





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Report	1 - 5
Annex I: List of Participants	
Annex II: Agenda	
Annex III Summary of the Decisions of the MEDU Program and RAC Directors Meeting	
Annex IV Memorandum	
Annex V Summary of Findings and Suggestions of the Answers to the Questionnaire about MAP Evaluation	



## **Introduction**

1. The XXI ordinary annual meeting of the RAC Directors was held at Sophia Antipolis (France) on 20 -21 January 2003 at the premises of the Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre.
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, opened the meeting by stressing its heavy agenda and its importance, as it was to take decisions regarding the preparation of the next CP and MAP focal points meetings, with a special focus on the preparation of the documents for both meetings. He introduced Ms. Tatjana Hema, the new MEDU Programme Officer, who replaced Mr. Da Cruz. Ms. Hema would cover all the issues followed by Mr. Da Cruz concerning MEDU and RACs, RAC SPA, RAC PAP and, starting from the beginning of 2004, she would be in charge of the future program related to the Historic sites.

## **Agenda item 2: Preparations for the Contracting Parties meeting**

4. Mr Arab Hoballah, MAP Deputy Coordinator, introduced the agenda by pointing out the main issues to be addressed: preparation for the next CP meeting; implementation of 2003-2003 biennium, progress and lessons; assessments and scientific documents; progress reports, programme budget and recommendations, MAP evaluation; information strategy. He addressed the need to draw the lessons from past experience and in addition noted that, since the funds for 2003 were 100% available, all the RACs directors and programs were expected to take advantage of it by better planning the future activities for the 9 months to come, till the timing of MAP focal points and CP meetings. In this context, the financial statements and the preparation of the progress reports on the activities had to start as soon as possible. Addressing the issue of the timely preparation of the progress report of activities, the meeting decided that the maximum delay for the finalization of the progress report by the Coordinator on the activities carried out during 2002-2003 biennium, in English and French, was early July 2003.

5. Mr. Chabason proposed to follow the same model of preparation of documents as that used for the 12<sup>th</sup> CP meeting in Monaco. In this context he requested that the meeting documents be classified in two categories: documents leading to policy recommendations; and information documents. In addition, he pointed out that the individual progress reports on the activities of each RAC and program should be discussed at the respective National Focal Points meeting, including, as indicative, the related budget for future activities.

6. Mr. Chabason proposed to reduce the number of the recommendations focusing them mainly on the most important policy and political issues and avoiding repetitions.

7. Regarding the financial issues, the MAP Coordinator mentioned that the budget should be prepared in euro. After discussions, the meeting agreed to propose a recommendation to CP in Catania, related to the payment of their contribution in euro. The basis for the budget of the next biennium should be the table of contributions by the Parties in euro as approved in Monaco. The financial implications of entry into MAP of FRY, were left to be discussed during the forthcoming Bureau meeting in Sarajevo.

## **Agenda item 3: Specific documents to be prepared for the next Contracting Parties' meeting**

8. Since the meeting decided on the classification of documents of the meeting into two main categories, Mr. Chabason focused on the issue of the documents leading to policy

recommendations for both meetings. He proposed the submission to Ministers for approval, among others, three strategic documents namely a) Strategic Action Program for the Conservation of Biodiversity SAP-BIO, b) Strategy for the implementation of the Emergency protocol, c) Orientations about the Mediterranean Strategy on Sustainable Development, and suggested that MEDPOL should update the existing SAP recommendations or prepare new strategic recommendations.

9. In reply, Mr. Civili, MEDPOL coordinator, recalled that the approach adopted by the Contracting Parties for the updating of the SAP was to review targets, activities and deadlines every biennium. As a result, MEDPOL would submit to each CP a list of revised activities aiming at the implementation of the SAP.

10. Mr. Patruno explained that REMPEC was preparing the strategic paper for the implementation of the new Malta protocol that would be discussed and approved by the REMPEC focal points and later on by the MAP Focal Points. The meeting discussed the need to carry out an extensive consultation process with Parties because the process of preparation of a strategic document should be as participatory as possible. In this regard, Mr. Chabason confirmed that consultation with governmental designated expert groups is very important and cannot be neglected and added that Monaco could probably be interested in supporting the organization of such an important meeting in June. Since the organization of such a meeting would require funding withdrawal from the MTF, it was decided to submit this proposal to the Bureau meeting in Sarajevo 19-20 May 2003, for the decision.

