Secretariat's activities and ensure their coordination with those of the RACs, and act whenever there is a need for a determination as to whether there are overlaps in activities.
14. A clear distinction should be maintained between the functions of the MCSD Secretariat (coordination, policy and strategic issues, etc.) and the function of the RAC support centres (basically for "thematic issues" and related activities including some kind of follow up).
15. All RACs are encouraged to refocus their programmes towards more sustainable development issues, act as Support Centres for the scientific and technical aspects of the MCSD's "thematic" activities and continue to facilitate the MCSD and its groups.
16. The potentials offered by current manpower resources and relevant arrangements within MEDU should be fully utilized, with outside professional advice if necessary, in order to give greater visibility not only to the MCSD but to MAP itself, as an integral part of a structured communications strategy.
17. In the MAP's Budget, there should be a separate budget line for the Commission, including all the activities of MEDU and the RAC's related to sustainable development. A fund-raising strategy should be developed, as an indispensable ingredient of the other strategies developed under MAP auspices.
18. In its 2004 Session, the Commission will adopt a Programme of Work for the period 2005-2015, based on the priorities of a variety of relevant global and regional initiatives, as they relate to the Mediterranean specificities.