

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Report	1-10
Annex I: List of participants	
Annex II: Agenda of the meeting	

Introduction

1. The extraordinary meeting of the RAC Directors was held at Delphi (Greece) on 1 and 2 July 2002 in the conference room of the European Cultural Centre. The meeting had been convened by the Secretariat of the MAP pursuant to a decision taken by the XXth meeting of the MED Unit and the Regional Activity Centres (Antalya, 11-12 Mar 2002) for the purpose of continuing the review of the MAP's future structure and strategy.
2. The list of participants is attached as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 1 : General introduction by the Coordinator

3. Mr. Lucien Chabason, MAP Coordinator, began by pointing out that the meeting was intended to be a seminar that would not take any binding decisions but would permit a free exchange of views on the issues which the Antalya meeting had not been able to discuss in detail due to lack of time. He said that Mr. Baher Kamal was unable to attend for health reasons and the item on information which he should have presented would be replaced by a short statement by the Secretariat. The majestic setting of Delphi was undoubtedly propitious to tranquil in-depth reflection, but it should not be forgotten that, in the 1970s and 1980s, it site had been the subject of lively debate due to the threat posed to the archaeological site itself by bauxite mining activities nearby; the danger had only been averted as a result of a resolute public campaign backed up political action. From ancient times, Delphi had also been closely linked to the history of ecology: the Pythia had often been called upon to resolve disputes related to the environment and, on two occasions when she was consulted on whether or not to dig a canal - to Corinth and in Khalkhidiki - she had made a famous pronouncement recommending strict respect for the nature created by Zeus. Twenty-five centuries later, this pronouncement still gave food for thought.

4. The meeting of the MED Unit and the Regional Activity Centres held at the beginning of each year was somewhat formal because problems and the appropriate responses only became apparent as time went by and activities were undertaken. A meeting such as the present one therefore provided an opportunity to look more closely at the major issues facing the MAP: the evaluation of the Centres and the programme as a whole, reformulation of documents, strategies being prepared and, relationships with partners. At the internal level, the MAP had embarked upon its reorganization in 1995, which had just been completed with the "prevention and emergency situations" Protocol. The result was an extension of the MAP's scope and activities, the creation of the MCSD, which had very early on examined closely its objectives and effectiveness, as well as the adoption of major practical strategies such as the SAP, which now raised the issue of resources needed for their implementation. Since Rio, however, the external context outside the MAP had also changed radically as a result of the emergence of the Euro-Med Partnership, the aptitudes of each partner (EEA, METAP, CEDARE, etc.), the dissemination of sustainable development, and increasingly determined action by civil society. During the discussion to be held, in which the heads of each Centre or programme would express their views on their own sphere and on the programme as a whole, it was important to bear in mind the MAP's relationship to the global context when evaluating its effectiveness.

Agenda item 2 : General discussion

5. Mr Francesco Saverio Civili, MED POL Coordinator, stated that the MED POL bore heavy responsibility. He did not say that because of a lack of modesty, but because throughout the MAP's early years the major part of the programme had been the MED POL's responsibility. It had therefore been a "witness" to overall developments in the MAP, from the scientific evaluation stage to more practical action to combat pollution. The SAP adopted in 1997 represented a complex system underpinned by what was - in comparison with other

centres or programmes - a solid legal basis, namely, the Land-based Sources Protocol. The SAP tackled new and highly technical issues, however, for example the management of catchment areas, for which the MED POL was ill equipped and it had to find the best possible expertise, linking up with the EU which, for its part, endeavored to propose a joint approach in this connection. This new aspect called for greater integration with certain RACs, for example PAP/RAC and CP/RAC.

6. The SAP also implied effective participation by governments, following up implementation of policies and activities, and the over-riding issue of financing – in other words, the resources for implementation – which had to be integrated within the strategy from the outset. Those were all aspects that applied to the MAP as a whole and if the issues were not resolved the end result would be failure. Regarding ongoing monitoring, which remained one of the cornerstones of the MED POL, it was now focusing on trend indicators and compliance with legislation. The question of closer collaboration with the EU in implementing the SAP, in connection with both evaluation and reporting, remained a key challenge and the MAP had gradually become accepted as a special partner.