11. In this context, Mr. Hentati, RAC SPA Director, suggested to follow the method that RAC/SPA used in the process of the SAP BIO preparation that included the organization of about 16 consultations sessions with stakeholders. An advisory committee was established, the SAP BIO national correspondents gave their inputs and would review the document. The RAC/SPA focal points and later the MAP focal point would approve it. During this discussion, Mr. Chabason made a remark regarding the assessment part of the SAP BIO document that didn't present a clear picture or diagnosis of the state of the marine environment. In reply, Mr. Hentati, RAC SPA Director explained that the document prepared until then was a first draft based on the national reports. He reported that the preparation of a new draft reflecting the remarks of Mr. Chabason was in process.

12. A general discussion was opened about the preparation of other documents such as MAP evaluation report, reporting system report, Environment and Development report, reporting under SAP, guidelines to achieve some of the objectives set under SAP, and the new informal document in French and Arabic etc. Mr. Chabason charged Ms. Hema, MEDU programme officer to prepare a memo related to the timing for the preparation of the documents assigning the respective responsible officers. The decisions and Memo are attached as annex 3 and 4 to this report.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Progress reports**

13. Mr. Chabason opened the discussion related to the main activities and issues to be addressed by the progress report of the coordinator for the MAP NFP meeting and other documents, and invited the RAC directors and MEDU officials to report briefly on their main specific issues.

14. Mr. Hoballah began by pointing out the work done for the preparation of the "Orientations on a Mediterranean strategy on sustainable development". Three contracted experts had finalized three substantial drafts and were working to prepare an integrated document that would be reviewed by experts in Barcelona in March 2003. He briefed the meeting about the preparation of the upcoming meetings under MCSD during 2003 such as the Barcelona meeting, the Steering Committee and the MCSD in Cavtat.

15. The RAC directors briefed the meeting about the implementation of several projects funded by MTF, external funding and future plans.

16. Mr. Chabason requested that MEDPOL should start planning to use the river watershed/basin approach in line with the EU Frame water directive.

17. In light with the need to better orient MAP towards a stronger involvement in the implementation of national activities, a lively discussion was opened about the need for additional external funding. Mr. Chabason, pointed out that the image of MAP due to its involvement in national activities had improved. In that context, external funding would be very important, in particular because the relevant MAP experience was not extensive.

18. The RACs directors informed about their efforts to prepare and submit project proposals for funding to external instruments. Both SMAP and Life programs were reported to be under development and evaluation. PAP RAC briefed that they have prepared a joint proposal with METAP. After addressing some developments related to the funding and programs available to be reached by quality project proposals, the meeting agreed that MAP task was among others to support the countries in the preparation of project proposals and "accompany" them in raising funds for their implementation.

19. On the subject of addressing the external funding, Mr. Chabason pointed out that, in relation to CAMPs, PAP/RAC should evaluate the situation and propose appropriate solutions to better exploit the full potential of CAMPs activity. He proposed that no CAMPs project should be launched if there was no other national or international partner to support its implementation. In this context, Mr. Civili added that during the preparatory phase of the GEF project, the approach of GEF was very strict. GEF would fund pre-investment studies on the basis of written statements or agreements proving the commitment to implement the investment after the project.

#### **Agenda item 5: Evaluation of MAP**

20. Mr. Chabason introduced this important issue by reminding that the general philosophy of the evaluation would not be the review of the past as an objective in itself but its consideration on a prospective base in order to make MAP capable of facing better the future challenges. In this context, he added that the methodology of the evaluation was very important. The Contracting Parties did not require a real evaluation and the Bureau decided to establish a steering committee to produce an internal evaluation without hiring consultants.

21. Ms. Hema introduced some of the findings of the answers of MAP professional staff to the questionnaire of the Coordinator "On MAP evaluation". The respective summary is attached to this report as Annex 5.

22. The international and national context of the MAP evaluation was largely discussed by all participants. The new situation related to the changes at EU level (enlargement process), the experience of the Prestige accident, the new Malta protocol, the differences between the north and the south, the rationale of the regional cooperation, the need to involve other actors (private sector and local authorities) and to accompany the countries (not only assisting them), some possible overlapping with EU legislation, the development inside the countries themselves were pointed out with the aim of defining the role of MAP and the process of its evaluation.

23. Several ideas related to the future role of MAP were put on the table such as how to keep marine and coastal area as a main field of expertise, experience and knowledge; to work closer with governments, to be a catalyst between the north and the south towards

common regional concerns, etc. In conclusion, Mr. Chabason pointed out the relative advantages of MAP such as relevance and competitiveness; the lack of other concurrent in the technical field and disadvantages such as not having sufficient tools to financially support the countries. MAP should strongly support the countries in preparing projects and requests for financial support. If MAP had a good political trust, it would easily gain stronger support. He called for more dynamism and changes in MAP culture in order to react in time. Mr. Chabason pointed out the importance of following up the developments in other environmental conventions and in international law.

