



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

EP



UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.155/3
16 March 1999

ENGLISH

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

Second Meeting of the Steering Committee of the
Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

Tunis, 8-9 March 1999

**REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE STEERING
COMMITTEE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Introduction

1. At its fourth meeting, which was held in Monaco from 20-22 October 1998, the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development decided to convene the second meeting of its Steering Committee (new title of its Bureau).
2. The second meeting of the Steering Committee, hosted by Tunisia, was held in the Khamsa Corinthia hotel, Gammarth, on 8 and 9 March 1999.
3. All the members of the Steering Committee, some of them accompanied by advisers, took part in the meeting, in other words: the Mediterranean Information Office for the Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development (MIO-ECSDE), Cyprus, Spain, the Chambers of Commerce Group for the Development of the Greek Islands (EOAEN), Monaco, the Municipality of Silifke, and Tunisia. The UNEP/MAP Secretariat acted as secretariat for the meeting. The full list of participants is attached as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the Meeting

4. The meeting was opened by H.E. M.Mehdi Mlika, Tunisian Minister of the Environment and Land Planning, and President of the MCSDs Steering Committee, who welcomed participants to his country. He thanked the Secretariat for its excellent preparatory work which provided such a solid basis for discussions. The main aim of the meeting was to examine the questions related to the Commissions method of work and its various components, the implementation and follow-up of recommendations, the preparation of a Strategic Review for the Year 2000 as established by its terms of reference, and cooperation with the United Nations and with national CSDs. It would have to define an operational process capable of giving the MCSD new impetus. From the word go, Tunisia had played a major role in MAP's new direction based on sustainable development, hosting the MED 21 conference in 1994. The setting-up of the MCSD, its novel composition and the importance of the work which it had already undertaken were achievements which the Steering Committee was called upon to consolidate.
5. Mr. L.Chabason, MAP Coordinator, thanked Tunisia for its warm welcome, and greeted participants on behalf of the Secretariat. The MCSD had already held four meetings, thus at this stage it was possible to provide a preliminary assessment of its achievements. The Secretariat's general feeling, as reflected in the report on the table, was that the Commission's thematic groups had done some very in-depth work, but that the conclusions and recommendations did not always express its wealth and scope. The procedures for implementation and follow-up should, therefore, be more clearly defined if recommendations were not just to remain a dead letter and, more generally, the Commission should be made more visible.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

6. The meeting adopted the draft agenda in document UNEP(OCA)MED WG.155/1.

Agenda item 3: Method of work and follow-up to recommendations

7. Mr. A.Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator of MAP, presented the report UNEP (OCA)/MED WG.155/2 structured according to the meeting's agenda, stressing the shortcomings on each point and ways to remedy them. It was a "critical", and at times "self-critical" report: although there was cause to be content with the work accomplished in the Mediterranean when compared

with other regions of the world, this was no excuse for sitting back on our laurels.

The Secretariat suggested amongst other things that recommendations could be honed according to the actors involved, they could be made more operational, they could be aired more widely to the outside world and even amongst members of MAP and the MCSD, partners could be clearly identified, an offensive information strategy could be adopted, and landmarks set. Although it was up to the States alone to implement recommendations, they could always be encouraged and boosted, and could be expected to provide information feedback.

8. During the ensuing general discussions all those who took the floor congratulated the Secretariat for the document before them, which tackled the problems both frankly and courageously, and in a very novel manner for MAP. However, was it not possibly a little too critical? Maybe the procedure applied to date should not be questioned quite so severely?

9. The opinions of participants on this point showed some variations. Two of them felt that the method of work and structure of the working groups should be seriously reviewed, with the groups becoming more responsible for implementation. Others felt that the groups should be free to decide themselves what method of work was most appropriate, depending on the theme which they were tackling. There was no doubt that recommendations should be rendered more effective, but within a flexible framework, using demonstration programmes, for example.

10. One speaker complained about the excessive number of international organisations at MCSD meetings; the Secretariat pointed out that although they should be more selective on this front, the political and technical support of certain organisations, which could moreover be involved in future thematic activities, should not be underestimated.

11. Another speaker felt that the Secretariat should work alongside the working groups on finalising the recommendations for the Contracting Parties, and that an initial examination of the finalised recommendations could take place at the meeting of focal points. Here, given the specific budgetary nature of the meeting of focal points two months prior to that of the Parties, the Secretariat felt that the Bureau was better suited to deal with this question.