7. During the debate that followed Mr. Civili's presentation, speakers agreed that the MED POL was indicative of the problems and challenges facing the MAP. Despite the extension of the MED POL's operational scope, ongoing monitoring had to remain a basic element, with detailed reports on trends in the marine environment, while being aware that other partners and organizations were well equipped for this work and often produced excellent documents (EEA, Black Sea, OSPAR). The SAP was profoundly marked by concepts that dated back at least a decade, as was also the case for some EU Directives: tangible objectives were set (for example, a 50 per cent reduction in priority POPs by 2005) without wondering how the resources were to be obtained or taking into account the situation in each particular country. How could a country such as Tunisia, which had already made considerable efforts, be asked to achieve the same reduction as another country that was starting from zero? The question of economic, financial and human resources therefore had to be integrated from the outset in order to be equal to the approaches increasingly being adopted at the international level (the Kyoto Protocol was one typical example). Implementation structures had to be put in place because the anticipated complementarity of the MAP and the METAP (whereby the latter would be responsible for implementation) had proved to be impossible. It was necessary to bring together experts in public policy, embark upon a stage in which the concept of "governance" had priority. The MAP had unquestionably become more visible at the country level. Countries recognized that it was not a financing institution, but expected it to provide expertise which its current resources did not allow it to do. The "what" stage had to give way to the "how" stage, the new sectors that had opened up as a result of the extension of the legal scope (catchment areas for example) had to be boosted.

8. Summarizing the spirit of the discussion, Mr. Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator, expressed the view that, at the present stage, the MAP had aroused expectations that it was unable to fulfil. The dilemma was quite simple and did not only apply to the MAP but also to the majority of other organizations such as the METAP, the UNDP, etc., which no longer knew how to approach countries and were reviewing their situation: either to move ahead, after fundamental restructuring and the fixing of clear objectives for the next five to ten years, or to remain the "traditional small-scale MAP", which would in fact be a step backward.

9. Mr. Ivica Trumbic, Director of the Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre, after referring to the principal phases of the Programme's gradual refocusing on the coast, explained the main problems it faced. For several years, there had been a marked contradiction between the clear theoretical ideas embodied in Integrated Coastal Area Management and the White Paper to which they had recently given rise, on the one hand, with well-practised field exercises, and, on the other, decision-makers and investors who did

not take the former into account when taking practical action and who paid scant attention to the implications of the concept of integration. He had also been witness to MAP's progression from part of the United Nations framework to a more political position. The conflict lay between the scope of the problem and the resources available. Finding more resources would mean a lengthy political process, but the coast's problems were urgent. If it was decided only to focus on certain aspects, that would mean that other equally important problems were ignored. The Contracting Parties had decided to make the MAP a more political instrument, but one might question their real determination in that respect. Maybe it would be necessary to await the Johannesburg meeting and proposals on new partnership models that focused on the concept of "governance", although the latter term still had to be defined. The question of resources – and consequently financing – could not be ignored, however.

10. One speaker asked whether it was justifiable to consider countries as a priori hostile to any form of implementation. The MCSD's recommendations themselves called for the follow-up to be entrusted to the Secretariat. Perhaps the move from evaluation to implementation should not be too hasty: there was an intermediate stage of political recommendations, such as those adopted by the OECD for example. According to other participants, the MAP was the only institution that dealt with all aspects of the coast's problems; its strength did not lie in its ability to allocate funds but in making countries aware of the urgent need for a national policy, offering the expertise and complementary measures, taking into account each country's specificities (land ownership, etc.), acting at the bilateral level and seeking an operational relationship with the EU. Countries had to be helped to apprehend the details in the White Paper. The Coastal Areas Management Programme (CAMP) had unquestionably been a useful learning period, but it was not possible simply to add field projects without developing an overall policy at the regional level, with solid operational intermediaries.

11. Mr. Victor Macià, Director of the Cleaner Production Regional Activity Centre, drew attention to the two sectors in which his Programme was involved, namely, the MCSD and the SAP. No doubt good sectoral relations had been established within that framework, but personally he felt deeply unsatisfied: his objective was Mediterranean enterprises, but the Centre's activities did not manage to reach them or be profitable to them. The Contracting Parties did not send any requests to him, the National Focal Points remained inactive and their profile obviously did not correspond to their mission. In Spain itself, where the CP/RAC made itself available to the Ministry of the Environment for targeted action in Spain, only a small number of persons were aware of the MAP's existence and its potential, so the CP Centre's regional activities were at a standstill. The MED POL, the SAP and the MCSD undoubtedly offered valid possibilities for action, but the climate had to change if they were to be properly exploited. There was, however, another, possibly more deep-seated, reason: the concept of cleaner production itself had been overtaken because the relationship between enterprises and the environment had become more global, more far-reaching and, in that connection, the RAC should perhaps change its name to "Centre for Enterprises and the Environment".

