



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



UNEP/(DEC)/MED WG.184/2  
19 March 2001

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH



---

**MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

Meeting of MEDU with NGOs

Barcelona, Spain, 19 April 2001

**MAP cooperation with its partners in civil society**

- 1. Elements for a cooperation strategy**
- 2. Revision of the list of MAP partners**
- 3. Proposed action**

**Athens, March 2001**



## Table of contents

	<u>Page no.</u>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>1. Elements of a cooperation strategy</b>	2
1.1 Diagnosis and significance of cooperation	2
1.1.1 MAP's perspective Based on the analyses of the Secretariat and the latest recommendations of the Contracting Parties	2
1.1.2 The perspective of MAP partners Based on interviews, reports and replies to the latest questionnaire	2
1.2 Proposal for three strategic orientations	5
1.2.1 Reducing differences in levels of development	5
1.2.1.1 Taking into account the specific characteristics of partners from the South and the East	5
1.2.1.2 Strengthening assistance to partners in the South and the East	6
1.2.1.3 Improving the capacities of partners in the South and the East	9
1.2.2 Improving MAP's operational tools	10
1.2.2.1 Integrating partnership into project implementation	10
1.2.2.2 Improving current partnership tools	11
1.2.2.3 Strengthening MAP as a focal point for partnership	12
1.2.3 Promoting concerted action by the partners	13
1.2.3.1 Further defining the role of the partners	13
1.2.3.2 Promoting partnership networks	14
1.2.3.3 Including new partners	15
<b>2. Revision of the list of MAP partners</b>	16
2.1 Relevance of partners according to the new criteria	16
2.1.1 Analysis of the criteria	16
2.1.2 Results of applying the retention criteria	24
2.1.3 The need for other criteria?	33
2.2 Categories of partners	33
2.2.1 Partners on the current MAP list	34

	<u>Page no.</u>
<b>3. Proposed action</b>	36
3.1 Endorsement of the criteria for selection and inclusion in the list of MAP partners	36
3.2 Proposal for a new classification	36
3.2.1 Intergovernmental Organizations	36
3.2.2 Local authorities	37
3.2.3 Socio-Economic actors	37
3.2.4 Non-governmental Organizations	37
3.2.5 Educational and University institutions	37
3.3 Adoption of rules respecting involvement in MAP meetings and activities	37
3.4 Transitional period for partners who do not at present adequately fulfil the cooperation criteria	38
3.5 Creation of a support fund for the NGOs	38
<b>Annex</b>	39

## **Introduction**

---

The Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties, held in October 1999 in Malta, adopted among other decisions a number of recommendations concerning the cooperation of the Mediterranean Action Plan with its partners in "civil society". In this context, the principal objective of this paper is to revise the current list of MAP partners and to prepare a strategy for mutual cooperation.

The institutional, operational and financial measures and action which will be necessary to achieve these objectives will have to be organized in the context of a long-term "participatory" strategy, which evolves in the sense that permanent evaluation and follow-up mechanisms should be established to readjust its effects by taking into account experience and errors.

The analysis contained in this paper is based on the various MAP reports and the documentation on partners available in the files of the UNEP-MAP library in Athens. A series of interviews with NGOs in Tunis and Athens, as well as a questionnaire sent out to all partners, made a substantial contribution to the process of reflection.

The initial document was prepared by the consultant Néjib Benessaiah and was revised by the Secretariat.

## 1. Elements of a cooperation strategy

### 1.1 Diagnosis and significance of cooperation

#### 1.1.1 MAP's perspective

In October 1997, the Secretariat raised the alarm when it noted that over 80 per cent of NGO partners were from the Northern part of the Mediterranean, and that those from the Southern and Eastern parts did not participate sufficiently in MAP activities. It therefore proposed that governments should facilitate the active cooperation of NGOs in activities for which they are competent. The Secretariat also observed that the capacities of NGOs should be reinforced in financial and institutional terms, with a view to helping them to be involved more directly in MAP activities. The report of the Working Group on MAP/NGO collaboration in 1998 indicated that, of 71 NGOs, only 30 were collaborating effectively with MAP.

In October 1999, during the Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties, the report of the Working Group on collaboration with NGOs was approved and important recommendations were made to governments and partners.

**The Contracting Parties are called upon** to create the appropriate working conditions for NGOs in tasks for which they are specialized, through financial, technical and institutional assistance. At the national level, they are called upon to encourage partnership between administrations, the private sector and NGOs.

**The Secretariat is called upon** to strengthen and upgrade its support to NGOs from the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean region. It is also called upon to strengthen exchanges and cooperation with current partners and to open up cooperation with new partners. The Secretariat was also requested to propose a new strategy for MAP's cooperation with its partners.

**The partners are called upon**, in the first place, to cooperate fully with MAP through the regular exchange of information. The relevance of the partners' activities can only be evaluated and put to good use if MAP has adequate basic information concerning the activities undertaken and the structures of its partners. The capacity to participate in and/or build active Mediterranean networks becomes an important new criterion in collaboration with MAP. So that the weaker associations can express themselves and understand regional issues, particular emphasis is placed on representativity and willingness to be involved in MAP activities.

#### 1.1.2 The perspective of MAP partners

The questionnaire distributed in July 2000 to all the 81 partners included in the updated directory of partners had a response rate of 41 per cent. It should be noted that certain partners from local authorities and socio-economic actors are not listed in the directory and it was not possible to contact them. This summary of the ideas contained in the replies to the questionnaire therefore applies in particular to the MAP/NGO partners. With the help of meetings with certain NGOs in Tunisia and Greece,<sup>1</sup> it was possible to identify the main ideas, rapidly organized into a selection of major "areas" of concern of the organizations contacted.

---

<sup>1</sup> NGOs contacted in Tunisia : APNEK, ATUMED and CETIMA. And those in Greece: Kathari Ellada, MIO-ECSDE, MedWet, Sea Turtle Protection Society of Greece.

1. The partners are in general agreement concerning the *difficulties of creating synergies and effective partnerships at the regional level*. The partners from the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean consider that there is a *certain lack of interest among many institutional partners in the North with regard to their initiatives and their local activities*. Apart from certain isolated cases of assistance, most of them believe that the **reduction of disparities lies essentially in the strengthening of their technical and institutional capacities, and in assistance in mobilizing financial resources**. Moreover, they appear to be aware of the limits of MAP's financing since, in response to question 23 of the questionnaire, "*How do you think you can finance your cooperation with MAP?*", over 60 per cent of the partners considered that they could do so by requesting financial assistance from inter-governmental institutions, other NGOs or other actors. In response to question 22, "*What do the meetings of the MCSD represent for your organization?*", some 70 per cent of them considered that they offered an opportunity for the exchange of information, knowledge and common action.

2. A second main idea taken up by a majority of the partners is the **strengthening of MAP as a focal point** for the collection, dissemination and redistribution of information on the commitments, programmes and activities of all the partners. The current means of communication should be strengthened by *the establishment of a MAP website, a discussion forum between partners and by a special secretariat dedicated to the maintenance of the site*. Many ideas support this strengthening of MAP as the engine of the NGO dynamic: support for means of communication (information bulletin, electronic communication, messages, forums, site).

*Practical assistance is sought in the form of loans to the poorest associations for access to the Internet and to communicate effectively and at a low cost with their partners; as well as support for publication activities by the partners. Creating a database for NGOs in the North and the South, with their contacts, fields of interest and the expertise which they offer, would facilitate the process of cooperation and communication. A directory of NGOs and better use of Internet technology would facilitate the access of partners to MAP documentation and offer them the possibility of including their activities in the MAP Website.*

3. A third idea which is also of importance in the view of the partners is the *intensification and regularity of means of communication (meetings for dialogue and exchanges, bulletins for exchanges of experience and knowledge), on the one hand, and their adaptation in relation to the partners concerned, thereby facilitating the strengthening of North/South and South/South cooperation, innovative experiences and the integration of the aspects of environmental feasibility, sustainability and social equity*. Certain of them propose the holding of an annual meeting of MAP partners, or a rotating Mediterranean congress. *The organization of important events once in the South and once in the North with a view to building bridges and learning from the lessons of others.*

In this web of meetings, the call is made to *bring governments and national NGOs closer together*, but also to develop new relations at the regional and local levels. The proposals include better communication with the Regional Activities Centres and the idea of common campaigns and environmental forums. MAP is invited to *become more involved in the meetings and major events organized by civil society and in return to give more emphasis to encouraging people from civil society to contribute to MAP programmes*. This type of conference is intended to include *discussion sessions on problems relating to collaboration and common action at the regional level*.

4. The issue of the **representation of civil society** in MAP bodies divides the partners which replied to the July 2000 questionnaire almost equally.

Certain believe that civil society is properly represented and hope that the university sector will be reinforced and that networks of local authorities will make use of instruments of decentralization. In their view, the NGOs' mandate and statute as observers appears to be limiting and may sometimes give the impression of marginalizing NGOs. *It may be regretted that the mandates of NGOs as members of the MCSD are relatively short (two years): it is difficult in such a short time to develop and reinforce advocacy capacities ... Moreover, the process of opening up to civil society would be strengthened if it were broadened to take in a larger number of entities as members of the MCSD.*

Certain partners consider that the representation of civil society could be improved (particularly in the MCSD) through assistance for its participation in MAP meetings and activities. Others emphasize that civil society is not adequately represented since *the MAP machinery is still dominated by governments*. The MCSD, *in which civil society is the best represented, is a significant step in the right direction. But its role and function within the MAP system is not yet clear.*

5. Another idea shared by the majority of national NGOs, in parallel with the recognition of the disparities between the spaces which exist for the development of civil society in the Northern, Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean, is that the approach "**act locally, think globally**" remains necessary in relation to the protection of the environment. It is therefore believed that efforts should be made so that small associations always have the opportunity to express themselves at a regional level. However, it is often recalled that, without their integration into networks, even if only at the national level, isolated associations would not be able to understand the over-theoretical issues which arise in MAP meetings.