#### **Agenda Item 6: MCSD and Task Force evaluation**

24. The evaluation of MCSD, the link with MAP overall evaluation and the work carried out by the Task Force on MCSD evaluation, were largely discussed. The Deputy Coordinator briefed the meeting about such a process. The Task Force was being led by Italy and Spain. The preliminary output of the Task Force was put before the Steering Committee of MCSD that took the decision to dig more into the link between MCSD and MAP. The first conclusion drawn was that some administrative improvements could be needed or other changes. Mr. Hoballah highlighted some options that could help MCSD to fulfill its mandate of 1995, such as a) Improving with means within the Secretariat as it is, with 3-4 professionals, b) an MCSD support unit with some autonomy from MEDU that would require more funds and a host country. In addition, he pointed out that in the mandate of MCSD there were some crucial issues to be discussed and clarified such as the role of MCSD as a cooperating body with NGOs, civil Society, business and IGOs. That would probably need a clearer mandate for MCSD and its relation with MAP components.

25. The participants discussed the options presented by the Deputy coordinator and pointed out that instead of having an MCSD dealing with economic and social analysis and cooperating with social and economic partners, the MCSD was transforming little by little into an office of studies and research. The meeting found inappropriate and non efficient the option of establishing an autonomous MCSD unit in a host country. In addition, such an option is equivalent with establishing a new center and they pointed out that there is no need to establish new centers. MCSD should be an integral part of MAP and be better supported in the context of MAP. A third option was proposed to give to BP a clearer mandate as a center for the Sustainable Development. MCSD should maintain the policy and advisory role with a light structure.

26. Mr. Benoit, BP Director considered the proposal of transforming BP as a center for sustainable development a practical and feasible option but that would require changes of the original mandate.

27. Mr. Chabason confirmed that clarifying the role and the functioning of MCSD was essential for MAP. The countries had or were establishing their national committees for SD. In this context the existence of such a regional structure was necessary and should be further strengthened. In order to move forward, Mr. Chabason pointed out that in principle, a consultative body could not also be an executive body; MAP and its programmes will realize the implementation of the MCSD recommendations; the centers should have clearer mandates in this regard: BP as a research center, PAP a more oriented action; CP could be transformed into a center for enterprise and sustainable development. Mr. Chabason concluded that a task force was established to accomplish such an evaluation and the respective conclusions would be drawn at the termination of this exercise.

28. Finally, Mr. Chabason raised the issue of the need for a better internal administrative structure for addressing the sustainable development, MCSD and the relevant themes. In this regard, he called for careful planning of the budget for the next biennium.



### **Agenda item 7: Information**

29. The Deputy Coordinator pointed out that a strategic paper on information had been drafted. He addressed some issues such as the need to increase MAP visibility. Dissemination of information and link with the media had to be substantially improved.

30. The Information Officer of MAP, B. Kamal, pointed out that MAP should prioritize its own goal, which was the improvement of MAP visibility and to define the list of activities necessary for its achievement; Many targets mean no targets. MAP did not have an efficient dissemination strategy; Map information should reach the politicians, general public and scientists.

31. There ensued a lively debate between participants related to the eventual need of MAP to communicate with the media; to update the web page; to exchange the information with RACs and MEDU programs and how MEDWAVES could be better fed with information from RACs and programs. To this aim, a proposal that the information officer should pay a visit to each RAC was found useful and accepted by all. The dissemination list of the information was also discussed.

### **Agenda Item 8: Closure of the meeting**

32. In closing the Meeting, the Deputy Coordinator expressed the view that this meeting was extremely useful in planning the future working programs; in strengthening cooperation between the Centers and the Unit and in leading to a fruitful exchange of views prior to important events. He declared the meeting closed at 10.30 A.M on Tuesday, 21 January 2003.



**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**

**MEDPOL**

**Mr Francesco Saverio Civili**

MED POL Coordinator  
UNEP/MAP  
48, Vass. Konstantinou  
116 35 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30-210-72 73 106  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [fscivili@unepmap.gr](mailto:fscivili@unepmap.gr)  
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

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

**Rear Admiral Roberto Patruno**

Director  
Regional Marine Pollution Emergency  
Response Centre for the Mediterranean  
(REMPEC)  
Manoel Island GZR 03  
Malta

Tel: +356 21337296-8 / 356 99497978  
Fax: +356 21339951  
E-mail: [rempec@waldonet.net.mt](mailto:rempec@waldonet.net.mt)