12. All participants welcomed Mr. Macià's frank and critical remarks on his own Centre. It was true that the Centre was not sufficiently present within the MAP, but it was not at fault: from the beginning, the Centre had not been sufficiently integrated in the programming of biennial exercises and that should change in the future, making provision for activities aimed at industry, which would be along the lines of the new budgetary documents to be proposed. Moreover, the fact that the Centre was wholly financed by Spain probably had an effect on its regional role and there was a need to establish better relations with the Spanish and Catalonian authorities, emphasizing the Centre's Mediterranean role. In MED POL, for example, the problem was not inviting the CP/RAC to become more involved in the SAP, but how to integrate it in the planning of activities from the beginning and how to count on a new

generation of national coordinators who were more open to the problems of enterprises. In general, the question of preparing the biennial exercise should be reviewed, focusing in the first place on its global content before each Centre drew up the list of its activities for the purposes of the budget. "Integrating" a Centre in the MAP should not be seen in the strict sense, with close coordination, on-site visits by the MED Unit, etc. Each Centre should remain an autonomous structure, with clear terms of reference, and coordination of horizontal projects – as was the case for BP-PAP – without necessarily involving action by the MED Unit. Lastly, in the case of NFPs, the institution could indeed be improved.

13. Should the concept of cleaner production be considered as out-of-date? Participants disagreed on that aspect. For some of them, the concept was still valid in countries with economies in transition and applied to 1970s-type industries that generated vast quantities of hazardous waste. It was probably introduced into the MAP at a late stage, but countries in the South had a twofold demand: to identify more clearly what they could do and to establish links with the private sector. The work carried out by the MCSD's "industry" group showed that the Barcelona Centre's contribution could be decisive. Clean production was both a tangible component in itself and a vector for private sector participation. Other speakers considered that the real issue was whether there was a place for a regional centre in this sector in comparison with national centres; in other words, whether the CP/RAC could have a role. The evaluation would have to make that clear and, if the response was negative, the title "enterprises and the environment" could open up better prospects.

14. Mr. Darko Domovic, Programme Administrator at the Regional Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC), noted that he was the only speaker who was not taking the floor as the Director of a Centre but that he would faithfully convey the message from Mr. Patrino, the Director of REMPEC, who was unable to attend the meeting. The REMPEC was the offspring of the MAP but it differed from the other Centres in many respects : joint management by the IMO and UNEP, a different approach that focused on the short term because it dealt with emergency situations, action at the international level inasmuch as maritime transport was primarily a global activity. Since 1992, however, the Centre had become more integrated within the MAP's structure and had made substantial efforts to build capacity for prevention and action at the national and regional levels. Its network of correspondents functioned satisfactorily. The Centre also interacted with other sectors such as the military and firemen. It worked with the oil industry, which funded one of the posts in REMPEC and sent auxiliary experts to REMPEC's headquarters in Malta. Lastly, a great deal had been done to assist countries in the legal field.

15. Several speakers considered that the extension of the REMPEC's terms of reference to cover prevention and combating maritime pollution as a whole had been beneficial to the MAP. It was also the only Centre that had an ongoing relationship with the private sector (which was not without the risk of a "boomerang" effect if, unfortunately, a major accident occurred in the Mediterranean). REMPEC should adopt a very elaborate strategy now that it had a strong and progressive Protocol that emphasized prevention. The strategies in public policy had become indispensable tools, which meant that there had to be prior in-depth knowledge of economic and financial mechanisms. The question of establishing port reception facilities, which was manifestly a failure, was ample proof of that: it was no longer possible, in a lyrical and communicative élan made up of solemn declarations, to undertake a very specific commitment – as had been done at Genoa in 1985 - to establish port facilities without first of all agreeing on how that should be done.

16. Mr. Mohamed Adel Hentati, Director of the Specially-Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre, informed the meeting of the results of what might be termed a kind of self-evaluation of the Tunis Centre. In recent years, the Centre had formulated tools and, for this purpose, it had organized a number of expert meetings, without having to undertake a major coordination effort. Countries were now asking for the application of those tools, which

raised a major problem for the Centre. It would have to modify its structure in order to adapt its resources and development to the new context, provide expertise to countries that had undertaken specific commitments in the form of conservation action plans, and hence strengthen its role in those countries. One other major challenge facing the Centre was that it was not alone in the Mediterranean in the biodiversity sector. The MAP should act in harmony with the measures taken elsewhere under the Bern, Bonn and Ramsar Conventions, etc. Lastly, other regional seas bodies (such as that for the Red Sea) were calling on the Centre and that was a new element that meant envisaging joint action. In the new context mentioned, the preparation of the BIO SAP became particularly important.