12. In the view of another delegate, MAP's main contact was with ministries for the environment or foreign affairs, and the problem was to get recommendations through to the other ministries or services directly involved (as with tourism). Should task managers be made responsible for follow-up? What about "drafting in" the managers of the first two task forces whose recommendations had already been adopted for the meeting of the Parties in Malta where they could report on any loopholes or obstacles to implementation.

13. Participants unanimously recognised that there was a lack of information, which came out clearly in the report. Some of them recounted occasions when they had been present in bodies or forums dealing with Mediterranean issues, and had themselves witnessed the lack of awareness of the Commissions existence, and even more so of its work. There were many ways of righting this, and new communication technologies such as the web should be used to better effect. MAP's present website was not particularly attractive, and access to it should be made possible via the UNEP site, with the full range of the MCSD's activities and output being regularly updated. The targets for information- such as national CSDs- should also be identified at the outset, and there should be at least one focal point for sustainable development issues in each country. Finally, international organisations should also be sent all useful information, as they could act as relays for circulating the results of the Commissions work.

14. The question of financing provided the opportunity to mention the possibilities on offer from the EU within the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and its financial instrument, MEDA, the SMAP adopted in Helsinki, and the possibility of MAP acting as facilitator in this context, being expressly recognised by the Barcelona Convention as the framework for regional cooperation on environmental matters. In answer to a delegate who felt that other Directorates General apart from DG XI could usefully be approached, the Secretariat recalled that it was bound by strict rules on procedures for submitting dossiers, but that the members of the MCSD had greater scope for action on an individual basis. One delegate pointed out the interest of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's (UN/ECE) programme entitled "Environment for Europe". The possibilities offered by the sub-regional framework (RAMOGE, etc.) should also be checked out. For his part, the Coordinator recalled that MAP would be submitting a project on integrated coastal management to MEDA, and that the work accomplished on this theme by the Commission with its corresponding recommendations was a further asset which could be used to flesh out and enhance the dossier.

15. Summing up, the President noted consensus on three main thrusts: 1) identifying and preparing themes following in particular a participation-based approach, and bearing in mind the idea of added value; 2) planning themes according to objectives; 3) implementation of recommendations, which needed funds to be mobilised. A "standard assessment" could be worked out for each approach, and a SAP along the lines of the "land-based" SAP approved by the Parties at the Tunis meeting in 1997 could be established for the implementation of the themes. The President felt that the Committee's overall assessment of the work accomplished was positive, but that major efforts still had to be made on the diffusion and information fronts. This would require the setting up of an effective system vis-à-vis the region's decision-makers.

Agenda item 4: New themes and their selection criteria

16. The Secretariat presented the matrix for theme selection, inviting the Steering Committee to agree on the criteria and the new themes. The Secretariat would review and complete the matrix in the light of discussions and send out a new version to members. The new themes should be chosen at an early enough stage to allow for long-term work planning, with some even being entrusted to a group of experts rather than a working group.

17. The President opened discussions on this point with the premise that there was overlapping between several themes, and that they should be reorganised under broader "mega-themes", so to speak, their classification being reviewed from a more strategic angle. The same went for the criteria which should, he believed, centre on three notions: MAP priorities, coherence with international programmes being implemented in the region, and feasibility.

18. All members of the Steering Committee took the floor to support the call for rationalisation and simplification. The criteria could be ranked according to their importance, and be granted a degree of constraint.

19. According to several participants, however, too broad a classification of the themes would mean running the risk of diluting them. We could end up with overloaded working groups and a system which was hard to handle. Maybe the aspects or -sub-themes- to be given priority under each broader theme should be picked out? It would be better to remove the themes which had already been completed or were being implemented from the matrix, as well as certain themes dealt with elsewhere, particularly in order to respect the strategic reviews priority of not spreading too wide. Finally, entrusting certain themes to expert groups would mean undermining the very

philosophy of the MCSD.

20. Having made a detailed examination of several of the proposed themes, in particular “waste management and consumption patterns”, which sparked off a lengthy debate on whether or not a distinction should be drawn between production and consumption, participants backed the President’s compromise on 6 themes. However, EOAEN representative expressed reserves on the subject concerning the islands and proposed to submit a note at the next meeting of the MCSD. These are to be found in the “summary of conclusions from the Steering Committee”.

Agenda item 5: Strategic Review for the year 2000

21. Before opening discussions on this point, the President confirmed that Tunisia was offering to host MCSD 6, with a half-day ministerial segment. This segment would provide the opportunity to assess MED 21 five years on (MED 21+5), which would add a touch of formality to the event, and would create a stronger media impact.