**Ms Lilia Khodjet El Khil**

Technical Expert  
Regional Marine Pollution Emergency  
Response Centre for the Mediterranean  
(REMPEC)  
Manoel Island GZR 03  
Malta

Tel: ++356 21337296-8 / 356 99497978  
Fax: ++356 21339951  
E-mail: [assistant4@rempec.org](mailto:assistant4@rempec.org)

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

**M. Guillaume Benoit**

Directeur  
Plan Bleu  
CAR/PB  
15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven  
Sophia Antipolis  
06560 Valbonne  
France

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

**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: 385-21-340490  
E-mail: ivica.trumbic@ppa.tel.hr  
Web: <http://www.PAP-THECOASTCENTRE.org>

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

**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

**MAP SECRETARIAT FOR 100 MEDITERRANEAN  
HISTORIC SITES  
SECRETARIAT DU PAM DE 100 SITES  
HISTORIQUES MEDITERRANEENS**

**M. Daniel Drocourt**  
Coordonnateur  
"100 Sites historiques méditerranéens" du  
Plan d'action pour la Méditerranée  
Atelier du Patrimoine de la Ville de  
Marseille  
10 Ter Square Belsunce  
F-13001 Marseille  
France

Tel. [33] 4 91907874  
Fax. [33] 4 91561461  
E-mail: ddrocourt@mairie-marseille.fr

**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 MEDITERRANE  
(UNEP/MAP)E**

**Mr. Lucien Chabason**

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

Tel: 30-210-72 73 100  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [chabason@unepmap.gr](mailto:chabason@unepmap.gr)  
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

**Mr. Arab Hoballah**

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

Tel: 30-210-72 73 126  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [hoballah@unepmap.gr](mailto:hoballah@unepmap.gr)  
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

**Mr. Baher Kamal**

Information Officer  
UNEP/MAP  
48 Vass. Konstantinou Ave  
116 35 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30-210-72 73 103  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [baher@unepmap.gr](mailto:baher@unepmap.gr)  
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

**Ms. Tatjana Hema**

Programme Officer  
UNEP/MAP  
48, Vass. Konstantinou  
116 35 Athens  
Greece

Tel: 30-210-72 73 115  
Fax: 30-210-72 53 196  
E-mail: [thema@unepmap.gr](mailto:thema@unepmap.gr)  
Web: <http://www.unepmap.gr>

## **ANNEX II**

### **AGENDA**

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Adoption of the provisional agenda and organization of work
3. General introduction by the Coordinator
4. Preparation of the next CP meeting:
  - Implementation of 2002-2003 biennium, progress and lessons
  - Preparatory process and coordination for 2004-2005 biennium
  - Assessment and scientific documents
  - Progress reports
  - Programme/budget/recommendations
  - Specific NFP and MAP NFP meetings
  - Respective responsibilities;
5. Outcome of the last Bureau meeting and process for MAP evaluation
  - Progress of Task Force on MCSD Assessment and Prospects
  - Evaluation questionnaire and assessment of preliminary results
  - Next steps and respective responsibilities
6. Information strategy and MAP visibility
  - Status and assessment
  - Needs and means
  - Prospects, further steps and respective responsibilities
  - Wrap up and concluding remarks
7. Preparation of BP/ERS/PAP Joint Focal Points Meeting
  - Date, venue and means
  - Common and respective issues
  - Cooperation and coordination
  - Invitation letter
  - Provisional agenda
  - Organization of the meeting
  - Documents to be prepared
  - Respective responsibilities
  - Next steps
8. Conclusions and recommendations
9. Other business
10. Closure of the meeting





## **ANNEX III**

### **SUMMARY OF THE DECISIONS OF THE MEDU PROGRAM and RACs DIRECTORS' MEETING**

20-21 January 2003  
Sophia Antipolis

#### **PREPARATION OF THE NEXT CONTRACTING PARTIES MEETING**

##### **1. Implementation of 2002-2003 biennium**

- The planning of future activities for the 9 months to come should be done in the most effective way, keeping in mind the calendar of meetings (Focal Points and Contracting Parties meetings).