6. **Common action** is also considered to be essential to develop North/South cooperation. However, in a context in which civil society is emerging, *it is indispensable to bring coherence to the various initiatives undertaken at the Mediterranean level so that they are more comprehensible*. Concrete proposals are sometimes made for the pooling of information resources through links with certain major Mediterranean networks.

7. **The strengthening of Mediterranean networks** is also a very widely held idea. Thematic networks appear to be appropriate, but remain isolated. *One issue is how to develop bridges to optimize the various meetings and develop synergy between the respective activities and the reflection process*. MAP is requested to optimize international and regional Mediterranean networks *through support for their capacity to undertake common action*. It is believed that it is necessary to strengthen the use of networking technologies. *There are many cases of synergy in the activities undertaken which could lead to better communication, such as in the case of the preparation of the Strategic Document.*



## 1.2 Proposal for three strategic orientations

### 1.2.1 Reducing differences in levels of development

#### *1.2.1.1 Taking into account the specific characteristics of partners from the South and the East*

When it was launched in Barcelona in 1976, the Mediterranean Action Plan placed emphasis on the urgency of the problem of unbalanced development between the Northern and the Southern and Eastern shores of the Mediterranean basin. Its success today as a centre for international efforts to protect the Mediterranean Sea is due in particular to the will to take into account the differences in economic, social and cultural development between the two shores. And, "despite the shortcomings and criticisms which may be made, the Barcelona Declaration constitutes the founding act of the Mediterranean of the 21st century. One of its principal contributions is to have fully integrated the cultural dimension into its philosophy."<sup>2</sup>

These disparities are not new in the Mediterranean and, even though history is composed of a succession of steps forward and backwards, links and exchanges have always persisted between populations which are both drawn apart by their differences and aware of their common future.

In its collaboration with its various partners, MAP is therefore confronted with two civil societies. The action taken for the implementation of the protocols to the Barcelona Convention is not carried out on a level playing field, but against a background of tangible and moving characteristics. Reducing differences is a long-term objective and it cannot easily be hoped that the concerted action of the MAP could by itself contribute to finding solutions to the situation of commercial, material and financial dependency of the civil societies of the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean cooperation developed by MAP, with the support of governments, nevertheless constitutes a powerful rampart against the deterioration of these differences and the resulting instability. In particular, through all the activities carried out by MAP, it offers a unique forum for dialogue between governments, joined by the voices of Mediterranean NGOs, socio-economic actors and local authorities.

The fact of taking these disparities into account also amounts to recognition of the need to adapt action and projects to the national context, while maintaining the coherence of programmes covering the region as a whole. It would be utopic to believe in a significant change in the threats and pressures on the Mediterranean environment, without responses being found to the development aspirations of the populations on the Southern and Eastern shores which take into account their constraints.

The revision of the Barcelona Convention in 1995 and the creation of the MCSD in 1996 introduced the concept of the need for sustainable regional development, adapted to the environmental, economic, social and cultural capacities of the Mediterranean Contracting Parties. With the establishment of the MCSD, the major importance accorded to the participation of civil society is also a significant turning point in Mediterranean cooperation.

In this respect, it is certain that the coastal countries of Southern Europe have played and will in the future play a major role in the reorientation of purely economic

---

<sup>2</sup> Paul Balta, *Le Bassin Méditerranéen: Un espace en quête de sens?* Publisud, 2000.

Euro-Mediterranean cooperation towards a broader strategy designed to reduce disparities through the development of new forms of partnership.

Civil society in the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean is far from being homogeneous. There are great differences between the situation of the associative sector from one country to another. While there is no freedom of association in certain countries, in others there is a situation of supervised freedom, while in others there is an appreciable margin for manoeuvre. Above and beyond the diversities, different situations and exceptions, the components of civil society in the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean in their widest sense (associations, NGOs, socio-economic actors, local authorities) can hardly be considered to constitute real collective forces capable of influencing development and the future of their societies.

In a context in which civil society is perceived primarily as political opposition, the associations which endeavour to fulfil new social functions as partners of the public authorities are recent in their origin and fragile. It is therefore easy to understand that they are characterized by a low level of social representativity and an often elitist nature. The great majority of partner associations have nevertheless managed not to take up a political position and have succeeded in becoming partners of the public authorities in the pursuit of development. They are seeking, above all, to show their worth as partners of national administrations, as forces of dialogue, initiative and action, and not merely as palliatives for the shortcomings of states related to the traditional faults of administrations, namely financial restrictions, shortcomings, routine, immobility and sectoral approaches.

#### *1.2.1.2 Strengthening assistance to partners in the South and East*

**Assistance to their partners in the South and East is clearly set out as an essential criterion for non-governmental bodies to be able to cooperate with the MAP system.** In parallel with taking into account the specific characteristics of development, the partners in civil society in the North have the responsibility of bringing their other partners closer to their own level. This means the levelling of their organizational, technical and managerial capacities. Through their experience, they can also guide their partners towards greater effectiveness in their relations with their governments, institutions and membership base.

Perhaps as much as financing, the partners in the South and East of the Mediterranean need support and the machinery and commitment of partnership with a view to continuity. The framework of collaboration with MAP can play the role of assisting in and safeguarding this continuity. With regard to NGOs in general, whether they are in the North or the South, they all need mutual assistance to guarantee themselves their own national audience: "we are not fully involved in the national process unless we gain international recognition."<sup>3</sup>

The strengthening of assistance can take several forms: strategic dialogue, institutional and financial support. Institutional support involves reinforcing the internal structural capacities of a non-governmental body, in parallel with the strengthening of its capacity to optimize its working relations with the other actors around it. Strengthening a non-governmental entity from the Southern or Eastern part of the basin means improving the performances of its activities and programmes, as well as re-orienting its general objectives and its impact at its base level.

---

<sup>3</sup> Interviews with NGOs in the Maghreb.

This is only possible through the double support of internal and institutional strengthening. It is nevertheless necessary for such support to be based on a participatory vision and not a conflictual approach to national administrations. The components of civil society are associations working in the interests of certain groups of the population. By their very nature, they have a specific function and will not replace government institutions, nor institutions in the commercial sector in the long term.

Assistance for the internal strengthening of non-governmental bodies in the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean will essentially take the form of training and advisory services to build their capacities and improve their professional competence, attitudes and knowledge. However, it also necessitates structural interventions, with a view to improving the approach adopted and the overall action of the non-governmental body within the national process in which it is working.

These structural interventions are difficult to implement in view of the psychological obstacles and resistance to which any project of organizational change gives rise, but they can be progressively accepted if they are accompanied by concrete projects and, in particular, financial resources. They may take the form of temporary support, consisting of identifying obstacles to the development of the organization, and analytical and structural support, which consists of identifying and selecting managerial approaches and options, and optimizing experience and professional expertise.

The difficulties and slowness involved in mobilizing financial resources are among the major obstacles, as emphasized in particular by the NGOs from the South and East in the interviews and in their replies to the latest questionnaire. Although all of them admit that MAP does not constitute a source of financing for their activities and programmes, most of them timidly reveal their urgent need for more accessible financial assistance.

**Rare are the NGOs from the South and East which have found solid and independent sources of financing. Most of them still depend on foreign sources.** The luckiest must nevertheless confine themselves to a limited role of executing activities, sometimes subject to concepts which are not the priorities of their membership. It is to be hoped that the strengthening of their institutions and capacities, in which they may be helped by their partners in the North, will enable them to overcome this poverty barrier. They will have to find better means of raising public awareness in their countries in the fields in which they are active, going back to their roots in their own local contexts and strengthening their links with civil society and other actors.

The replies to the questionnaire show that almost all the NGOs in the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean do not expect any form of financial assistance from their governments. They consider themselves to be merely tolerated and see themselves as being far from the concerns of their partners in the North, who are experiencing a crisis of identity of their own in their dual role as economic agents in a competitive context and social actors working for change.

The issue of the financing of NGOs in the South and the East is also related to the volume and sources of financing. While their partners in the North generally draw their resources from fund-raising campaigns, government assistance and income-generating activities, for those in the South external assistance for the implementation of specific projects is their main source of financing.

For many reasons, the partnership between the North and the South and East is dominated by this type of transfer of resources from the North to the South. Although the mediation of NGOs in the North is justified by the need to transfer managerial techniques and the professional expertise which has been acquired, it nevertheless constitutes a model of assistance which is based on donors from the North and beneficiaries in the South and the East, and which determines the procedures for the provision of the funds, their destination and supervision. Under this system of cooperation, it is inevitable that the NGOs in the North sometimes tend to impose their projects and underestimate the specific contexts of the beneficiaries.

The replacement of sporadic and uncoordinated aid by a concerted programme of Mediterranean cooperation would facilitate collaboration with NGOs and other entities of civil society by reducing constraints related to the seeking of contracts, and the conditions and unequal access to financing. When financing ceases to be the main priority, the partners are able to concentrate on the sharing of roles and resources in a context of complementarity.

**In this context, and within the framework of the real cooperation advocated by MAP, it is clear that energetic measures to mobilize resources must imperatively be taken to support the efforts made by civil society, and particularly in the Southern and Eastern parts of the basin, where it is vulnerable for all the reasons explained above.** Over and above the cooperation and financial assistance provided between NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors, two frameworks may be envisaged for such mobilization:

#### The MAP framework:

The budget of the Mediterranean Action Plan is too low and it is urgent to call for it to be increased by the Contracting Parties in order to permit a minimum level of effectiveness in its collaboration with its partners in the South and the East.

The adoption of a new strategy of cooperation between MAP and its partners would require an increase in the budget envisaged in Chapter I.E *Coordination and cooperation with non-governmental organizations*. This increase outside the regular budget of MAP should be made available to the Secretariat for an initial period of four years, by means of an extraordinary contribution from the Contracting Parties, which are all perfectly well aware of what could be gained by strengthening the relevant activities of the partners in civil society.