17. One speaker noted that the Tunis Centre was sometimes mistaken for an IUCN Centre and Mr. Hentati pointed out that a memorandum of understanding between the SPA/RAC and the IUCN Centre in Malaga was being finalized and it provided for a joint action programme. That was only the beginning of what could be a series of activities. Another speaker sounded a note of caution regarding fairly vague agreements in which the role of the MAP would be formally recognized but then ignored in practice. Three other speakers considered that it was time to review the organization of the SPA/RAC to ensure proper coordination with other highly active organizations. A general diminution – or even erosion - of the influence of institutions that dealt solely with the environment had been observed. In the case of biodiversity, the situation in the Mediterranean was that at least six conventions covered the same species, with several GEF projects, the financing of many other projects, and good returns at the political level. Some degree of inertia in the present system should not lead to a downward trend. A Centre such as that in Tunis should therefore develop partnerships completely independently. The evaluation should provide an opportunity to clarify the situation and it should be dynamic, taking into account the other actors, the Centre's value added, the advantages represented by the Contracting Parties with their political support and budget. One participant underlined the need to seek new partners, even among multinationals, which were the new global powers following the establishment of the WTO.

18. Mr. Guillaume Benoit, Director of the Blue Regional Activity Centre, described the Centre's development within the overall context of the Mediterranean and the world, which was moving towards a market and budgetary policy favourable to the environment. The issue was now to see how the MAP could become a forum for the evaluation of policies, and only the Parties were empowered to respond. In his view, there was a problem : the MAP was traditionally linked to ministries of the environment, which had little influence on developments.

19. In the case of Blue Plan, like the PAP, CP and ERS Centres, it was not underpinned by a Protocol. It operated in the Mediterranean region where information capacity was lacking. Its strategy focused on some straightforward objectives : to assist in developing ideas regarding the major environment-development issues so that time would not be wasted; to enhance operational tools (the work on indicators for example), to adapt the limited resources to the fields of activity, laying emphasis on effectiveness. The BP was closely involved in the work of the MCSD, although there was a lack of focus in the themes and confusion was frequent within the Commission between the BP's status as a NFP and as a member. As regards BP's work with the PAP, if the latter Centre concentrated more on ICZM, the respective competences of the two Centres would have to be more clearly defined. In the increasingly important area of relations with the EEA and the Environment DG, roles in the Mediterranean would also have to be clarified. Lastly, Mr. Benoit urged greater flexibility in financing because the current administrative rules were too stringent in his view, particularly with regard to the separation between personnel and activities in the budget.

20. Following the presentation, one speaker wondered what exactly was the role of the BP, which in his view was not clear, unlike the role of the PAP, for example, which was widely known as the "Coastal Centre". Did the BP act as the permanent anchor for the MCSD? The work on indicators had undoubtedly been excellent, but to what purpose? Other speakers considered that the BP was related to MAP's capacity to deal with sustainable development and that was why it played a central role in the MCSD. That meant dealing with both economic and environmental issues, although there was an obvious lack of expertise in the former. The BP had proved its effectiveness in monitoring and should strengthen its component relating to the Mediterranean Observatory for Environment and Development, particularly as data were now being produced at the national level and the BP could synthesize them. It should also continue to play its prospective role (its original, traditional function), which had led to the successful first report in 1988 and should see the success of the new Environment-Development report. The BP's work should not spill over into seeking answers, however, because it was not equipped to evaluate countries. The speakers acknowledged that, in general, the BP and the MCSD were closely linked and the former's role would to a large extent depend on the latter's ability to complete its "revolution", to undertake operational and clearly political reforms, to go beyond the simple and vague advisory framework allotted to it, which was appreciated by countries provided that it disturbed no-one.