22. The President emphasised how important the strategic review was, since it would mean that a “Mediterranean inventory” on sustainable development and the implementation of Agenda 21/MED 21 could be drawn up, and that relevant recommendations could be made. The Steering Committee should therefore give the Secretariat some guidance to assist it in drawing up a clear remit for carrying out the assessment, which would go to the next MCSD meeting in Rome.

23. At the request of participants, the Secretariat detailed the three options contained in the report for drawing up the strategic review: a team of external experts, a team of experts working on behalf of the members of the MCSD, a team from the MED Unit and the RACs with some ad hoc experts.

24. Most members of the Committee felt that it was better to combine the three options to end up with a balanced and effective formula. It was finally agreed that the work should be done by a team involving experts, members of the MCSD and Secretariat working in tandem. The team would be made up of seven members: 3 independent experts, 3 MCSD members (one state representative, the other two from the “NGO/socio-economic actors” and “local authorities” categories), and one representative from the Secretariat. One alternative would be to have a team of 9 members, with a second country representative and a representative for each of the major groups.

Agenda item 6: Cooperation with the United Nations and national CSDs

25. The President invited participants to start by examining the links which would have to be created with national CSDs. Initially, it would be the job of the Secretariat to establish where they already existed, and then to establish what approach to take. This would be made easier by the fact that, in many countries, the ministry of the environment held the presidency or vice-presidency of the national commission on sustainable development or some related body. Once the national CSDs had been identified, exchange of information and some form of cooperation would have to be organised with them.

26. For its part, the Secretariat added that the focus should not be exclusively on national CSDs. There were plenty of programmes (agendas 21) or institutions for the promotion of sustainable development at local level and, through its own example and activities, the MCSD should assist and encourage those countries which did not have them to introduce such instruments.

27. On the question of MCSD cooperation with the United Nations, the Coordinator recalled the efforts made by the Secretariat for the MCSD to take part in UN/CSD sessions, and the rather encouraging results achieved, which were an expression of increased recognition of MAP and MCSD activities.

28. The Deputy Coordinator confirmed the UN/CSD's interest in cooperating with the MCSD. Although no details were available as yet, it was foreseen that in late 1999 the two Commissions would jointly organise a workshop on national sustainable development strategies in the Mediterranean, as a cost-sharing exercise.

29. The Secretariat again raised the question of MCSD accreditation to the UN/CSD as an autonomous observer. The difficulty stemmed from the status of the MCSD and the presence of NGOs and socio-economic actors within the Mediterranean Commission, the present UN/CSD terms of reference only providing for participation by countries. Also, the MCSD case was the first of its type.

30. The meeting agreed that it was up to delegations from the Mediterranean countries in the UN/CSD to get the name of the MCSD and its activities known, so that the idea of its accreditation in its own right could gradually be put forward. It would also be good to organise a meeting of Mediterranean delegations under the Presidents guidance on the sidelines of every UN/CSD session, so that they could strive to present a "common front" or "alliance".

31. The Deputy Coordinator announced that, as well as a panel on regional seas which would take place during CSD 7, a special panel to introduce the MCSD was being planned for CSD 8.

32. On cooperation with the United Nations specialised agencies, the Coordinator recalled that although these agencies did not take part in the MCSD, some of them had been involved in the thematic activities (WTO for "tourism", UNIDO for "industry", etc.), and that this could be taken even further for future specific themes, possibly even appointing them as task managers. Two participants expressed reservations on this front, pointing out that task managers were a form of capacity building for the region, and that any involvement of international organisations would bring with it the risk of seeing a global vision being slapped on the Mediterranean.

33. At the suggestion of a participant, the meeting considered what attitude should be adopted vis a vis the many colloquia, seminars, conferences and meetings of every description which were regularly held on subjects falling within the Commissions ambit, many of which were assisted by the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. Obviously these could be used as a tribune to present Mediterranean achievements, although this would be purely on an individual basis and, given the number of "showcase" or "false frontage" events, there would also have to be prior assurances that these were serious gatherings.

34. One participant put forward the idea of organising a congress or major conference in the Mediterranean on sustainable development, with very broad participation (international organisations, universities, NGOs, companies, etc.), and this was accepted by the meeting. The conference could coincide with "Rio+10" (2002) and would also provide the opportunity to take stock of "MCSD +5".

Agenda item 7: Thematic activities between MCSD meetings

35. The Deputy Coordinator presented the summary table on working groups for the themes now being dealt with, showing the various meetings and workshops planned for all of them.

36. Moreover, the table of meetings of interest to the MCSD was felt to be very useful, and the Secretariat is expected to update it on a regular basis and ensure that it is widely circulated.