This fund, which is called for by the MAP partners,<sup>4</sup> should in the first place and on an urgent basis be used to finance the components and activities proposed in the strategic directives for better cooperation between MAP and its partners. It would firstly make it possible to bring partners with a low level of resources up to a minimum but effective technical threshold, thereby permitting exchanges and dialogue with local associations and partners so that they can be associated more effectively in the Mediterranean dialogue, which is what the whole of the civil society in the North, South and East is demanding over and above everything else.

It will also serve to provide resources for common projects identified by the MCSD and supported by the base. By coming closer to civil society in the field, the MAP partners would play a role in identifying and promoting projects, and could be engaged to execute components for which they have expertise. A large number of the partners which are currently included on the MAP lists have the necessary

---

<sup>4</sup> Essentially NGOs in the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean.

expertise and sufficient knowledge of local conditions to organize and provide technical assistance and training on the job for public and private projects in the fields of public awareness, impact studies, scientific diagnoses, the planning of wet areas and other protected areas.

The fund could assist NGOs, socio-economic actors and local authorities to undertake evaluation activities and social impact studies for certain environmental projects and directives. These evaluations could play the role of identifying key actors, proposing an appropriate framework for their participation and determining social and institutional obstacles and factors of success.

#### Inter-governmental partner organizations:

The cooperation between MAP and its partners in civil society is of interest to inter-governmental organizations which have participated in supporting MAP. It is the responsibility of MAP to ensure that all the sources of funding and the financial instruments of the United Nations system, the European Union, the World Bank and other Mediterranean and Arab financing systems, in particular, are more transparent for its partners in civil society. Through better information and involvement, they would be able to support MAP's priorities and its major activities more effectively and integrate into their strategies the coherence of the associative activities which can be guaranteed by the MAP Secretariat.

By providing its partners in the South with better access to strategic information on financial resources and the working methods of the various potential donors, MAP could adapt the ambitions of their programmes more effectively to the implementation of its new strategy and to the strengthened capacities of its most active partners: networks of major cities, networks of associations and regional economic actors.

#### *1.2.1.3 Improving the capacities of partners in the South and East*

The expertise and knowledge of local conditions possessed by certain partners, and particularly those which form part of networks, today offers a useful conduit for the strengthening of the technical and organizational capacities of small non-governmental bodies.

The need for exchanges which is emphasized by all partners is felt to be essential by the organizations in the South. Even though it is still difficult to envisage very well-structured South/South contacts, there is a significant demand for the organization of exchanges of experts and knowledge within an annual framework under the aegis of MAP.<sup>5</sup> This involves exchanging expertise, identifying the experience of others, comparing points of view and creating platforms for dialogue between the partners on the two shores of the Mediterranean.

While exchanges, training and organizational development are basic requirements for the acquisition of expertise, they can only contribute to the sustainable strengthening of capacities within a context of concerted structural adaptation, which MAP alone is currently in a position to guarantee through the continuity of its objectives and action.

---

<sup>5</sup> A very common proposal in the replies of partners to the latest questionnaire. See the section on *the perspective of the partners*.

The strengthening of the capacities of non-governmental bodies in the South and the East should be planned in concert with the MAP system and its partners. It will be necessary to establish new methods of work and collaboration, with local initiatives being taken by the base groups. Within such a framework, the strengthening of the capacities of partners in the South and East could have a direct impact on raising the level of human resources for the whole of civil society.

Investments in human resources are therefore necessary if it is wished to see NGOs in the South and East becoming ready to take on new roles and more independent positions in a context of programmed and long-term financing. It is also necessary to train professionals from the South in new methods of participatory planning, organizational development, information and financial management.

To assume these roles and relations, the partners in the South and East will have to acquire new competences in the fields of public relations, mediation, dialogue and influence. But, in particular, they will have to go beyond their "social positioning" and their competition to create new partnerships, share roles, expertise and responsibilities. By becoming stronger, the partners will in turn have the responsibility of developing the capacities of their membership base so that everyone can participate with a better knowledge of what is at stake, and thereby reduce the divide between the informed militant elite and the ill-informed and passive population.

The improvement of capacities also depends on the legitimacy and responsibility of the partners, irrespective of their public and their influence. It involves the introduction of democratic methods of management and the distribution of responsibilities, which are necessary if they are to be recognized as legitimate members of the emerging Mediterranean civil society. All the social actors gain their legitimacy from having their roots in a local process, a committed support group in their own country and the alliances that they develop with the rest of civil society. A sense of responsibility at the institutional level is a prerequisite if they are to sit at the MAP negotiating table.

## 1.2.2 Improving MAP's operational tools

### *1.2.2.1 Integrating partnership into project implementation*

In addition to its role as a catalyst for dialogue between Mediterranean countries, MAP undertakes research activities and scientific studies. Cooperating with its partners means (in etymological terms) operating and working with them. While the framework offered by the MCSD is one of dialogue on an equal footing between governments and civil society, it is nevertheless true that common activities and projects should constitute an indispensable component of practical cooperation for the achievement of the objectives set out in the protocols.

The global approach to problems as determined by MAP, and its role of providing expertise and scientific analysis, enable it to monitor the relevance with which roles are distributed and avoid redundancy and the futile duplication of experience.

By making judicious use of the current expertise of MAP partners, it would be possible to undertake common projects and activities in all the priority fields: water demand management, the sustainable management of coastal areas, sustainable development indicators, tourism, information, awareness-raising, environmental education and participation, free trade and the environment, industry and urban development. In addition to effectiveness in the implementation of activities, these

partnerships would consolidate cooperation within the whole MAP system. In a context of strengthened partnership, the role of the Coordinating Unit and the Regional Activities Centres would be lightened and would consist of providing additional technical and administrative support.

Through partnership with local authorities and Mediterranean cities, it would be possible to take greater account of the use made of the available space, the importance of which is often underestimated. Since land use planning has rarely been integrated into economic and social planning, it is necessary for a global review to be undertaken of the model of human settlement and the process of urbanization. The role of MAP in this respect would be to undertake prospective work for a regional development strategy integrating priority actions so that their effects and impact could be evaluated. The establishment of such a global regional strategy should come before any hierarchy is determined for priorities.

#### *1.2.2.2 Improving current partnership tools*

The MCSD is one of the principal tools of MAP's cooperation with its non-governmental partners. Established in 1996 as a consultative body, it has attached significant importance to the participation of civil society as a whole alongside government representatives.

It may be considered that, at the current stage of its development and in the overall Mediterranean context, it is broadly representative of the emerging dynamic involving governments and civil societies. Giving greater importance to this new representation does not have to be reflected in terms of the number of members, but rather in the relevance, effectiveness, quality and, in particular, the representativity of partners in civil society.

While the representativity of partners remains their own internal challenge if they are really to be able to speak on behalf of their civil society, the effectiveness and quality of their participation depends to a great extent on the judicious choices to be made by the MCSD in being able to use the most appropriate actor at the right time to pursue priorities more dynamically and broadly.

In view of the institutional and operational diversity of partners in civil society, it is difficult to achieve a perfectly balanced representation in the MCSD. The question should arise more in terms of activities and integration into a common strategy, rather than of an egalitarian tribune for the dissemination of the ideas of partners. In other words, the MCSD should remain much more a tool for decision-making and launching interventions than a forum for debate. Its numerical expansion is not desirable, in the sense that the pressing need is for greater effectiveness and the focusing of the considerable expertise which has been accumulated on Mediterranean issues.

The MCSD offers a framework within which each government in the Mediterranean cannot disregard the trends in Mediterranean civil society. Through networks and other exchange activities, the non-governmental partners have to innovate and invent a form of participation which is more global and which stimulates them to seek complementarity and expertise which is as close as possible to the population.

As noted in many reports<sup>6</sup>, the participation of local authorities, NGOs and socio-economic actors in the decision-making process relating to sustainable development is in itself important recognition by Mediterranean governments and the European Community of their importance and their potential contribution. On the other hand, this legitimization of their activities should be accompanied by a consensual concern on their part to avoid interference in political decision-making processes and to avoid the suspicion of serving partial interests.

An improvement in the participation of civil society in the MCSD should be accompanied by a process of broadening, through a rotation procedure, to take in other entities, such as universities, local authorities in medium-sized towns, certain groups of users, such as the hotel industry, the fishing industry, farmers, etc.

The participation of the members of civil society in the meetings and thematic working groups should become compulsory, provided that financial assistance is offered to the poorest of them.

#### 1.2.2.3 *Strengthening MAP as a focal point for partnership*

Irrespective of the extent to which they are organized, MAP partners do not as a group constitute a structure for concerted action. The process set in motion by MAP's activities and the relations that it maintains with its partners gives it the responsibility of strengthening its role as the focal point of a network.

In the absence of the establishment of a unit devoted to "**Cooperation with civil society**" in the Coordinating Unit of MAP, it is essential to entrust a member of the Secretariat with the task of implementing the cooperation strategy and maintaining constant links with the partners. Initially, the official's work would consist of organizing operational collaboration, communicating with and encouraging the involvement of the partners and setting up a database on the partners, based on the compilation of their articles, publications, studies and specific activities undertaken. The official should also supervise the improvement of the quality and media impact of the current Website.

The entries on the partners could include hyperlinks directly to their websites and the e-mail addresses of their focal points. The second section *Programmes and activities* would also gain from being expanded in the same way as *What's MAP*. The magazine *MedWaves* is not accessible and should be included in a better illustrated and more attractive format (PDF). In general, the appearance of the site should be considerably improved. The central panel, for example, should be designed as an entry point, well illustrated and offering links to updated news, studies and decisions. Item 5 *What's new* could then be eliminated.

During this preliminary phase, the MAP site could include a server dedicated to the partners, with a greater number of entries which would allow them to propose their own sites and those of their networks, and would include a search facility for the whole MAP site. An entry for *new partners* could be dedicated to new bodies, which would thereby be offered a temporary space to present themselves.

During a second phase, the establishment could be envisaged, with the support of the computer unit, of an intranet server for all the bodies in the MAP system which would provide significant space for its partners in civil society. The

---

<sup>6</sup> *Le rôle des ONG face aux problèmes d'environnement et de développement dans le contexte méditerranéen*, Paloma Agrasot, EEB, 1993.



intranet technology can play a considerable role in collaboration systems by providing an interactive platform which is easy to use and can support the development of complex database applications.