21. Mr. Giovanni Cannizzaro, Director of the Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre, said that he had only been in charge of the Palermo RAC for a short time and that, within the MAP, the Centre played a special, but non-thematic, role, essentially providing services, technical support for ongoing monitoring, mapping, statistics (indicators), measurement of parameters. From a strategic standpoint, the Centre's future activities could be envisaged in the light of the important measures taken at the international level to improve remote sensing capacity, for example, the use of satellites to ensure observance of treaties and conventions (the Kyoto Protocol for monitoring CO₂ sinks; desertification and biodiversity conventions; MARPOL convention; Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES)). The latter was a joint initiative by the EC and the European Space Agency that had received a strong political impetus with the aim of making the best possible use of existing and future satellites and in which the ERS/RAC took an active part in pilot projects.

22. Mr. Cannizzaro indicated out that the ERS/RAC could act as an interface with such international initiatives so as to allow Mediterranean users to be sufficiently united and represented within future satellite infrastructures on land. He hoped to strengthen cooperation with the other RACs and MAP projects, in addition to the cooperation already established with the PAP and BP RACs, particularly with MED POL (on eutrophication and pollution monitoring), with REMPEC (detecting hydrocarbon spills, sensitivity mapping), and with SPA/RAC (BIO SAP, Medwet Coast project).

23. After thanking Mr.Cannizzaro for his presentation, the Coordinator suggested that, at the next meeting of RAC Directors, he should explain the opportunities afforded by new satellites and satellite programmes.

Agenda item 3: Documents to be prepared for the next Contracting Parties' meeting

24. Mr. Chabason introduced the agenda item and outlined the changes which the Secretariat intended to make to the documents with a view to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties. The documents could be classified into three categories : (i) evaluation documents of a scientific nature, providing information on the state of the environment, including the BP's new Environment-Development report, the updated cross-border diagnostic assessment, and possibly the evaluation section of the BIO SAP; (ii) retrospective reports on activities : report on the activities of the MAP, which was basically a working

document of the meeting of NFPs for the purpose of preparing the meeting of the Parties, and the thematic reports of the MCSD; and (iii) a series of documents leading to recommendations : draft programme and budget for the forthcoming biennium, with – a new feature – a description of activities, specific recommendations (following evaluations), MCSD recommendations and recommendations concerning the reporting system in the light of pilot experiments currently under way in several volunteer countries.

25. Participants agreed with the classification, which would allow the documents relevant to the NFPs meeting to be separated from those relevant to the CPs. The discussion then focused on what could be submitted to the NFPs belonging to each Centre or programme, who had to approve a list of activities prior to the meeting of MAP NFPs. The Secretariat emphasized that the specific NFPs had no financial role and they could only be given an indication of the budgetary allocation, it being understood that the budget would remain constant (with an increase of 1-2 per cent at the most) and that the final budgetary decision lay with the meeting of the MAP NFPs.

Agenda item 4 : Methodology for the general evaluation of MAP requested by the Contracting Parties

26. In introducing this agenda item, the representative of the Secretariat pointed out that the evaluation issues had been thoroughly discussed during the previous discussions on the MAP, the Centres and the MED POL. At their meeting held in Monaco, the Contracting Parties had requested the Secretariat to prepare a strategic evaluation of the overall framework of the Barcelona Convention, with its operational bodies and the Coordinating Unit, and by October 2002 to draw up a report, in cooperation with the Bureau, for submission to the next meeting of the MAP NFPs. This request meant deciding on an operating method to be proposed to the Parties. At its meeting held in Damascus in March 2002, the Bureau decided to hold an initial discussion on the report at its subsequent meeting in Monaco in October, and then to consider a preliminary draft at its meeting in spring 2003. Consequently, the evaluations would commence following the same procedure used for the REMPEC and the SPA/RAC evaluations and they should conclude in March 2003. They could be conducted for the other RACs in 2004, using feedback from the evaluations already undertaken. The CPs' request was for "an overall evaluation of the MAP structure", which implied not only administrative components but also the structures in countries (NFPs), meetings, the MCSD and even the UNEP to the extent that it contributed to the MAP under its regional seas programme. Consequently, the MED Unit could not undertake the evaluation.

27. At the conclusion of a lively discussion during which many different ideas were put forward (committee of independent experts, "critical self-evaluation", role of a moderator, etc.), participants agreed that the Secretariat should propose the following to the Bureau meeting in Monaco in October 2002: the general evaluation would be undertaken by a "steering committee" composed of three or four Contracting Parties, an intergovernmental organization, and an NGO; the MED Unit would make available to the committee interviewers who would carry out a series of interviews – with the CPs in particular – as previous evaluations had shown how useful they were, and the Committee would appoint a rapporteur. The whole procedure would be of an interactive nature and would include intermediate working meetings as well as close relations with the Bureau which, at its next meeting, would consider the terms of reference for the evaluation.