##### **2. Preparatory process and coordination for 2004-2005 biennium**

- The budget for the next biennium should be prepared in euros. The discussion of budget issues at the Specific Focal Points meeting upon their request should be indicative.
- The draft programme and the budget for the next biennium should be prepared by mid July. There should be more detailed justifications for each activity, its objectives and budget

##### **3. Progress reports/Recommendations/Budget**

- The Secretariat should finalize the progress report of activities, recommendations and budgets in English by mid July 2003.
- The preparation of such reports should begin as soon as possible.
- There should be separate documents of the progress report, recommendations and budget.
- MEDU should presently prepare a memo giving a timetable for this process.
- The Centers, Programs and MCSD should prepare and submit their progress report to the Secretariat by mid June and not later than end of June, after the Specific NFP meetings 2003
- The progress reports should first be submitted for discussion at the Specific Focal Points meetings

##### **4. Assessment and Scientific documents**

###### **a. The assessment documents include:**

- The Blue Plan report on the environment and development
- The assessment part of SAP Biodiversity by the RAC SPA
- The trans-boundary marine diagnostic analysis by MEDPOL

- ###### **b. The scientific documents should be prepared as information documents and finalized as soon as possible to render possible their translation and to that end these documents should be as brief as possible.**

##### **5. Strategy documents**

- **The strategy documents include:**

1. SAP Biodiversity Strategy
2. Orientation for the Mediterranean Strategy on SD
3. Strategy for the implementation of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol.
4. Regional Plans (GEF)

- The process of finalization of the strategic document is very important and should be participatory as much as possible. Ad hoc governmental designated experts groups should largely discuss the strategic papers before being submitted to the Specific Focal Points meeting.
- Particularly for REMPEC strategic paper, such a meeting should be held not later than June 2003. REMPEC and the Secretariat should be responsible for finding a host country for this event.
- MEDPOL should continue keeping the SAP in line and up to date with international and regional related development.

## **6. RACs Evaluation**

The ongoing evaluation process for REMPEC, SPA and the future of Historic Sites should be finalized and reported to the CP.

## **7. MAP overall evaluation**

- The MAP evaluation process should continue. The Secretariat should nominate two experts as requested by the last Bureau meeting.
- The summary of the answers to the MAP coordinator questionnaire should be completed by adding the inputs of BP, REMPEC and ERS that should be finalized by end of January
- The first meeting of the “think tank” will be organized in March 2003 in Athens
- The introductory note for the March meeting should be prepared as soon as possible based on the inputs and answers to a) the MAP evaluation questionnaire received, b) conclusions of RAC directors at Delphi meeting and c) the present meeting.

## **8. MCSD**

- Several options were discussed about the future of MCSD and the mandate of some RACs.
- The meeting of Barcelona about the orientations of regional strategy on SD will consider the table of content of the strategy.
- BP would provide a summary paper of “Environment and Development” to the Barcelona meeting.

## **9. The future of CAMPs**

- The RACs should cooperate under the coordination of PAP RAC to implement a new approach towards assisting the countries in preparing and implementing the CAMPs including additional support of other donors as requested by the last Bureau meeting.
- The PAP RAC should prepare a strategic paper about the CAMPs future.

## **10. Information strategy and MAP visibility**

- RACs and MEDU should exchange regular information and combine the relevant mailing list.
- Medwaves should regularly include information from RACs and their programs and activities
- System of web use statistics should be utilized including the information on the origin of the visitors
- Electronic mail is a very important tool to be used.
- The networking with media in the Mediterranean could be the proper channel for information dissemination.
- The information officer should have field sessions with each RAC upon request, to assist them on how the information should be drafted, presented and disseminated properly.



**ANNEX IV**  
**MEMORANDUM**

Following the decisions of the MEDU and RACs directors meeting, held on 20-21 January 2003 in Sophia Antipolis, France, the preparation of the documents for the MAP Focal points should meet the following time schedule:

**Working documents leading to recommendations**

**1. Recommendations and Programme Budget for 2004-2005**

**Deadline:**

- Inputs from MEDU, MEDPOL, PB, PAP, CP, ERS, REMPEC to be submitted to MEDU by **05 June 2003 (in both languages)**.
- Inputs from RAC SPA have to be submitted to MEDU by **25 June 2003 (in both languages)**
- Final version of the integrated recommendations and programme budget document for the next biennium to be ready **in English by 16 July 2003**, including photocopies.

**Responsible Officer: T. Hema**, with inputs and support from all RACs and Programme Directors (**MEDU, MEDPOL, PB, PAP, REMPEC, SPA, CP, ERS**)

**2. Draft Strategic Assessment of the General Framework of Barcelona Convention (the operational bodies and the Coordination Unit)**