The intranet system is a network of computers which can share data through the use of protocols which are now standardized. MAP information would be stored on the Cooperation Unit's server and provided to each computer in the network connected by means of the usual navigator (Netscape or MS Explorer). Each person in the network could therefore have access to all authorized information on the server.

This infrastructure, based on Internet standards and technologies, would allow the secure sharing of data within a well-defined and limited group of MAP partners. It would also open the door to video-conferencing techniques, or more simply to on-line consultation forums, access to the MAP libraries and those established by the partners.

### 1.2.3 Promoting concerted action by the partners

#### *1.2.3.1 Further defining the role of the partners*

MAP cooperates with three major categories of partners in civil society: socio-economic actors, local authorities and NGOs. The diversity of the partners means that MAP has to distinguish carefully the roles of each of them in terms of action, geographical scope and technical expertise. Although these roles are not fixed in stone, when they are optimized they allow greater effectiveness in the common execution of approved programmes.

In its collaboration with civil society, it will not be a question of restricting participation to a "manageable" number of partners, but of encouraging the inclusion of the broadest number of bodies (in which priority would be given to networks) in the group, based on a specific role and strategy. The interventions and participation of the partners must be continuous within the network which is to be established and strengthened. But they will have to be managed on the basis of their relevance to their activities, their competence and MAP's strategy.

The real criteria of cooperation are in practice involvement in the MAP process and the expertise acquired by the partner. Irrespective of the size or scope of a partner, what is important is its involvement in common projects and activities, its expertise and its representativity as an actor in the civil society to be developed at the Mediterranean level.

Local authorities are called upon to play their role as new interfaces with governments. Whatever the level of decentralization they may have achieved, they are representatives of a civil society which is seeking greater autonomy and scope for its activities. Support should be given to all recommendations designed to strengthen them in networks, seek their improved participation and diversify their representation from major cities to medium-sized cities.

Contacts must be strengthened within regions, which would benefit from the integration of MAP's objectives into their development plans. This would require networks of coastal cities to become involved in the issues confronting their regions with a view to achieving more concerted physical planning of Mediterranean coastal areas.

Taking as a basis the eight themes retained as programmes of activities for the working groups of the MCSDD, and without wishing to over-schematize their interventions, the following distribution of roles may be proposed:

1.	Water demand management	International NGOs, thematic NGOs, NGO networks
2.	Sustainable management of coastal regions	Thematic NGOs, networks of cities, local authorities, NGO networks
3.	Sustainable development indicators	International NGOs, national NGOs, university networks
4.	Tourism	Thematic NGOs, socio-economic actors, national NGOs
5.	Information, awareness-raising, environmental education and participation	National NGOs, socio-economic actors, NGO networks
6.	Free trade and the environment	Socio-economic actors, international NGOs, NGO networks
7.	Industry	Socio-economic actors, international NGOs
8.	Urban development	Networks of cities, university networks, national NGOs, NGO networks

### 1.2.3.2 Promoting partnership networks

In the second part of this report, the principal criteria for selection and cooperation with MAP are identified. The criterion of ***involvement in active Mediterranean networks*** means the capacity to participate or organize a network at the national, regional or international level in the field of the environment or sustainable development in the Mediterranean.

It is evident that the logic of networking makes it easier to achieve the representation of all the partners in civil society. Nevertheless, the recommendations of the Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties emphasized the danger when advocating that networks should *act as focal points for the various NGOs they represent*. The recommendation is also applicable to networks of cities, socio-economic actors and local authorities.

As the recognized focal point for Mediterranean issues, MAP and its operational instruments need to benefit more fully from their cooperation with the major Mediterranean networks, such as: MIO-ECSDE, MED Forum and MedCoast, which are very active federations involved in MAP activities; MedCities, which is involved in decentralized cooperation and the institutional development of coastal cities; MedEcomedia, for awareness-raising and information, etc. These major networks will be responsible for developing and launching national networks with a view to including smaller local associations in Mediterranean dialogue.

MAP should continue its active cooperation with international partner NGOs, such as MedWet, Greenpeace, WWF and others, which are prepared to integrate their networks in accordance with the focal role played by MAP. This wealth of expertise offers the advantage of covering all the coastal countries by gathering together real forums of NGOs, government representatives and inter-governmental organizations.

Integration into networks should promote cooperation between partners at different levels and incite them to take advantage of their differences of scale to shed new light on the process of reflection and on the implementation of the selected activities. It should also make it possible to develop links with other groups in civil society with the goal of mutual support in their policies and operational activities.

#### *1.2.3.3 Including new partners*

**The role of the new “Civil Society Cooperation” unit will be to listen to, seek out and include all the components of civil society which can help MAP further its objectives, and which are not yet involved in its partnership.**

Its role will also be to encourage the acceptance of a **new type of partnership** between all the actors involved, through a new sharing of responsibilities between governments and local authorities, socio-economic actors and the emerging civil society of associations at all levels and of citizens' movements. None of these groups of actors can act on their own. The planning of development spaces in the Mediterranean (at the local, national and regional levels), taking into account short- and long-term priorities, cannot be achieved merely on the basis of unbridled market forces, nor through the bureaucratic approach of governments, nor indeed through the exclusive management of complex issues by associative initiatives.

It is therefore urgent to actively seek the involvement of larger numbers of representatives of the local authorities of Mediterranean cities, particularly by opening the door to medium-sized coastal cities of over 20,000 inhabitants. Through their networks, the local authorities of coastal areas should be better informed of MAP's activities and invited to participate. As important actors in urban and coastal areas, architects and urban planners should also be included in cooperation with MAP through their major organizations, UAA and IUA.

MAP should pursue and reinforce its collaboration with the partners involved in public mobilization for Mediterranean cooperation and should include **new organizations which are close to consumers and cultural associations** in Mediterranean cities.

Education and universities constitute a very broad field which the “Civil Society Cooperation” unit should also include in its partnership. Above and beyond their educational mission, universities offer significant potential at the managerial level which could assist in advising in the implementation of local development projects and in strengthening the technical capacities of partners at all levels, from small associations to large NGO networks and socio-economic actors. For their part, governments should associate their national organizations with the dissemination of information in schools and universities on the major issues covered by the Mediterranean Action Plan and should propose activities in which young persons can participate directly.

## 2. Revision of the list of MAP partners

The list of MAP partners is a working tool for the MAP system, serving to identify the most appropriate partner (in a particular field, geographical area or operational context) for participation in its activities (general and specialized meetings, MCSD, common projects, etc.).

It also serves as recognition, by virtue of its conformity with predetermined criteria, of the relevance of the partner to MAP's objectives and programmes.

The third purpose of this updated list, which has been distributed to all the partners, is to allow them to get to know each other better and to contact each other.

The list currently raises two problems which need to be resolved: readability and the pertinence of the information that it contains. It is therefore necessary to:

1. Improve this MAP working tool
2. Periodically clarify and evaluate the relevance of the partner organizations included on the list so as to respect the criteria for inclusion, as well as the criteria for retention and collaboration (which will be analysed).

### 2.1 Relevance of partners according to the new criteria

#### 2.1.1 Analysis of the criteria

Before assessing the relevance of the partners, it is necessary to determine the basis upon which this is to be done. The new criteria to be taken into account should therefore be identified, following an analysis of their development over the various important MAP meetings.

In 1989, Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure of MAP was amended to specify the policy advocated by the Contracting Parties and the Secretariat and provides that *"The Executive Director shall, with the tacit consent of the Contracting Parties, invite to send representatives to observe any public sitting of any meeting or conference (...) any international non-governmental organisation which has direct concern in the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution."*

This initially timid approach progressively evolved towards an extension of the geographical and material scope of the partners. In the case of NGOs, the first criteria for the eligibility of these non-governmental bodies to cooperate with MAP were set out at the Ninth Meeting of the Contracting Parties in June 1995 (Annex XIII, Appendix II) and concern the possibility of the "exchange of information" and *"(...)"* for NGOs to attend MAP meetings".

It should be noted that the criteria for inclusion in the list of partners, to which reference is made in the constitutive documents of the MCSD and the latest recommendations of the Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties, are only mentioned indirectly and are assimilated to mere conditions for access to MAP information in Chapter 2. *Exchange of information, "Any non-governmental organisation (...) which is concerned primarily with environmental issues and sustainable development in the Mediterranean (...) and is free from concerns of commercial or profit making nature may exchange information with MAP and receive information from it."* This very general indication is immediately followed by the

conditions which must be fulfilled by an NGO applying for access to information and which, worded differently, in our view constitute veritable basic criteria for the inclusion of NGOs<sup>7</sup> in the MAP list.

1. The relevance of the NGO's aims and activities to the MAP goals stipulated in the Barcelona Convention and its protocols.
2. The existence of a constitution (...) its programme of activities and an elected bureau.
3. The establishment of its headquarters or one of its offices in a Mediterranean country (for at least two years).
4. Indication of the assistance that it can provide to the furtherance of MAP's policies.

However, according to the recommendations of the Ninth Meeting of the Contracting Parties, these criteria for inclusion in the MAP/NGO List of Partners do not give automatic access to MAP meetings.

With regard to the "possibility for NGOs to attend MAP meetings", it should be noted that these consist more of indications of selection priorities and clarification of the responsibilities of NGOs than of real criteria. The selection priorities depend on the general or specialized nature of the meetings.

For general meetings, priority is given to the international or regional scope of the NGO and its pluridisciplinary interests, as recognized in its constitution, as well as a multinational representation on its governing board. This priority for access to general meetings is supplemented by the scope of the NGO's activities, which must "be concerned with matters covering a substantial portion of MAP's field of activity" and leaves open the possibility of "a rotating representation (...) of some national organisations which are equitably selected" from the Mediterranean region.

With regard to the specialized meetings of MAP, priority is given to the regional scope of the organization, which should preferably be as broad as possible, and the organization is to be invited on the basis of its particular interests which should be concerned with matters covering a specific portion of MAP's field of activity.