Agenda item 5 : Discussion on a MAP strategy on coastal zone management

28. The Director of PAP/RAC introduced the elements for a MAP strategy on coastal zone management, explaining the background to the issue and the principal milestones : refocusing of the MAP on coastal management at the end of the 1980s, taking into account

all the aspects of each zone and the mutual relations among them; the concept of ICZM, which stemmed from Agenda 21, adopted by the MAP in the context of Coastal Area Management Programmes (CAMPs); subsequent generations of CAMPs; formulation of guidelines and a Planning Book on ICZM; MCSD thematic group on coastal management, with substantial work on indicators; prospective analysis. Some of these activities had been carried out jointly with the METAP and the EU. The major problems were bureaucratic obstacles, the power of private interests and short-term economic benefits, and the absence of genuine political will. Therefore, an effective strategy had to be put in place.

29. The ensuing discussion focused on the following issue : either strategic objectives were fixed at the regional level aimed at local actors, or a proper regional plan of action was drawn up. The latter, which appeared both logical and in harmony with the MAP's mission, obviously did not meet with political endorsement by the countries. The latter's wishes had to be respected and progress made prudently, step by step. Countries were disoriented, they had to be helped by giving them a framework and, if possible, not focusing too much on "integration", which appeared to have an inhibiting effect. A commitment to report on what was happening and what was being done on their coasts, based on indicators, would be very welcome. Until now, countries did not have a coastal policy and all the measures taken around the Mediterranean Basin lacked consistency or were not put into effect. Through pilot cases, the regional approach would promote the idea of a "coastal" Protocol which, like the "land-based sources" Protocol, would include regional programmes and national action plans. The "land-based sources" Protocol/SAP provided a good example of a balance in that respect. In that case, however, in view of the lack of enthusiasm for a "coastal" Protocol, was it necessary to await a hypothetical political change of mind before deciding to act?

30. At the conclusion of the debate, it appeared that for the moment there was no mandate from the Parties for a regional coastal management strategy. In such a situation, therefore, it was necessary to limit action to a "MAP enterprise strategy", fixing as an objective a request to the Contracting Parties, at their meeting in Catania in 2003, to give a clear mandate for a regional strategy and a feasibility study on a "coastal" Protocol. Until then, it was necessary to prepare the ground : (i) by developing a "coastal vision", in other words, a scenario that would show the inexorably strong impact of current trends, particularly if the free-trade area came into existence, clearly outlining and identifying the "hot spots" around the Mediterranean; (ii) by taking the conclusions of the White Paper and refining them, laying emphasis on the inadequacy of tools at the national level; and (iii) by drawing up the "MAP enterprise strategy", fixing the objectives for giving countries support that should be neither quantified nor confined to a particular territory. The end result of this action should not only be to bring the matter to the attention of the Contracting Parties once again in 2003, but also to prepare a project for submission to the GEF or a new project for submission to the MEDA in 2004. Lastly, participants agreed that countries should certainly be encouraged to pay attention to the degradation of their coasts, but also not to ruin the economic – and not only ecological – benefits of the coast. The two elements could be complementary : part of the coast could be made a protected site, which would lead to a rise in the price of land and consequently provide a source of income. Lastly, the strategy should provide an opportunity to return to the theme of sustainable tourism and to review in this context concepts such as "load capacity", which represented the transfer of an ecological concept into the socio-economic area and was far from being the subject of unanimity.

Agenda item 6 : Discussion on a MAP strategy on prevention and control of maritime pollution

31. Mr. Darko Domovic, Programme Administrator at REMPEC, outlined a document prepared by the Malta Centre entitled "Elements for a MAP strategy on prevention and control of maritime pollution" : general overview, objective, results expected as regards preparation for action, action, and the prevention of pollution by ships. The new "prevention

and emergency situations” Protocol of 2002 should be translated into a pragmatic strategy inasmuch as the protection of the marine environment against pollution caused by maritime transport could only be achieved by an “ongoing security” process that encompassed the three separate stages of prevention, preparation for action, and action. Although it was addressed to Mediterranean coastal States, the strategy should be prepared bearing in mind that maritime traffic was essentially a global activity governed by laws adopted at the international level. It therefore had to remain within the limits of the provisions to be found in the legal instruments adopted under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The REMPEC wished to be able to make consistent proposals at the NFPs’ meeting.