Agenda item 8: Draft agenda for the fifth meeting of the MCSD

37. Participants were asked to look at the agenda for the forthcoming fifth meeting of the MCSD in Rome (1-3 July 1999) which they adjusted in places.

38. On the "tourism" theme, it was agreed that a drafting group (or finishing committee) could be set up during the Rome meeting, not necessarily made up of members of the working group, which would be responsible for finalising the recommendations presented in the plenary. This should also be done for the "indicators" theme.

39. The Coordinator stressed how important the "tourism" theme was for the Mediterranean, and the need to have strong recommendations. Also, the MCSD had always been able to count on the generosity of host countries for funding its meetings, but the time was approaching when meetings would have to be organised in countries for which financing was a problem, in order to respect a fair geographical balance. Something would therefore have to be done within the budget, such as opening a line for voluntary contributions from countries for MCSD meetings.

40. In answer to a delegate who raised the question of the Commissions renewal, the Deputy Coordinator pointed out that only 11 of the 15 members apart from country representatives who had to be replaced every two years, were up for renewal this time round, since four had only recently been appointed by the Monaco meeting. The Bureau would be asked for its view on this question of the renewal of members, seeing to it that the MCSD in its present shape will stay in place until the meeting of the Parties in Malta (October 1999), and that the work of the thematic groups proceeds smoothly.

Agenda item 9: Closure of the meeting

41. As agreed, participants were given a "summary of conclusions of the Steering Committee's work", on the understanding that this report of the meeting would shortly be drafted and circulated to members of the Committee for comment. Having come back to the question of new themes and changed the wording of some of them, the participants adopted the summary, taking into account the reserve of paragraph 21.

42. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 13.00 p.m. on Tuesday, 9 March 1999.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS OF THE WORK OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.

1. Method of work and follow-up of recommendations

The Steering Committee praised the quality of the Commission's work. These achievements should be used as a basis for further progress, with the emphasis in future work being placed on the three following areas, without bringing the basic structure into question (working group, task managers):

- a) clearer identification and preparation of themes (approach based on participation, specific nature of the Mediterranean, added value, etc.);
 - b) improved planning of thematic activities by objectives;
 - c) implementation and follow-up of recommendations (execution, valorization, information/communication, financing).
- It shall be the duty of each working group to take due account of these three areas in carrying out their activities.
 - On implementation, it could give rise to strategic actions programmes (SAPs), with certain themes being particularly suited to this approach because of the importance of the issue they raise for the Mediterranean.
 - The Secretariat in conjunction with the task managers shall work to finalise recommendations to render them more operational before they are presented to the Contracting Parties.
 - More effective follow-up shall be achieved by using demonstration programmes, amongst others.
 - Greater visibility for the Commission and broader circulation of its results amongst all the actors involved are a crucial objective which means that the emphasis must be placed on using all available channels to circulate recommendations and information to all partners. The best possible use shall also be made of new communication technologies. In this context, the work and activities of the MCSD shall be presented on the MAP website, which should be made easily accessible via the UNEP site and vice versa, both sites being regularly updated.

II. New Themes and their Selection Criteria

- The matrix presented by the Secretariat for selecting new themes needs to be rationalised to make it more operational:
 - a) by tightening up criteria (on notions of priority, squaring with regional/international programmes, and feasibility) and by defining them more clearly;
 - b) by regrouping themes, even if it entails clarifying their characteristics and sub-themes. The new themes put forward would then cover:

1. Local management and sustainable development (with the emphasis on the specific points of wetlands, islands, mountainous or desert regions);
 2. Sustainable management of natural marine resources (including fisheries);
 3. Energy and transport and sustainable development;
 4. Employment and training;
 5. Agriculture and the rural environment (including land use, erosion and desertification);
 6. Consumption patterns and waste management;
 7. Health and the environment.
- The Secretariat shall rework the matrix to take account of comments made by the meeting and shall send out the new version to all MCSD members for them to fill in as far as possible. A synthesis shall be presented to the forthcoming MCSD meeting so that the new themes may be selected.

III. Strategic Review for the year 2000

- The strategic review foreseen by the Commission's terms of reference is crucially important in that it will provide the opportunity for drawing up an "inventory" of sustainable development in the Mediterranean, five years after the Contracting Parties adopted the Agenda MED 21 Programme.
- In the interests of clarity and objectivity, this assessment shall preferably be drawn up by a team of seven members made up of: three independent experts, three members of the Commission (one representing a State, one for the "NGO/socio-economic" actors, and one "local authority" representative), and a representative of the Coordinating Unit.
- The Secretariat shall prepare a specific remit for this review to be drawn up, for presentation to the forthcoming MCSD meeting.
- With an eye to this review, Tunisia reiterated its proposal to host the 6th meeting of the MCSD in the year 2000, which will be the opportunity for a "MED 21+5" and should also involve a ministerial component. Funds will have to be mobilised for this event.