In view of the criteria for inclusion on the list of partners, indicators for the verification of their eligibility were established in the form of a "dossier to be submitted by the NGO in question containing information on" the above points, and in particular:

---

<sup>7</sup> At the time of Ninth Meeting of the Contracting Parties, the term NGO probably excluded the other categories of MAP partners (socio-economic actors, local authorities). It will be seen that in the most recent reports, even though there remains some ambiguity concerning the meaning of "civil society", the partnership is broadened and more clearly defined.

**Table 1**

<b>Justifications</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
Constitution or terms of reference + rules of procedure + list of members of the governing board and bureau	General eligibility International/regional/national
Programme of activities for next 2 years	Relevance of goals and activities Determination of fields of competence
Evaluation of activities in previous years	Idem + commitment to MAP objectives
NGO's proposals to improve Mediterranean cooperation	Indication of contribution that could be made by NGO
Budget for past year and coming year	Adequacy of resources for stated competence

After clarifying the criteria for inclusion on the list of partners and specifying indicators for the verification of their eligibility, the Ninth Meeting determined the "responsibilities of invited NGOs in their relations with MAP", which took the form of directives more than mere recommendations.

These responsibilities may be considered, worded differently, not as criteria to evaluate the possibility of inclusion on the list of partners, but rather as a series of criteria for cooperation for partners on the MAP list.

- Cooperation with MAP for the furtherance of the objectives of the Barcelona Convention and its protocols and responsibility for implementing the mutually agreed programme of collaboration;
- Dissemination of information on MAP policies;
- Individual or collective collaboration in the implementation of MAP policies and programmes;
- Providing MAP with information on the NGO's reports and publications;
- Informing MAP of changes in their structures, interested public and secretariat.

Based on the original text, it will be seen below how these criteria evolved towards the recommendations adopted by the last meeting of the Contracting Parties, on the basis of which the relevance of the partners will be analysed.

This latter meeting, the Eleventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties, was held in October 1999 in Malta and approved the recommendations on MAP/NGO cooperation, in Annex IV, Appendix V. These recommendations, which include the new selection criteria for the list of partners, are addressed to governments, NGOs and the Secretariat.

Paragraph C9 provides that "*selection of NGOs to be incorporated in the MAP/NGO List of Partners shall be based on the real profile (competence in the*

*thematic field) of the organization which will be illustrated in a dossier to be submitted by the NGO in question containing information on:*

- *main objectives and field of competence of the organization;*
- *NGO constitution, terms of reference, or articles of association;*
- *activity and financial reports;*
- *bulletins and media articles published by the organization.”*

It is specified in paragraph C10 that *“the selection of organizations to be incorporated in the MAP/NGO list of partners is to follow the same criteria used in the selection of the members of the (...) MCSD, namely selection of organizations representing three categories: local authorities, socio-economic actors and environmental NGOs.”*

As will be seen in the recapitulation in Table 3 of the development of the criteria and recommendations, and before examining the constitutive documents of the MCSD, to which reference is very clearly made, mention should be made of the lightening of the conditions for inclusion in the list of partners set out in C9, with no other reference than to the criteria for admission to the MCSD and a series of recommendations (B1-B9) which, as noted above, could be very pertinently reformulated and used as criteria for retention and cooperation in the list.

By virtue of the constitutive documents of the MCSD, and particularly the composition of the Commission, 21 places are reserved for representatives of the Contracting Parties and 15 for partners, who are subdivided into three categories, for which specific *methods of nomination* and *selection criteria* are attributed.

(i) Local authorities:

These are proposed by governments of the Contracting Parties. The only criterion for their participation and membership of the MCSD consists of being *“concerned with environmental and sustainable development issues”*. This amounts to selecting almost all Mediterranean cities as potential participants in MAP meetings. This is justified when it is considered that Mediterranean cities are the spaces in which environmental issues have the highest media profile and in which most of the activities of environmental and development associations take place.

It would however be appropriate to take into account the level of their involvement in the context of general and specialized meetings and to propose a classification of local authorities into two groups:

- General meetings: coastal cities (maximum 50 kilometres from the coast) of over 200,000 inhabitants.
- Specialized meetings: coastal agglomerations of over 20,000 inhabitants with experience to disseminate or which are faced with problems of specific interest.

(ii) Socio-economic actors:

The criteria established (North/South representation, developed/developing countries, rural/urban, activities at the Mediterranean level) appear to be suited to major actors with regional activities in the Mediterranean. These could be given priority for general meetings.

The establishment of a sub-category of national, or even local actors, highly involved in aspects of themes, could be of interest for the specialized meetings of MAP and the MCSD. In this case, selection in the sub-category could take into consideration one of the thematic areas covered by MAP (urban waste management, sustainable tourism, sustainable fishing and aquaculture, etc.).

(iii) NGOs:

The first selection criteria for NGOs which are candidates for membership of the MCSD is to be included on the list of MAP/NGO partners. This means that they have to respond to basic criteria as they may be understood from the recommendations of the Ninth Meeting of the Contracting Parties, which are analysed above. This is the principal criterion.

The second criterion is based on the status and geographical scope of the NGO's activities, namely NGOs with global scope, NGOs with regional scope and NGOs with national and local scope. In practice, this opens the door to all the NGOs included on the MAP list and, in this respect, is not a principal criterion.

The third criterion is based on the NGO having a concrete and action-oriented approach towards the Mediterranean. This criterion is repetitious, since it is partially covered by the first criterion, which encompasses this definition.

**Table 2**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>NGOs</b>	<b>SE actors</b>	<b>Local authorities</b>
• Involvement in environmental and sustainable development issues			●
• North/South/East representation		●	
• Developed/developing countries		●	
• Rural/urban		●	
• Activities at the Mediterranean level		●	
• Inclusion on the list of MAP partners	●		
• With global scope	●		
• With regional scope	●		
• With national/local scope	●		
• Having a concrete and action-oriented approach towards the Mediterranean	●		

If the basic criteria and the "responsibilities" of NGOs are examined, as approved at the Ninth Meeting of the Contracting Parties, and are compared with the latest recommendations of the Eleventh Meeting, it may be concluded that:

**the criteria for the selection and inclusion of NGOs on the MAP list of partners have not changed and are still as follows:**

1. Relevance of the aims and activities of the NGO to the MAP goals stipulated in the Barcelona Convention and its protocols.
2. Existence of a constitution, a programme of work and an elected bureau.



3. Establishment of the headquarters of the NGO, or of one of its offices, in a Mediterranean country (for at least two years).
4. Indication of the contribution that it can make to the furtherance of MAP's policies.

**Table 3**

**The recommendations which are the criteria for cooperation with NGOs in the list of MAP partners have developed between 1995 and 1999 as follows:**

Recommendations 9 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of CPs	Recommendations 11th Meeting of CPs
1. Cooperation with MAP for the furtherance of the objectives of the Barcelona Convention and its related protocols and responsibility for implementing the mutually agreed programme of collaboration.	1. NGOs shall fully cooperate with the Mediterranean countries and MAP Secretariat for the furtherance of the objectives of the Barcelona Convention and its protocols.
2. Dissemination of information on MAP policies and programmes.	2. NGOs shall provide the MAP Secretariat regularly with information on their activities and changes in their structures.
3. Individual or collective collaboration in the implementation of MAP programmes.	3. NGOs shall build and strengthen national and regional networks, with wider representation of Mediterranean NGOs in the networks
4. Provision of information to MAP on the NGO's reports and publications.	4. NGOs shall cooperate individually and collectively (networks) in the implementation of MAP programmes and shall prepare qualitative inputs to MAP research projects.
5. Informing MAP of changes in their structure, interested public and secretariat.	5. Sharing of experience and lessons, communication and exchange of information within the various NGOs shall be strengthened.
	6. Encourage networks of NGOs to be present in MAP meetings by sending relevant experts.
	7. NGO networks shall guarantee to act as focal points for the various NGOs they represent.

Recommendations 9 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of CPs	Recommendations 11th Meeting of CPs
	8. NGOs shall disseminate information on MAP activities through their newsletters, Internet web pages and through other channels in order to make MAP's efforts and importance in the Mediterranean better known to the public at large.
	9. NGOs shall be encouraged to invite MAP representatives to participate in their ordinary meetings.

An attempt will be made to analyse each of the recommendations adopted by the Eleventh Meeting and to regroup them, with a view to retaining those which are most applicable as criteria for cooperation/retention on the list of MAP partners. These new criteria should also permit the criteria for inclusion on the list to be updated.

**Table 4**

**Means of verifying the extent to which a partner meets the cooperation criteria:**

1. *Main objectives and fields of competence of the organization;*
2. *NGO constitution, terms of reference, or articles of association;*
3. *Activity and financial reports;*
4. *Bulletins and media articles published by the organization.*

<b>Recommendations (11th Meeting of CPs)</b>	<b>Criteria to be retained</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>
1. Cooperation in the furtherance of the Barcelona objectives.	Unreliable criterion, because it is too general. Can only be verified jointly with several criteria. Could be used as criterion for inclusion and classification on the list to identify the fields in which the candidate is active and the scope of its activities.	3 + 4
2. Regular provision of information to MAP on the partner's activities and changes of structure.	CRITERION 1 To be retained. <b>Provision of regular information to MAP.</b>	2 + 3 + 4
3. Development of national and regional networks.	NEW CRITERION 2 To be retained. <b>Network or integration in active Mediterranean networks.</b>	1 + 2 + 3
4. Cooperation in the implementation of MAP programmes through their contribution to projects.	CRITERION 3 To be retained. <b>Contribution to MAP programmes and projects.</b>	3 + 4
5. Developing the sharing of information between NGOs.	NEW CRITERION Not to be retained – can be included in criterion 2.	
6. Attendance at MAP meetings.	NEW CRITERION 4 To be retained. <b>Involvement in MAP activities.</b>	3
7. Networks acting as focal points for NGOs they represent.	NEW CRITERION Not to be retained. Could be included in criterion 2.	
8. Dissemination of information on MAP activities.	CRITERION 5 <b>Dissemination of information on MAP activities.</b>	3 + 4
9. Invitations to MAP to participate in NGO meetings.	Not to be retained. Can be included in criterion 1.	