32. After participants had thanked Mr. Domovic for his presentation, two speakers drew attention to research by the European Space Agency and the new satellites that were being developed. The Mediterranean should play a role in those activities because – particularly as a result of the free-trade area - the shipping sector was going to experience unprecedented growth. It was therefore an aspect that should be integrated in the strategy, together with the question of the threat to SPAMIs posed by shipping and the introduction of alien species from ballast water.

33. In general, speakers considered that the approach taken by the REMPEC in its strategic elements was too traditional, not sufficiently dynamic. The document did not take into account the general trends in the region, which were nevertheless decisive : the arrival of oil from the Caspian Sea in the Mediterranean; the access of new Mediterranean countries to the EU (with an end to flags of convenience); directive 2000 on port reception facilities; developments in the legal framework, with the new Protocol, naturally, but also with new EU directives, which meant that a degree of competition between the EU and the IMO had emerged; the establishment of police forces responsible for monitoring shipping, which would become increasingly active and present. Lastly, but above all, there was the problem of resources, the financial cost of implementing the strategy: the REMPEC should on this occasion go beyond its technical role and tackle the economic, financial and fiscal aspects and the impact of free trade. The draft strategy should therefore be reviewed in the light of those future developments.

Agenda item 8 : How to make MAP more effective and more visible – Preparations for the Johannesburg Summit

34. Mr. Arab Hoballah, Deputy Coordinator, described the preparatory process for the Johannesburg Summit, which he deemed disappointing in many respects because the document put before the latest meeting – held in Bali – only actually covered three topics: financing, trade, and governance. Two proposals on governance for sustainable development had not been endorsed, which meant that governance for the environment became more important. The current climate was therefore rather pessimistic regarding the prospects for Johannesburg. Perhaps it should be considered that everything had already been decided in advance, for the worst. The “veterans” of Rio pointed out that it had been the same then, just before the Summit, but that had not prevented it being a success. A final effort was being made to “save” the Summit, at the United Nations Secretariat, the South African delegation – the most closely involved of course – but also among other member countries of the European Union, which were urging all heads of State and government to go to the meeting in Johannesburg *en masse*.

35. The Mediterranean intended to play its role in the staging of this event and for many months the MAP had been endeavoring to give it the means to do so. The results of Johannesburg would be separated into two components : initiative I, an action plan comprising commitments; initiative II, an exercise in partnership in specific forms of action, with substantial financing, which would be imposed by its sheer volume and in which certain countries – Italy for example – were closely involved. The MAP could not make its presence

at the Summit felt as a separate body, but it would be present and active and would support the side events such as the meeting of NGOs on the Mediterranean, led by MIO, or the forum on water. The Executive Director of UNEP was intending to hold a debate on regional oceans and seas, and the Mediterranean, because of its recognized role as a "pioneer sea", could play a major role in that. Lastly, the MAP had made a considerable information effort, publishing various brochures and leaflets, and the Centres were urged to disseminate them widely among their NFPs, because at Johannesburg itself there would only be limited means due to the vast quantities involved.

Agenda item 9 : Other business

36. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat provided details on two issues : firstly, the preparation of the regional sustainable development strategy, the relevant meetings to be held, with the objective at present of submitting the "Approach to the Strategy" to the next meeting of the MCSD; secondly, the follow-up to application of the Protocols and dealing with violations, for which a proposal would be put to the Bureau to allow the Secretariat to be assisted by an *ad hoc* committee which would review the issue, as the relevant mechanism envisaged in the Convention had yet to be defined in practical terms.

Agenda item 10 : Closure of the meeting

37. The Coordinator expressed the view that a meeting such as the present one was extremely useful in strengthening cooperation between the Centres and the Unit and it had led to a fruitful exchange of views on the eve of important events. He declared the meeting closed at 5.30 pm on Tuesday, 2 July 2002.