**Deadline:** Final version to be ready in French by **20 June 2003**, in English by **05 July 2003**.

**Responsible officer T. Hema**

**3. Evaluation draft report of RAC SPA ,**

**Deadline:** Final versions in both languages to be submitted to MEDU by **25 June 2003**

**Responsible Officer: A. Hoballah** with support of **A. Hentati**

**4. Evaluation draft report of REMPEC ,**

**Deadline:** Final draft report in both languages to be submitted to MEDU by **20 June 2003**

**Responsible Officer: FS Civili** with the support of **R.Patruno**

**5. Biodiversity Strategy Draft (including only the recommendations)**

**Deadline:** Final version in both languages to be submitted to MEDU by **28 June 2003**

**Responsible officer: A. Hentati** in cooperation with **A. Baric** and **T. Hema**

**6. Strategic Paper Draft "On the Implementation of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol"**

**Deadline:** Final version to be submitted in both languages to MEDU by **13 September 2003**

**Responsible Officer: R. Patruno**

**7. Draft paper for the future of MAP activities in the field of CAMPs including the legal frame development.**

**Deadline:** The document to be submitted in both languages to MEDU by **20 June 2003**

**Responsible Officer: I. Trumbic** in cooperation with **A. Hoballah**.

- 8. Draft regional plan for the reduction of input BOD by 50 percent by the year 2005 from industrial sources.**

**Deadline:** Final versions in both languages to be submitted to MEDU by **15 June 2003**

**Responsible Officer: FS Civili** in cooperation with **A. Baric**

- 9. Draft Regional plan for the reduction by 20% by 2007 of the generation of hazardous waste from industrial installations**

**Deadline:** Final version in both languages to be submitted to MEDU by **15 June 2003**

**Responsible Officer: FS Civili** in cooperation with **A. Baric**

- 10. Draft-Recommendations drawn from the implementation of the trial phase of the reporting system**

**Deadline:** Document to be ready by **15 June 2003 in English, and by 30 June 2003 in French**

**Responsible Officer: T Hema**

- 11. Draft-Reporting System on National Compliance to Strategic Action Programme**

**Deadline :** Final versions in both languages to be submitted to MEDU by **15 June 2003**

**Responsible Officer: FS Civili.**

### **Information Documents**

- 1. Activity Progress Report**

- a) The MEDU, MEDPOL, MCSD, BP, PAP, SPA, CP, ERS, REMPEC RACs specific inputs for the preparation of the progress activity report.**

**Deadline:** The inputs in both languages for the preparation of the progress report have to be submitted to MEDU by **05 June 2003** and only for RAC SPA by **25 June 2003**.

**Responsible Officers : L.C, A.H, FSC, TH, BK, RACs directors**

- b) The integrated progress activity report has to be finalized by 19 July 2003 in English, and by 28 July 2003 in French, including photocopies.**

**Responsible officer: T Hema** with inputs from **L.C, A.H, FSC, TH, BK, RACs directors**.

- c) The Final Reports of the Specific National Focal Points Meetings** have to be submitted to MEDU in both languages by **15 June 2003, and for RAC SPA by 28 June 2003**.

**Responsible officers: FCS, RACs directors**

- 2. Financial and Implementation Report of MAP program**

**Deadline:** Final version to be ready in English and French by **25 August 2003**

**Responsible officer: K. Ben Salah**

**3. Report on the Environment and Development (first draft)**

**Responsible Officer: P. Benoit /BP**

**4. Assessment Part of the SAP BIO document,**

**Responsible officer: A. Hentati RAC/SPA in cooperation with A. Baric, and T. Hema**

**5. The trans-boundary diagnostic analysis of marine pollution**

**Responsible Officer: FS Civili, MEDPOL**

**6. Information note on the orientation for a Mediterranean Strategy on SD**

**Deadline:** for Documents Nr. 3,4,5,6: **12 July 2003** if MEDU is expected to disseminate them to MAP NFP prior to the meeting or **25 August 2003** if it will be disseminated by MEDU during the NFP meeting.

**Responsible Officer: A. Hoballah**

**7. MAP Legal frame; Informal document**

**Deadline** Documents to be ready in French, English and Arabic languages by **15 July 2003**

**Responsible officer: T. Hema, H. Pissala Petrou**

**\*Important notes**

- All documents (English version) should be sent to MAP Focal Points by 25 July 2003; French version to be sent 15 days later.
- When preparing recommendations, please distinguish clearly between strategic/policy recommendations and those related to activities, and avoid any overlapping with the list of activities
- Recommendations to the Parties should straight to the point and be very limited in number
- The specific inputs from MEDU, MEDPOL, MCSO, PB, PAP, REMPEC, SPA, ERS have to be formulated and formatted according to the Secretariat instructions as attached.
- The specific inputs related to the Recommendations and Programme budget for the new next biennium have to highlight the rationale for the new activities and the related budget.