There is therefore a series of criteria against which the current list of MAP partners will be analysed and an opinion formed on the manner in which they meet the retention criteria identified above. For this purpose, use will be made of the documentation and reports available in the MAP archives and the replies to the various questionnaires sent out since 1998.

### 2.1.2 Results of applying the retention criteria

Taking into account the recommended strategy, which is based on the fundamental objectives of MAP, the recommendations of the Contracting Parties and the various discussions concerning partnership, a hierarchy will be proposed for the selection criteria according to the importance attached to each criterion.

A preliminary hypothesis for the hierarchy of these criteria - 43221 - would adopt the following weighting coefficients.

**Table 5**

<b>Criteria retained</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Assessment aids</b>
CRITERION 1 <b>Provision of regular information to MAP</b>	4	Volume of mail. 98 survey
CRITERION 2 <b>Network or integration in active Mediterranean networks</b>	3	2000 questionnaire Library files
CRITERION 3 Contribution to MAP projects	2	Library files 2000 questionnaire
CRITERION 4 Involvement in MAP activities	2	Reports, meetings 98 survey 97 survey
CRITERION 5 Dissemination of information on MAP activities.	1	Library files 2000 questionnaire

This means that **the first criterion considered to be the most important for the purposes of cooperation is the provision of regular information to MAP**. The ratings attributed to each partner have a coefficient of 4. The assessment for this criterion consisted of examining the detailed files on each partner and additional information from the various reports on cooperation.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Reports on *Collaboration PAM/ONG: Panorama*, by Sandrine Scardigli, UNEP, Athens, 1998, and *An examination by the Secretariat*, UNEP, Athens, 1997.

**The second important criterion is the capacity of the partner to participate in active Mediterranean networks.** This is given a coefficient of 3. The assessment of this criterion was based on the documentation available within MAP on the activities, constitution and objectives of partners. Detailed questions in the last questionnaire in July 2000 also contributed to estimating the capacities of partners which replied.

**The third criterion is the contribution to MAP projects.** This is given a coefficient of 2 and has been assessed through an examination of the documentation which is available for certain partners (activity reports) and knowledge of the scope of their current activities.

**The fourth criterion is involvement in MAP activities.** This has a coefficient of 2 and has been assessed on the basis of participation in meetings, MAP invitations and general involvement in its activities.

**The fifth criterion is the dissemination of information on MAP activities.** Since this depends largely on the financial capacities of each partner, its coefficient of 1 is the lowest. It was assessed on the basis of the documentation, brochures and websites of the partners.

The matrix for the rating was entered into a programme so that the weighted rating was calculated automatically and so that other assessors could produce a second rating. For this, it is sufficient to change the value of the weighting coefficients indicated under each criterion to see the final classification of the rating, which depends in each case on the range of criteria retained. Table 6 below recapitulates the results of the hypothesis for the range of criteria retained - 43221 - corresponding to the selection explained above. Each partner on the updated MAP list has been rated from one to five according to the extent to which it meets each of the criteria retained. The rating coefficients are then applied.

It should be noted in the first place that the average for the group is around a rating of 27 (equivalent to 10 out of 20). It may be noted that 44 partners have a rating which is equal or above this average, or over 50 per cent of the partners. This means that half of the partners included in the list are below the expected average for their cooperation with MAP. With a certain magnanimity, it may be considered that with a rating of 24 the partner meets the cooperation criteria (equivalent to a mark of 8 out of 20), which produces a total of 29 partners which have a very low eligibility level for cooperation with MAP.

#### Rating Partner

- 
- 24 Cyprus Conservation Foundation (Cyprus)
  - 24 Underwater Research Society/Mediterranean Seal Research Group (SAD/AFAG) (Turkey)
  - 23 CEDIP - International Park Documentation Centre (Italy)
  - 23 OGP - International Association of Oil and Gas Producers (United Kingdom)
  - 22 IMC - International Marine Centre (Italy)
  - 22 Lebanese Environment Forum (LEF) (Lebanon)
  - 22 MAREVIVO - Associazione Ambientalista (Italy)
  - 22 MEA - Mouvement Ecologique Algérien - Algerian Ecological Movement (Algeria)
  - 21 MEDPAN - Mediterranean Protected Areas Network - (France)
  - 20 Legambiente (Italy)
  - 20 Sustainability Challenge Foundation (Italy)
  - 19 Association Internationale Forêts Méditerranéennes (France)
  - 19 JCI - Jaycees Ankara (Turkey)

- 18 Amigos del Mediterraneo (Spain)
- 18 AREA-ED - Association de Réflexion d'Echange et d'Action pour l'Environnement et le Développement (Algeria)
- 18 CYMEPA - Cyprus Marine Environment Protection Association (Cyprus)
- 18 Mediterranean 2000 (France)
- 17 Committee for the Protection of the Palm Island Protected Zone (Lebanon)
- 17 UNIMED - University of the Mediterranean (Italy)
- 16 EFT - Environmental Foundation of Turkey (Turkey)
- 16 IEF - International Energy Foundation (Libya)
- 16 SPNI - Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel (Israel)
- 15 Europe Conservation (Italy)
- 15 TÜDAV - Turkish Marine Research Foundation (Turkey)
- 14 AMPN - Association Monégasque pour la Protection de la Nature (Monaco)
- 14 SDA/ELS - Instituto Universitario de Ciencias Ambientales (Spain)
- 12 AMWAJ of the Environment (Lebanon)
- 11 PPNEA - Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment (Albania)
- 11 RC - Ricerca e Cooperazione (Italy)
- 10 Association de jeunes pour la protection de l'environnement (Algeria)

In the event that consideration were given to the recommendation to *attach priority to the practical nature of the partnership*, namely the third criterion (contribution to MAP projects) and the fourth criterion (involvement in MAP activities), the following weighting would be applied: 33441. This would give a slightly different list of partners with a rating of 24 or below.

- 24 Committee for the Protection of the Palm Island Protected Zone (Lebanon)
- 24 IEF - International Energy Foundation (Libya)
- 24 SPNI - Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel (Israel)
- 23 Association Internationale Forêts Méditerranéennes (France)
- 23 AREA-ED - Association de Réflexion d'Echange et d'Action pour l'Environnement et le Développement (Algeria)
- 23 CYMEPA - Cyprus Marine Environment Protection Association (Cyprus)
- 23 Mediterranean 2000 (France)
- 23 UNIMED - University of the Mediterranean (Italy)
- 23 EFT - Environmental Foundation of Turkey (Turkey)
- 20 TÜDAV - Turkish Marine Research Foundation (Turkey)
- 20 SDA/ELS - Instituto Universitario de Ciencias Ambientales (Spain)
- 19 AMPN - Association Monégasque pour la Protection de la Nature (Monaco)
- 17 PPNEA - Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment (Albania)
- 17 RC - Ricerca e Cooperazione (Italy)
- 16 Association de jeunes pour la protection de l'environnement (Algeria)
- 15 AMWAJ of the Environment (Lebanon)

In any case, the partners should be seriously informed of this situation and urgently requested to update and improve their cooperation with MAP.

**Table 6**

**Relevance of partners according to the new criteria**

**Rating and weighted results 4 3 2 2 1**

CR1 VERY IMPORTANT Regular supply of **information to MAP**, CR2 IMPORTANT **Integration in active Mediterranean networks.**

CR3 Contribution to MAP projects and CR4 Involvement in MAP projects. REASONABLY IMPORTANT CR5 Dissemination of MAP activities.  
NEUTRAL

Name of partner	Date Coop.	Status	Geographical scope	COMPETENCE	Category of partner	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5	TOT
MIO-ECSDE - Mediterranean Information Office for Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development (Greece)	1995	REG	Mediterranean	NGO network, public education, training, projects	INT NGO	3	5	4	5	3	48
MED Forum - Forum of the Mediterranean for the Environment and Sustainable Development (Spain)	1997	INT	Mediterranean	Sustainable development network	REG NGO	3	5	4	2	3	42
MEDCITIES Network (Spain)	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Cities network	Local authorities	2	5	3	5	2	41
Greenpeace International (Netherlands)	1995	INT	International	Network, pollution, pressure group	INT NGO	2	5	3	4	2	39
EOAEN - Chambers Group for the Development of Greek Isles (Greece)	1997	REG	Greece	Mediterranean islands, environment	S-E actor	1	5	4	4	3	38
MEDASSET - Mediterranean Association to Save the Sea Turtles (Greece)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Marine biodiversity, marine turtles, research, training	THEMA NGO	3	4	4	2	2	38
ECO Mediterrania (Spain)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Information network	REG NGO	2	4	3	4	3	37
IPIECA - International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (United Kingdom)	1995	INT	International	Petroleum industry network	S-E actor	3	5	3	1	2	37
MEDWET Network (Greece)	1995	INT	International	Regional network, wet areas, projects	INT NGO	2	5	4	2	2	37
APNEK - Association de protection de la nature et de l'environnement de Kairouan (Tunisia)	1995	NAT	Tunisia	Public education, local groups, desertification	THEMA NGO	2	3	4	4	3	36