Annex I**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRES AND PROGRAMMES OF THE
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN
CENTRES D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES ET PROGRAMMES DU
PLAN D'ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE**

**REGIONAL MARINE POLLUTION
EMERGENCY RESPONSE CENTRE FOR
THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA (REMPEC)
CENTRE REGIONAL MEDITERRANEEN
POUR L'INTERVENTION D'URGENCE
CONTRE LA POLLUTION MARINE
ACCIDENTELLE**

Mr Darko Domovic
Senior Programme Officer
Regional Marine Pollution Emergency
Response Centre for the Mediterranean
(REMPEC)
Manoel Island GZR 03
Malta

Tel: 356-21-337296-8
Fax: 356-21-339951
E-mail: ddomovic@rempec.org

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE
BLUE PLAN (BP/RAC)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES DU
PLAN BLEU (CAR/PB)**

M. Guillaume Benoit
Director
Blue Plan
BP/RAC
15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven
Sophia Antipolis
06560 Valbonne
France

Tel: 33-4-92387130/33
Fax: 33-4-92387131
E-mail: gbenoit@planbleu.org
Web:

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

Mr Ivica Trumbic
Director
Priority Actions Programme
Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC)
11 Kraj Sv. Ivana
21000 Split
Croatia

Tel: 385-21-343499
Fax: 385-21-361677
E-mail: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr
Web: <http://www.PAP-THECOASTCENTRE.org>

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS
(SPA/RAC)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
POUR LES AIRES SPECIALEMENT
PROTEGES**

Mr Mohammed Adel Hentati

Director
Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity
Centre (SPA/RAC)
Boulevard de l'Environnement
La Charguia
1080 Tunis
Tunisia

Tel: 216-71-795760

Fax: 216-71-797349

E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org.tn

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
ENVIRONMENT REMOTE SENSING
(ERS/RAC)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
POUR LA TELEDETECTION EN MATIERE
D'ENVIRONNEMENT (CAR/TDE)**

Mr Giovanni Cannizzaro

Director
Environment Remote Sensing/Regional
Activity Centre (ERS/RAC)
Via G. Giusti, 2
90144 Palermo
Italy

Tel: 39-091-342368

Fax: 39-091-308512

E-mail: ctmrac@tin.it

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
CLEANER PRODUCTION (CP/RAC)
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONALES
POUR UNE PRODUCTION PROPRE
(CAR/PP)**

Mr Victor Macià

Director
CP/RAC
Cleaner Production Regional Activity Centre
184, Paris Street
3rd floor
08036 Barcelona
Spain

Tel: 34-93-4151112

Fax: 34-93-2370286

E-mail: cleanpro@cema-sa.org

**PROGRAMMES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, SPECIALIZED AGENCIES OF
THE UN SYSTEM, CONVENTION SECRETARIATS
PROGRAMMES DES NATIONS UNIES, AGENCES SPECIALISEES DU
SYSTEME DES NATIONS UNIES, SECRETARIATS DES CONVENTIONS**

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME
COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN
PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES
POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT
UNITE DE COORDINATION DU PLAN
D'ACTION POUR LA MEDITERRANEE**

Mr Lucien Chabason
Coordinator
UNEP/MAP
48 Vass. Konstantinou Ave
116 35 Athens
Greece

Tel: 30-10-72 73 100
Fax: 30-10-72 53 196
E-mail: chabason@unepmap.gr
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

Mr Arab Hoballah
Deputy Coordinator
UNEP/MAP
48 Vass. Konstantinou Ave
116 35 Athens
Greece

Tel: 30-10-72 73 126
Fax: 30-10-72 53 196
E-mail: hoballah@unepmap.gr
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

Mr Francesco Saverio Civili
MED POL Coordinator
UNEP/MAP
48, Vass. Konstantinou
116 35 Athens
Greece

Tel: 30-10-72 73 106
Fax: 30-10-72 53 196
E-mail: fscivili@unepmap.gr
Web : <http://www.unepmap.gr>

Mr. Humberto Da Cruz
Programme Officer
UNEP/MAP
48, Vass. Konstantinou
116 35 Athens
Greece

Tel: 30-10-72 73 115
Fax: 30-10-72 53 196
E-mail: dacruz@unepmap.gr
Web : <http://www.unepmap.gr>

Annex II

Extraordinary meeting of RAC Directors Delphi (Greece), 1-2 July 2002

Agenda

- Item 1: General introduction by the Coordinator
- Item 2: General discussion
- Item 3: Documents to be prepared for the next Contracting Parties' meeting
- Item 4: Methodology for the general evaluation of MAP requested by the Contracting Parties
- Item 5: Discussion on a MAP strategy on coastal zone management
- Item 6: Discussion on a MAP strategy on prevention and control of maritime pollution
- Item 7: How to make MAP more effective and more visible – Preparations for the Johannesburg Summit
- Item 8: Other business
- Item 9: Closure of the meeting