## **ANNEX V**

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT MAP EVALUATION**

#### **1. JURIDICAL ASPECTS**

##### **1.1 RATIFICATION**

- 1 Great efforts to prepare and adopt regional legislation are not being utilised
- 2 The lack of ratification represents a serious problem of image and credibility for the Barcelona system and of the whole Mediterranean region
- 3 The instruments not yet in force, the new protocols, don't create any concrete trouble; the countries are working smoothly through a type of preparatory phase
- 4 There is no problem because the MAP structures are implementing the CP recommendations. The trend is increasing despite some MAP instruments that are not yet in force
- 5 The non ratification process delays the implementation of plans and strategies decreasing the numerous possibilities for reaction that MAP could offer for the protection of the Mediterranean
- 6 The main negative impact is the non-equal national progress relative to projects and initiatives for the protection of the Mediterranean

##### **SUGGESTIONS**

- 1 The need for regional legislation and its ratification to be shown through real examples; i.e., oil transportation in the Adriatic, if we want it entered into force
- 2 Year 2003 is crucial for the ratification process, because countries are expected to take concrete actions

##### **1.2 INCORPORATION INTO NATIONAL SYSTEM**

- Incorporation is low
- The countries sometimes have difficulties in understanding the implications of international agreements on their national systems.
- There are countries that have ratified the convention or the protocols making them an integral part of their national juridical system. Their implementation is hampered because those instruments are not yet in force due to the non-ratification by the necessary quorum of countries

##### **SUGGESTIONS**

- Assistance to be offered to some countries to help them understand the national implications of the international agreements and their implementation.

##### **1.3 COHERENCE WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS AND PROTOCOLS**

- There is no problem of coherence because the texts of the Barcelona system have been prepared taking into account what already existed

### **SUGGESTIONS**

- It is important to continuously follow the relevant possible international development that could make the Barcelona system suddenly obsolete
- Lack of coordination between Secretariats for the reporting system. In this context, the mutual and reciprocal cooperation amongst Secretariats is very important
- A better coordination of the activities concerning the Mediterranean is needed in the frame of other related and complimentary programs

### **1.4 COHERENCE WITH EU LEGISLATION**

- No coherence problem with EU related to land based pollution, SAP and biodiversity
- The EU is more advanced than the Mediterranean one to a certain extent on water, Sea and ICZM
- The only aspect is the harmonisation of the reporting system

### **SUGGESTIONS**

- To make efforts to follow EU example

### **1.5 REPORTING SYSTEM**

- The reporting system being tested is acceptably complex and not too difficult to fill in.
- MAP does not have an effective reporting system which is related to the ratification issues

### **SUGGESTIONS**

- The countries should gradually apply the reporting system; which will increase the credibility of MAP
- The creation of a mechanism that would follow up the application of the legal texts is desirable
- Monitoring of compliance to regulations is very important
- MAP should look towards linking with some monitoring existing systems

### **1.6 REFERENCE OF BARCELONA CONVENTION TO SEVERAL PUBLICATIONS**

- There are several mentions of the Barcelona Convention
- There are a number of books
- Other regional marine conventions are rarely mentioned
- The European legislation is mentioned more often because it is linked more closely to political and economic aspects

### **SUGGESTIONS**

- To stimulate the preparation of papers to be published in journals
- There are plenty of subjects to write about

## **2. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT**

### **2.1 THE PERFORMANCE OF THE MEETING OF THE CP INCLUDING THE DOCUMENTS**

- The work of the Secretariat is good and significant improvements have been made in the last few years.
- The documents are of good quality

#### **SUGGESTIONS**

- More should be done to have more transparency in the intra MAP conference preparation process and to increase the integration of the MAP component Activities
- The output of each CP meeting would be a document with political value formally approved by the Ministers related to the status of the Mediterranean and what the countries themselves commit.

#### **2.2 THE JOINT FOCALS POINT MEETING FOR PAP, BP AND RS RACS FORMULA**

- The advantage is only economical
- There is not much opportunity to discuss the issues in depth
- It depends on the specific subjects of the meeting

#### **SUGGESTIONS**

- To have three days separate meetings for each centre

#### **2.3 RACS FOCAL POINT MEETING TO BE SHORTER**

- Two days meeting is the minimum for a single centre
- Four days meeting is a minimum for more than one centre

#### **2.4 MCSD IN THE INSTITUTIONAL POINT OF VIEW**

- MCSD has always been considered as an initiative that should be supported by a very light institutional structure
- The leaning on the type of MAP structure, more than an intellectual construct, is dangerous
- It is wrong to go towards further institutionalisation of SD.