Name of partner	Date Coop.	Status	Geographical scope	COMPETENCE	Category of partner	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5	TOT
ASCAME - Association of Chambers of Commerce of the Mediterranean (Spain)	1995	REG	Mediterranean	Transport, communications, tourism	S-E actor	2	5	3	2	3	36
Environnement et développement au Maghreb (ENDA) (Morocco)	1998	NAT	Maghreb	Public education network, Training, local action	REG NGO	2	5	4	1	3	36
CEFIC/EUROCHLOR - European Chemical Industry Council (Belgium)	1995	NAT	Europe	Chemical industry	S-E actor	2	3	3	5	2	35
FOEI - Friends of the Earth International (Belgium)	1995	REG	International	Environmental network, pressure group	INT NGO	2	5	2	3	2	35
Friends of the Earth Mediterranean Network (MEDNET)	1999	NAT	Mediterranean	Public information, pressure group	THEMA NGO	2	5	3	2	2	35
WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature (Italy)	1995	REG	International	Biodiversity projects, training, education	INT NGO	1	5	3	4	2	35
HELMPEA - Hellenic Marine Environment Protection Association (Greece)	1995	REG	Greece	Maritime industry, information, training	S-E actor	2	4	3	2	3	33
Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat (France)	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Wet areas, research, training	THEMA NGO	3	3	4	1	2	33
ICCOPS - International Centre for Coastal and Ocean Policy Studies (Italy)	1995	REG	International	Ocean coastal areas	INT NGO	2	3	4	2	3	32
Forum for the Lagoon of Venice (Italy)	1995	REG	Mediterranean	Med. lagoons, local action	THEMA NGO	2	4	3	1	3	31
AOYE - Arab Office for Youth and Environment (Egypt)	1995	REG	Arab countries	Public education, youth	REG NGO	2	3	3	2	3	30
Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED) (Egypt)	1996	REG	Arab countries	Network activities, public education	REG NGO	1	5	3	1	3	30
CETIMA - Centre d'études internationales du Maghreb et de la Méditerranée (Tunisia)	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Research, information	REG NGO	2	3	4	1	3	30
EEB - European Environmental Bureau (Belgium)	1995	NAT	Europe Mediterranean	Information network, research	INT NGO	1	5	3	1	3	30



Name of partner	Date Coop.	Status	Geographical scope	COMPETENCE	Category of partner	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5	TOT
Ellada Kathari/Clean-up Greece (Greece)	1999	NAT	Greece	Public education, training, local action	THEMA NGO	2	4	3	1	2	30
FOEME Middle East - Friends of the Earth Middle East (Israel)	1997	NAT	Middle East	Information, local action	REG NGO	2	4	3	1	2	30
ICAMAS - International Centre for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomics Studies (France)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Agriculture, research, training	THEMA NGO	2	3	3	2	3	30
EFMA - European Fertilizer Manufacturers Association (Belgium)	1996	REG	Europe	Fertilizer industry network	S-E actor	1	5	3	1	2	29
ICOMOS - International Council on Monuments and Sites (France)	1995	NAT	International	Cultural aspects	INT NGO	1	5	3	1	2	29
MEDCOAST (Turkey)	1996	NAT	Mediterranean Black Sea	Training, dissemination	REG NGO	2	2	3	3	3	29
MEDCOM - START Planning Committee for the Mediterranean (France)	1996	NAT	Mediterranean	Research, dissemination	INT NGO	1	5	3	1	2	29
TEMA - Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, Reforestation and the Protection of the Natural Habitats (Turkey)	1995	REG	Turkey	Public education, Training, projects	NAT NGO	2	3	3	2	2	29
ACOPS - Advisory Committee on Pollution of the Sea (United Kingdom)	1995	INT	International	Legislation, public education	THEMA NGO	2	2	4	1	4	28
Centre Méditerranéen de l'environnement (CME) (France)		NAT	Mediterranean	Public education, youth	REG NGO	2	3	3	1	3	28
CREE - Centre des Régions Euroméditerranéennes pour l'environnement (France)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Institutional network	REG NGO	1	4	3	2	2	28
FEM Fondo Euro Mediterraneo per lo sviluppo Socio-Culturale	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Média, cultural aspects	REG NGO	2	2	4	1	4	28
IME-MEDWAN - Institut Méditerranéenne de l'eau (France)	1995	REG	Mediterranean	Water, research, dissemination	INT NGO	1	3	3	3	3	28
MEDMARAVIS - Research and Conservation of Islands and Coastal Ecosystems in the Mediterranean (France)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Marine biodiversity, bird life, research	THEMA NGO	2	2	3	3	2	28
TURMEPA - Turkish Marine Environment Protection Association	1995	NAT	Turkey	Maritime industry, information,	S-E actor	1	4	3	2	2	28

Name of partner	Date Coop.	Status	Geographical scope	COMPETENCE	Category of partner	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5	TOT
(Turkey)				training							
Academia Mediterranea Halicarnassensis Foundation (Turkey)	1998	REG	Mediterranean	Research, training	UNIV ORG	2	3	3	1	2	27
ATUMED - Association Tunisie Méditerranée pour le Développement Durable (Tunisia)	1997	REG	Tunisia	Public education, local action	THEMA NGO	2	2	4	1	3	27
IJO - International Juridical Organisation for Environment and Development (Italy)		INT	International	Legislation, research	INT NGO	2	3	3	1	2	27
RIMMO - Réserve internationale maritime en Méditerranée occidentale (France)	1995	REG	Western Mediterranean	Marine fauna	THEMA NGO	3	1	3	2	2	27
Bird Life International (Spain)	1995	NAT	International	Bird life, biodiversity	INT NGO	1	4	3	1	2	26
CIIRC - International Centre for Coastal Resources Research (Spain)		NAT	Coastal areas	Coastal areas	INT NGO	2	2	4	1	2	26
FIS - Foundation for International Studies (Malta)	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Research, information	REG NGO	2	1	3	3	3	26
IOI - International Ocean Institute (Malta)	1995	INT	International	Oceans, marine environment	INT NGO	2	2	3	2	2	26
ASMAPE - Association Marocaine pour la Protection de l'Environnement (Morocco)	1997	NAT	Morocco	Public education	THEMA NGO	2	3	2	1	2	25
DHKD - The Society for the Protection of Nature (Turkey)	1995	REG	Turkey	Research, local action	NAT NGO	1	3	3	2	2	25
European Environmental Policy and Law Institute (EEPALI) (Greece)	1997	INT	Greece	Expertise, public information, training	THEMA NGO	2	2	3	1	3	25
Sea Turtle Protection Society of Greece (STPS) (Greece)	1999	INT	Greece	Turtles, local action	THEMA NGO	2	3	2	1	2	25
Cyprus Conservation Foundation (Cyprus)		REG	Cyprus	Biodiversity, training	NAT NGO	2	2	3	1	2	24
Underwater Research Society/Mediterranean Seal Research Group (SAD/AFAG) (Turkey)	1997	NAT	Turkey	Marine fauna, monk seal, public education	THEMA NGO	2	2	3	1	2	24
CEDIP - International Park Documentation Centre (Italy)	1995	REG	International	Protected areas, information, local action	INT NGO	1	3	3	1	2	23

Name of partner	Date Coop.	Status	Geographical scope	COMPETENCE	Category of partner	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5	TOT
OGP - International Association of Oil and Gas Producers (United Kingdom)		INT	International	Petroleum industry	S-E actor	1	3	3	1	2	23
IMC - International Marine Centre (Italy)	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Biodiversity, marine research	INT NGO	1	2	3	2	2	22
Lebanese Environment Forum (LEF) (Lebanon)	1997	INT	Lebanon	Networks, training	NAT NGO	0	4	3	1	2	22
MAREVIVO Associazione Ambientalista (Italy)	1995	INT	Italy	Local action, public education	NAT NGO	1	2	3	2	2	22
MEA - Mouvement Ecologique Algérien - Algerian Ecological Movement (Algeria)	1997	INT	Algeria	Local action, public education	NAT NGO	2	2	2	1	2	22
MEDPAN - Mediterranean Protected Areas Network - (France)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Protected areas	THEMA NGO	0	3	3	2	2	21
Legambiente (Italy)	1997	INT	Italy	Local action, public education	NAT NGO	1	2	3	1	2	20
Sustainability Challenge Foundation (Italy)	1996	REG	International	Sustainable development, training	THEMA NGO	1	2	3	1	2	20
Association Internationale Forêts Méditerranéennes (France)	1996	NAT	Mediterranean	Forests	THEMA NGO	2	1	2	1	2	19
JCI - Jaycees Ankara (Turkey)	1995	INT	International	Youth groups, training	INT NGO	0	3	3	1	2	19
Amigos del Mediterraneo (Spain)	1995	INT	Mediterranean	Public education, collaboration with local authorities	THEMA NGO	0	2	2	3	2	18
AREA-ED - Association de Réflexion d'Echange et d'Action pour l'Environnement et le Développement (Algeria)	1997	NAT	Algeria	Public education, training	THEMA NGO	1	2	2	1	2	18
CYMEPA - Cyprus Marine Environment Protection Association (Cyprus)	1995	INT	Cyprus	Information, training	S-E actor	1	2	2	1	2	18
Mediterranean 2000 (France)	1995	NAT	Mediterranean	Local action	NAT NGO	1	2	2	1	2	18
Committee for the Protection of the Palm Island Protected Zone (Lebanon)	1995	INT	Lebanon	Public education, local action	NAT NGO	1	1	3	1	2	17
UNIMED - University of the Mediterranean (Italy)	1995	NAT	Italy	University research	UNIV ORG	0	3	2	1	2	17
EFT - Environmental Foundation of Turkey	1996	NAT	Turkey	EIA training, public	NAT NGO	1	1	3	1	1	16

Name of partner	Date Coop.	Status	Geographical scope	COMPETENCE	Category of partner	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5	TOT
				education							
IEF - International Energy Foundation (Libya)		REG	Developing countries	Energy, information, training	INT NGO	0	2	3	1	2	16
SPNI - Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel (Israel)	1996	INT	Israel	Public education	NAT NGO	0	2	3	1	2	16
Europe Conservation (Italy)	1995	INT	Europe	Environment, cultural aspects	REG NGO	0	1	2	3	2	15
TÜDAV - Turkish Marine Research Foundation (Turkey)	1998	INT	Turkey	Research, public education	NAT NGO	1	1	2	1	2	15
AMPN - Association Monégasque pour la Protection de la Nature (Monaco)	1997	NAT	Monaco	Thematic research, local action	THEMA NGO	1	1	2	1	1	14
SDA/ELS - Instituto Universitario de Ciencias Ambientales (Spain)	1995	INT	International	Legislation	THEMA NGO	0	2	2	1	2	14
AMWAJ of the Environment (Lebanon)	1998	NAT	Lebanon	Public education	THEMA NGO	1	1	1	1	1	12
PPNEA - Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment (Albania)	1995	NAT	Albania	Public education	NAT NGO	0	1	2	1	2	11
RC - Ricerca e Cooperazione (Italy)	1996	REG	Italy + dev. countries	Social sciences	THEMA NGO	0	1	2	1	2	11
Association de jeunes pour le protection de l'environnement (Algeria)	1996	NAT	Algeria	Public education, youth	THEMA NGO	0	1	2	1	1	10

### 2.1.3 The need for other criteria?

The five criteria retained above make it possible to produce a fairly visible table of the relevance of cooperation between MAP and its partners. The rating system would gain from being tested by other assessors, who should endeavour to apply the following rules:

**The first criterion deemed to be the most important for cooperation is the regular provision of information to MAP.** The rating 0 is attributed to a partner which has not sent a single letter acknowledging the receipt or expressing thanks for the receipt of *MedWaves*, or for which there is not yet a clear file on its constitution, structures, activities and financial reports. Exemplary information gains the rating 5. A good level of information merits the rating 3.