IV. Cooperation with the United Nations and national CSDs

- The Secretariat shall draw up of list of all existing national CSDs or similar bodies; it shall then seek a mutual exchange of information and, if needs be, shall establish cooperation with them. The increasing number of activities (Agenda 21s) at both national and local level could act as an incentive for other countries or regions.
- A joint meeting co-financed by the MCSD and the UN/CSD on national sustainable development strategies shall be organised in late 1999 in a Mediterranean country.

- As far as cooperation with the UN/CSD is concerned, it shall be the responsibility of MCSD member countries taking part in CSD sessions, and particularly the Commission President, to make known the Commission's work and achievements, to underscore its exemplary nature, one of the objectives being in the long term to open the way for the MCSD's accreditation as an autonomous observer, to be requested by the President. An informal meeting of Mediterranean delegations on the sidelines of each session would usefully assist this "alliance" of riparian states.
- As well as a panel on the regional seas to be held during CSD 7, it is foreseen that a specific panel for the presentation of the MCSD shall be organised during CSD 8.
- Furthermore, it is foreseen that a major conference on sustainable development in the Mediterranean be organised, to which competent international agencies, universities and other interested parties shall be invited. This conference, to coincide with "Rio+10"(2002), would provide the opportunity to take stock of "MCSD+5".

V. Intersession MCSD thematic activities

- MCSD members should play a more dynamic and effective role in the working groups.
- The agenda of meetings, which is deemed to be very useful, should be completed and regularly updated in order to keep MCSD members informed, and encourage their participation. It would also be useful to indicate meetings which have already been organised, which would be of great interest to ongoing work.

VI. Provisional agenda for the 5th MCSD.

- In the interests of clarity, the "Rules of Procedure" should not be included as an agenda item. The "Remit for preparing the strategic assessment for the year 2000" should, however, be added.
- Concerning the organisation of work, drafting committees should be set up for all working groups rounding off their activities at the 5th MCSD, particularly for the "Tourism and sustainable development" and "Indicators of sustainable development" themes.
- With an eye to the financing of MCSD meetings, it is proposed that the host country should bear a substantial share of the costs, without ruling out external contributions.
- Finally, the NGOs should be encouraged to take part in the organisation of MCSD meetings, a role which the Secretariat will work to boost.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**CYPRUS
CHYPRE**

Mr Nikos S. Georgiades
Director for the Environment
Environment Service
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources
and Environment
10-12 Gregory Afxendiou
2360 Ayios Dometios
Nicosia 1100
Cyprus

Tel: 357 2 303883
Fax: 357 2 774945
E-mail: rocperiv@cytanet.com.cy

**CHAMBERS GROUP FOR THE
DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK
ISLANDS (EOAEN)**

M. Georges Giourgas
Conseiller Affaires Européennes
Chambers Group for the Development of Greek
Islands (EOAEN)
World Trade Centre
162 Bd Emile Jacquant
Bruxelles 1000
Belgique

Tel: 322 2030090
Fax: 322 2031067

**MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION OFFICE FOR
ENVIRONMENT CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT (MIO-ECSEDE)**

Mr Emad Adly
co-chairman
MIO-ECSDE
Arab Office for Youth and Environment (AOYE)
14 Abu Almahasen Elshazli Street
El Mohandesin, Giza
Cairo
Egypt

Tel: 20 2 3041634-3059613
Fax: 20 2 3041635
E-mail: aoye@ritsec1.com.eg

**MONACO
MONACO**

S.E. M. Bernard Fautrier
Ministre Plénipotentiaire,
Chargé du suivi des questions
d'environnement,
Direction des relations extérieures

Tel: 377 93 15 833
Fax: 377 93 15 8888

M. Patrick Van Klaveren
Conseiller Technique de S.E. M.B.Fautrier
Villa Girasole,
16, boulevard de Suisse
MC98000 Principauté de Monaco
Principauté de Monaco

Tel: 377 93 158148
Fax: 377 93 509591
E-mail: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

MUNICIPALITY OF SILIFKE

Mr Merih Kerestecioglu
Advisor (MEDCONSULT)
Silifke Belediyesi
Rumeli Caddesi Birlik
Apt. 84/11 80220
Osman Bey
Istanbul
Turkey