#### **SUGGESTIONS**

- MAP should avoid creating a stronger structure conceptually attached but physically detached from MAP
- MAP should try to better integrate the SP in its activities
- An appropriate solution will be not to create a new structure but to modify the mandate of the BP and make it the core centre of MCSD.
- If the RACs are not going to develop their core expertise they can't be of much help to MCSD as technical support
- It is necessary to strengthen the cell of MCSD in the MAP
- It is necessary to better support financially the MCSD
- A special unit should be created

#### **2.5 THE MANDATE OF RACs**

#### **SUGGESTIONS**

- A clearer statute of the RACs will be helpful
- There is a need to update the mandate of some centres BP, PAP, RAC ERS

- An official document, mandate or statute should be written for each centre.

## **2.6 JOHANNESBURG IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

- MAP already covers a large number of the topics of the Johannesburg Action Plan
- MAP should reflect the basic recommendations of Johannesburg as poverty alleviation, financing for sustainable development, partnership and governance, climate change and fisheries, etc.

## **2.7 RELATION MEDU-RAC AND RAC-RAC**

- MEDU-RAC relations have been improving over the years
- RAC-RAC relations are not satisfactory or only slightly improving and should be strengthened substantially

## **3. COOPERATION AND INTERVENTION OF MAP**

### **3.1 GENERAL**

- MAP could be an instrument for development funds
- The present balance between the cooperation and the intervention should be kept
- The trend that sees MAP more involved in concrete actions on a national level is very positive and should continue
- An activity for clearing house for projects and investment to assist concretely the countries in preparing proposals to donors, should be launched

### **3.2 MCSD ISSUES AND RACS SUPPORT**

- MAP structure cannot and should not keep the monopoly of the support function to the MCSD
- MAP through the RACs and Focal Points should take into account the recommendation of MCSD
- MAP could develop action strategic programs on the basis of the MCSD recommendations.
- The RACs have to support MCSD activity in their field of expertise.
- If MCSD will be in charge of the implementation of the recommendations; its mandate should be extended.

### **3.3 CAMP s**

- CAMPS are highly sought by the countries
- MEDA SMAP should be a welcome partner in CAMPs
- The future of CAMPs is closely related to the future relations with EU

### **3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION**

A precise planning can and could be made for the preparation of large and comprehensive assessment reports in close cooperation with RACs and Medpol

### **3.5 INFORMATION STRATEGY**

- The new web is complete
- The other publications are in line with most world production
- The MAP is relatively little known because the official contacts are limited only to the MoE and of the scarce diffusion of documents
- It should be decided if Medwaves will be MAP or a Mediterranean journal
- A tour of MAP and its components by the known journalist in the field, would be helpful

### **4. OTHER INTERGOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS, EU, Etc.**

- Better than the past
- Rather good, except with EU
- MAP is occupying a more important role in the region by other institutions

#### **4.1 CONVENTIONS AND CENTRES, SPECIALLY BIODIVERSITY**

- The links are with IUCN, Ramsar, GEF, etc.
- RAC SPA should take the lead in expertise
- PAP RAC could be active because of its expertise in ICAM which is the more appreciated as a tool for the protection of biodiversity
- Generally the information on possible revisions and additions of other conventions and programs should be known
- To cooperate in harmonising the reporting with other systems

#### **4.2 THE COOPERATION WITH ACADEMIC AND SCIENTIFIC MEDIA**

- Not very fruitful
- Being recently improved

#### **4.3 COOPERATION WITH UNEP**

- Modest cooperation
- It was better in the past
- It is increasing

#### **4.4 PREPARATION OF PROJECTS FOR FUNDING**

- Coordination of Medpol and RACs for setting the priorities and projects should be improved

#### **4.5 NGO**

- The relations are modest or not satisfactory
- The private sector and local authorities
- The MCSD has initiated some cooperation that is very positive

### **5. HUMAN AND FINANCIAL ASPECTS**

#### **5.1**

- The structure of MAP is not heavy and should be strengthened

- Economist are needed in MEDU and other centres in line with Johannesburg recommendations
- MEDU and RACs should better exploit the possibility of having JPOs paid by the governments
- MAP can't afford to ask for new staff at present

## **5.2**

- There is an obvious trend to make use of the consultant once the experience is positive
- There is no time sometimes to follow the work of consultants
- Good roster is needed and is improved constantly
- Efforts should be made to find experts in all countries for geographical coverage
- Each officer should make a list of experts based on his knowledge

## **5.3 More transparency is needed**

## **5.4 The Medpol and RACs are capable of preparing projects for funding. Lobbying by countries and MAP is necessary**

## **6. RELATIONS WITH COUNTRIES**

- MAP should be present in the countries
- The involvement of MAP mobilizing local actors and stakeholder will make it better known.