**The second important criterion is the capacity of the partner to operate as/or in active Mediterranean networks.** The rating 0 or 1 is attributed to a totally isolated partner. A network such as MIO, MedWet or MedForum can obtain between 4 and 5. Small national networks or national associations collaborating with Mediterranean networks may be rated 2 or 3, according to the extent to which they are active.

**The third criterion is the contribution to MAP research projects.** This is rated on the basis of an examination of documents and an evaluation of the extent of their involvement and their expertise in the field. For example, WWF, MEDASSET and MedWet receive a rating of between 4 and 5 in view of the relevance of their activities in their thematic fields. A very dynamic local association can also obtain a high rating.

**The fourth criterion is involvement in MAP activities.** Extremely active partners which attend the principal meetings, such as Mediterranean networks and certain NGOs in the South and the North, obtain the highest rating (4 to 5). The rating must be indulgent for newly registered partners and for those in the South and the East (a minimum of 2).

**The fifth criterion is the dissemination of information on MAP activities.** Since this depends largely on the financial capacities of each partner, its coefficient of 1 is the lowest. It has been evaluated on the basis of the documentation, brochures and websites of partners. The rating has to be very magnanimous for new partners and those in the South and East.

During the first phase, and while awaiting the reorganization of the criteria described in this strategy, it appears futile to further burden the **cooperation criteria** for the selection of partners through the addition of further criteria.

## **2.2 Categories of partners**


The title currently used for the directory leads to confusion and includes MAP partners under the general title of "non-governmental organizations". In addition to its relations with governments, MAP collaborates with inter-governmental organizations, socio-economic actors, local authorities and national, regional and local non-governmental organizations. In accordance with the logic of the proposed strategy, the following title for the directory of partners is proposed:

*Répertoire des partenaires du MAP*  
*Directory of MAP partners*


2.2.1 Partners on the current MAP list

The current directory is a list made up in general of two non-governmental entities per page. The alphabetical order selected leads to some confusion, since the selection is sometimes made on the basis of initials and sometimes based on the full name. The titles of NGOs and other partners are not given great emphasis. The information provided on each body is fairly complete and well organized. There are 81 non-governmental bodies. According to the classification explained above, they are distributed as follows: 69 NGOs, of which 18 are international, 13 are regional, 25 are thematic and 13 are national. There are only nine socio-economic actors, one partner which may be considered to be a local authority and two which have been classified in a new category, namely educational and university institutions. A total of 57 partners are based in the North of the Mediterranean, and 24 are organizations from the Southern and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean.

INTERNATIONAL NGOs	18
REGIONAL NGOs	13
THEMATIC NGOs	25
NATIONAL NGOs	13
TOTAL NGOS	69
LOCAL AUTHORITIES	1
SOCIO-EC. ACTORS	9
UNIVERSITY INST.	2
TOTAL	81



Classification and distribution in the NGO subgroup



### **3. Proposed action**

#### **3.1 Endorsement of the criteria for selection and inclusion in the list of MAP partners**

The criteria set out by the Ninth and Eleventh Meetings of the Contracting Parties could be formulated as follows:

1. Relevance of the aims and activities to the MAP goals stipulated in the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.
2. Existence of a legally established constitution for at least two years, a programme of activities and a periodically elected bureau or leadership.
3. Establishment of the partner's headquarters or one of its main offices in a Mediterranean country (for at least two years).
4. Indication of the assistance that it can provide to MAP.

#### **3.2 Proposal for a new classification**

It is proposed to bring together all the MAP partners in the same directory. The format would be substantially the same as the present one, with changes in the classification and new indications making it possible to identify at a glance the field of competence and the classification of the partner. This would enable the Secretariat to identify rapidly the appropriate partner for a specific type of activity or meeting. An example of the new composition of the directory is attached in Annex (3.3).

The partners would be classified by alphabetical order (see the unclassified rating table) and by category. The entries for the coordinates of the focal points, telephone, fax and e-mail would be maintained. The new directory of MAP partners should divide all the partners into five major categories:

1. Intergovernmental organizations
2. Local authorities
3. Socio-economic actors
4. Non-governmental organizations
5. Educational and university institutions

##### **3.2.1 INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

- The focal points of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, the departments and major programmes of the Union which are currently associated with meetings and in the follow-up of MAP activities should appear under the same format as other partners. The entry would indicate the specific characteristics of the department or body.
- The focal points of United Nations agencies which cooperate with MAP, including WHO, IMO, WMO, UNESCO, IAEA, UNDP, FAO ...
- Development financing institutions, such as the World Bank, EIB, UNDP, World Environment Facility, METAP, the Arab League, etc.
- Partner conventions, such as RAMSAR and the Bonn Convention.



### 3.2.2 LOCAL AUTHORITIES

- All the municipal authorities engaged in cooperation with MAP should appear in the directory, with the coordinates of the focal point and other entries.
- The cities of Rome, Sousse, Calvia, Tripoli, Naples, etc.

### 3.2.3 SOCIO-ECONOMIC ACTORS

- The list of actors included should be supplemented and broadened with new profiles (professional groups for the hotel industry, the fishing and aquaculture industries, orders of architects and urban planners, etc.).

### 3.2.4 NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

In Table 6, the NGOs have been classified under the following four sub-categories:

1. International NGO, as recognized in its constitution and active at an international level.
2. Regional NGO, operating in a network of more than three Mediterranean countries, with a Mediterranean scope and coverage, even in cases where its constitution places it in the category of a national NGO.
3. Thematic NGO, very specialized and competent in a narrow or broader area of Mediterranean problems. These are the most numerous of the partners.
4. National NGO or network, which is active at the level of its own country with a Mediterranean vision.

### 3.2.5 EDUCATIONAL AND UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONS

This new category may include educational bodies, research foundations with a university or scientific vocation, regional Mediterranean institutes, school networks, etc.

## **3.3 Adoption of rules respecting involvement in MAP meetings and activities**

The principal partner organizations and international networks will be invited to all the relevant general meetings.

Specialized partner organizations and networks will be invited to meetings that are relevant to their field of activity.

Other partners and networks will be regularly informed of MAP activities and occasionally invited to meetings which are of particular relevance to their field of activity.

The status of partners in the MCSD will remain as it currently stands.

### **3.4 Transitional period for partners who do not at present adequately fulfil the cooperation criteria**

Partners which have not achieved an adequate rating with regard to the cooperation criteria will benefit from a period of one year to improve their situation.

If the assessment made at the end of this period is still inadequate, the organization will be removed from the list of partners.

### **3.5 Creation of a support fund for the NGOs**

Under the Chapter *Coordination and cooperation with non-governmental organizations*, a specific fund will be created to assist with the activities and facilities of partners with low levels of resources and those activities that are relevant to MAP's objectives.

## **ANNEX**



## Questionnaire July 2000

UNEP-MAP QUESTIONNAIRE July 2000

*Improving cooperation between the Mediterranean Action Plan- UNEP-MAP- and its partner Non-governmental Organisations*

*Hereafter the term NGO refers to all actors in Civil Society: NGOs, Local Authorities and Socio-economic actors.*

1. Relevance of the NGO's activities to MAP's objectives

11 Mention the main problems you encounter (max. 3) in carrying out your activities.

---

12 Mention one recent activity (in the last 2 years) which has influenced a governmental decision in your country, or in a regional or international context.

---

13 Mention 3 activities (max.) through which you feel you have supported MAP's aims and activities.

---

14 Mention 3 specific priority actions (max.) through which MAP could assist you.

---

2. Suggestions for improving cooperation between MAP and the NGO.

21 How can existing means of communication between you and MAP, and between you and the MCSD be improved.

---

22 **What do meetings of the MCSD represent for your organisation?** Tick 2 priority boxes.

---

An opportunity to fund your actions and programmes?

Media coverage for your achievements throughout the Mediterranean level?

An opportunity to exchange information and know-how?

An opportunity for joint action?

**23 How do you primarily envisage funding your cooperation with MAP (tick one box)**

---

- By drawing on your own resources?
- By requesting financial assistance from your government?
- By requesting financial assistance from inter-governmental institutions, other NGOs, other actors?

**24 How can you further strengthen MAP's activities**

---

- By providing training (expertise, material, teaching)
- By providing funding, either directly or through a project
- By providing information (local activities, public awareness raising, network activities, scientific documents and results).

**25 In your view is civil society well-represented in MAP forums?**

---

26 Mention 3 priority actions (max.) for improving cooperation between the NGOs to the North of the Mediterranean basin on the one hand, and those to the South and East on the other.

---

3. Your NGO's ability to become involved in MAP's Mediterranean networks.

31 Since when have you been using electronic means of communication (e-mail, Internet)?

---

32 Are you the focal point or webmaster for any network? If so, which?

---

33 Which NGO, local community or socio-economic actors' networks do you belong to?

---

34 Which NGOs or other elements of Civil Society do you feel are closest to you, for the purpose of setting up a network?

---

35 How many Internet-linked workstations are available to you?

---

36 Which of your activities do you feel would most benefit from your joining MAP's networks?

---