Tel: 90 212 2129483
Fax: 90 212 2960299
E-mail: merihk@medconsult.com.tr

Ms Nesrin Algan
Advisor
Silifke Belediyesi
AU-SBF
Cemal Gursel Cad.Cebeci
Ankara
Turkey

Tel: 90 312 3197720
E-mail: algan@ada.net.tr

SPAIN
ESPAGNE

Mme Amparo Rambla Gil
Subdirectora General Adjunta Normativa y
Cooperacion Institucional
D.G de Calidad y Evaluación Ambiental
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Plaza San Juan de la Cruz
28071 Madrid
Espagne

Tel: 34 91 5976374
Fax: 34 91 5975980

TUNISIA
TUNISIE

S.E. M. Mehdi Mlika
Ministre de l'Environnement et de
l'Aménagement du Territoire
Ministère de l'Environnement et de
l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord - Bâtiment I.C.F.
B.P. 52
1080 Ariana
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 708230
Fax: 216 1 707122

M. Khalil Attia
Directeur Générale de l'Environnement
Ministère de l'Environnement et de
l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord - Bâtiment I.C.F.
B.P. 52
1080 Ariana
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 702779
Fax: 216 1 238411
E-mail: patenaires@rdd.tn

Mr Beshir Ben Mansour
Président, Directeur Général
Agence Nationale de Protection
de l'Environnement (ANPE)
rue du Cameroun-Belvédère
Tunis
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 840221
Fax: 216 1 848069

Mme Amel Benzarti
Directeur Général du CITET
Tunis
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 772014
Fax: 216 1 772255
E-mail: citet@email.nti.tn

M. Fethi Debbabi
Chargé de l'information et de
la presse au Cabinet du Ministre de
l'Environnement
et de l'Aménagement du Territoire
Ministère de l'Environnement et
de l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord
B.P. 52
2080 Ariana
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 704000

Mme Aziza Hamrouni
Assistante du Ministre de l'
Environnement
Ministère de l'Environnement et de
l'Aménagement du Territoire
Centre Urbain Nord - Bâtiment I.C.F.
B.P. 52
1080 Ariana
Tunisie

Tel: 216 1 703087
Fax: 216 1 703286

M.Touhami Hamrouni
Président, Directeur Général
ONAS
19, rue de la Mounnoie
Tunis
Tunise

Tel: 216 1 343819

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME (UNEP)
COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN
SECRETARIAT OF THE MCSD**

Mr Lucien Chabason
Coordinator

Tel: 30 1 7273101
E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr

Mr Arab Hoballah
Deputy Coordinator

Tel: 301 7273126
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr

Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 10 Athens
Greece

Tel: 30 1 7273100
Fax: 30 1 7253196-7
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr

MCS D THEMATIC SELECTION MATRIX

CRITERIA	Importance				Appraisal			Feasibility				Methodology			
	MED21/MAP priority	MED partners priority	National / local priority	UN-CSD programme	Stakes and risks	Added value by MCS D	SD dimension	MAP capacity/expertise	Knowledge	Co-partners	Funding opportunities	Working Groups or Group of Experts	Period of work	MAP support centre or partners co-support centre	
Themes to be considered by MCS D															
Local Management and Sustainable Development (Wetlands, islands, mountain and desert areas, etc.)															
Sustainable management of maritime natural resources (fishing, etc)															
Energy, transport and sustainable development															
Employment, training and environment															
Agriculture and rural environment (agricultural policies, land use, erosion, desertification, etc)															
Consumption patterns and waste management															
Health and environment															

N.B. Themes handled by the MCS D with adoption dates and recommendations :

- Sustainable management of Coastal Regions (completed in 1997)
- Sustainable development indicators (to be completed in 1999)
- Free trade and environment (to be completed in 2001)
- Management of Water Demand (completed in 1997)
- Tourism and Sustainable Development (to be completed in 1999)
- Industry and sustainable development (to be completed in 2001)
- Information, awareness and participation
- Management of urban development (to be completed in 2001)

THEMATIC WORKING GROUPS

Themes	Task managers	Members of the group	Support from MAP*
Short-term (over about a one-year period)			
- Sustainable management of coastal zones (completed)	Morocco and MEDCITIES	CREE, European Community, Greece, City of Rome, Spain, EcoMediterrania, Monaco, WWF, Italy, EOAEN, Cyprus, France, Tunisia, MIO-ECSDE, Egypt, Malta, Albania, Lebanon, Algeria, FIS	RAC/Priority Actions Programme, RAC/Blue Plan, RAC/Environment Remote Sensing and RAC/Specially Protected Areas
- Management of water demand (completed)	Tunisia and Morocco	Libya, WWF, APNEK, European Community, Egypt, Italy, France, CEFIC, MIO-ECSDE, Malta, Spain, EcoMediterrania, CEDARE, Cyprus, Israel, Algeria, Turkey, Bosnia & Herzegovina	RAC/Blue Plan and RAC/Priority Actions Programme
Medium-term (until 1999 Contracting Parties meeting and beyond)			
- Sustainable development indicators (to be completed in 1999)	France and Tunisia	European Community, Morocco, EcoMediterranean, Greece, Israel, Spain, Slovenia, Turkey, Lebanon, Algeria, Municipality of Silifke	RAC/Blue Plan
- Tourism and Sustainable Development (to be completed in 1999)	Spain, EOAEN and Egypt	Malta, Monaco, Cyprus, Croatia, European Community, Greece, EcoMediterrania, WWF MIO-ECSDE, ASCAME, Slovenia, Libya, Turkey, Lebanon	RAC/Blue Plan and RAC/Priority Actions Programme
- Information, awareness and participation	MIO-ECSDE and CREE	European Community, WWF, France, APNEK, Croatia, Egypt, Morocco, MEDCITIES, EcoMediterrania, Albania, Algeria, Libya, Lebanon	MED Coordinating Unit
- Free trade and environment in the Euromediterranean context (strategic impact assessment) (to be completed in 2001)	Lebanon	Tunisia, France, European Community, APNEK, Morocco, MIO-ECSDE, Algeria, ASCAME, FIS, Bosnia & Herzegovina, WWF	RAC/ Blue Plan MED Coordinating Unit
- Industry and sustainable development (cultural, economic, technical and financial aspects of progressive elimination of land-based pollution) (to be completed in 2001)	Italy, Algeria, F.I.D	WWF, Israel, EOAEN, ASCAME, CEFIC, Spain, European Community, Turkey, Tunisia, RME MIO-ECSDE	MED POL, RAC/Cleaner Production
- Management of urban development (to be completed in 2001)	Egypt, MEDCITIES, Turkey	FIS, MIO-ECSDE, Spain, Morocco, France, Malta, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Algeria, CEDARE, EC, Slovenia, Cyprus, RME	RAC/Priority Actions Programme and RAC/Blue Plan

* The Coordinating Unit and the Regional Activity Centres will each provide the necessary support to the different working groups according to their expertise.

MCS D INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUPS		
Subject	Dates and venue	Responsible persons/bodies
Management of Urban Development	Experts meeting , 26-27 April 1999 Split	Egypt-Med Cities- Turkey- PAP-BP-ERS
Tourism and Sustainable Development,	Working Group, 6-7 May 1999, Split	Spain-EOAEN-Egypt- BP-PAP
Sustainable Development Indicators	Workshop, 10 -11May 1999, Sophia Antipolis	France-Tunisia-BP
Industry and Sustainable Development	Working Group 16-17 May 1999 Masa Carrara	Italy-Algeria-FID-MED POL-CP
Information, Awareness and Participation	Working Group, 24-25 May 1999, Athens	MIO-ECSDE - CREE - Med Unit
Free Trade and Environment	Working Group, 4-5 June 1999 Barcelona	Lebanon-BP-Med Unit-ASCAME
National Sustainable Development Strategies in the Mediterranean Region	Workshop, end 1999 early 2000	UN-CSD and MCS D Secretariats.

5th meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development
Rome, 1-3 July 1999

Provisional Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Election of the Steering Committee of the Commission
3. Adoption of the provisional agenda and organisation of work
4. Progress report by the Secretariat
5. Activity reports by the Task Managers :
 - 5.1. Sustainable Development Indicators : review and adoption of list of indicators and proposed recommendations (per geographical levels and categories of actors);
 - 5.2. Tourism and Sustainable Development: review and adoption of proposed recommendations (per geographical levels and categories of actors);
 - 5.3. Information, awareness and participation: proposed programme of actions and recommendations;
 - 5.4. Free Trade and Environment: major issues and programme of work;
 - 5.5. Industry and Sustainable Development: issues, method and programme of work;
 - 5.6. Management of Urban Development : terms of reference and organisation of work;
6. Method of work and follow-up of recommendations
7. New subjects and selection criteria
8. Strategic review for the year 2000 : terms of reference
9. Cooperation and fund raising
10. Sixth meeting of the MCSD
11. Any other subject
12. Adoption of the meeting's report
13. Closure of the meeting.

Speech of H.E Mr MOHAMED MEHDI MLIKA
Meeting of the Steering Committee of the MCSD
Tunis, 8-9 March 1999

M. Bernard Fautrier
M. le Coordonnateur du PAM
Honorables Membres du Comité directeur de la CMDD
Mesdames et Messieurs,

C'est pour moi un réel plaisir de vous retrouver à Tunis dans cette réunion du Comité directeur de la CMDD.

Je voudrais à cette occasion remercier tous les membres du Comité directeur et souhaiter la bienvenue parmi nous aux représentants des pouvoirs locaux, des acteurs socio-professionnels et du tissu associatif dont la présence témoigne de la consécration de la dimension participative dans l'action du PAM et de la volonté de tous les partenaires d'agir ensemble pour que la Méditerranée qui nous unit soit toujours un espace de paix et de développement durable. Je voudrais également remercier l'unité de Coordination du PAM et à sa tête Monsieur Chabason pour l'excellente préparation de notre réunion.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je voudrais vous faire part de quelques réflexions à propos de notre travail tous en souhaitant qu'avec votre accord et votre soutien nous puissions aller de l'avant conformément aux recommandations de la CMDD.

La CMDD qui vient de tenir sa 4ème réunion et en train de réaliser un important travail autour des grandes priorités du développement durable de notre région. Lors de sa dernière réunion, un long débat s'est ouvert concernant la structure et les méthodes qui devraient être adoptées pour assurer le suivi de la mise en oeuvre des recommandations de la CMDD.

Nous souhaitons que cette réunion puisse nous permettre d'avancer en définissant un processus opérationnel et efficace de mise en oeuvre et de suivi des recommandations de la CMDD. Ce processus devrait être en mesure de redynamiser la CMDD et de renforcer son impact et sa présence réelle dans la région. A cet effet nous sommes appelés à traduire les recommandations thématiques proposées dans le cadre des groupes de travail en recommandations et engagements pratiques en spécifiant qui devrait faire quoi? et Comment? En définissant le rôle que devrait être celui des Parties contractantes, des pouvoirs locaux, des acteurs socio-économiques ou du tissu associatif.

Cette définition du processus de suivi de la mise en oeuvre des recommandations de la CMDD devrait également être accompagnée d'un système d'évaluation par le biais de rapports ou autre moyen.

D'autre part un effort d'information et de communication serait nécessaire pour assurer à la Commission, une certaine visibilité et une certaine présence et d'amener ainsi à son action et à ses programmes un degré minimum d'appui politique et médiatique auprès des Parties contractantes et de ses partenaires dans la région euro-méditerranéenne.

Dans le même cadre nous estimons qu'il conviendrait, en ce qui concerne les nouveaux thèmes, de mettre en oeuvre certains critères de sélection afin d'opérer une hiérarchisation en

fonction des priorités nationales, et régionales ainsi qu'en fonction des priorités de PAM II et des programmes de nos partenaires. Une telle démarche serait de nature à soutenir l'efficacité de l'action de la CMDD.

Mesdames et Messieurs

Il ya presque cinq ans maintenant, la Conférence MED 21 de Tunis a permis de réorienter le PAM dans la perspective de développement durable, à travers une adaptation de l'Agenda 21 de RIO au contexte et à la réalité de l'environnement et du développement du Bassin Méditerranéen. Depuis beaucoup de travail a été fait, et l'expérience méditerranéenne est très suivie par les observateurs intéressés car elle pourrait servir de modèle pour d'autres régions ou sous régions telles que la mer noire ou la mer baltique.

Nous estimons qu'il est aujourd'hui opportun que la CMDD entreprenne la réalisation d'un bilan stratégique d'évaluation de la mise en oeuvre du Programme d'Action MED 21 et des décisions des réunions des Parties contractantes en matière d'intégration du développement durable. Ce bilan stratégique devrait nous permettre d'avoir une idée claire de la situation dans notre région, de tirer les conclusions et de mieux avancer sur la voie d'un développement qui soit garant de prospérité et de stabilité dans notre région.

Mesdames et Messieurs

Je voudrais souligner que la CMDD constitue un important acquis pour notre région. Un acquis que nous avons ensemble mis en place et dont nous devons consolider l'action et la participation à la mise en oeuvre de notre partenariat au service du développement durable.

Je vous remercie pour votre attention et nous passons, si vous voulez, maintenant à l'adoption de l'adoption de l'ordre du jour.