



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

EP



UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.358/10
10 June 2011
Original: ENGLISH



MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

14th Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission
on Sustainable Development
Budva, Montenegro, 30 May to 1 June 2011

**Report of the 14th Meeting of the Mediterranean
Commission on Sustainable Development**

Table of Contents

Body of the report

Annexes

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Annex I | Conclusions and Recommendations of the Meeting |
| Annex II | Recommendations of the Assessment on the Implementation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD) |
| Annex III | List of Participants |
| Annex IV | Agenda of the meeting |

Introduction

1. At the kind invitation of the Montenegrin Government, the Fourteenth Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) was held at Hotel Maestral, Budva, Montenegro, from 30 May to 1 June 2011.

Participation

2. The meeting was attended by the following members of the Commission:

Albania, Algeria, APO (Environmental Protection Services), Association of Italian Local Agenda 21, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Centre for the Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe (CEDARE), Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, ENDA Maghreb, France, Greece, Israel, Lebanon, Malta, Mediterranean Information Office for Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development (MIO-ECSDE), Montenegro, Morocco, RAED-Arab Network for Environment and Development, Slovenia, Tunisia, Turkey, Worldwide Fund for Nature / Mediterranean Programme Office (WWF MEDPO) and the World Bank.

3. The following components of UNEP/MAP were also represented at the meeting:

Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC), Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC), Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC) and Cleaner Production Regional Activity Centre (CP/RAC)

4. The following United Nations specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other partners attended the meeting as observers:

Arab Forum For Environment and Development (AFED), Environmental Center for Administration and Technology (ECAT Tirana), Global Footprint Network, IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (IUCN-Med), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), UN Conference Rio 2012 and the United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (UNEP DTIE).

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

Opening of the meeting

6. The meeting was opened at 9 a.m. by Ms Mawaheb Abu El Azm, outgoing President of the MCSD Steering Committee, who welcomed participants and thanked the authorities of Montenegro for hosting the meeting.

7. In his welcoming address, H.E. Mr Predrag Sekulic, Minister of Sustainable Development and Tourism of Montenegro, said that the meeting afforded a crucial opportunity for developing further guidelines for improving the institutional framework for the MCSD's work and fostering integration of the environment in development strategies. In the unique Mediterranean context, greening of the economy, sustainable consumption and production (SCP) and integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) should be the framework for the region's participation in the third United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in 2012 and also feature prominently in the MCSD's forthcoming programme of work. Montenegro would be signing the agreement for the implementation of

the country's CAMP programme at the current meeting. Another critical area to be addressed by the Commission was that of adaptation to climate change.

8. Ms Maria Luisa Silva Mejias (MAP Coordinator) welcomed participants and thanked the Government of Montenegro for hosting the current session of the MSCD. She recalled the important achievements of the MCS D in its 16-year history and introduced the themes for the meeting, which mirrored the two main themes of Rio+20: a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; and the institutional framework for sustainable development. The themes emphasized the need to enhance the contribution of the economic pillar in environmental conservation and to seek organizational efficiency, complementarities and synergies among stakeholders. The Mediterranean provided a valuable model for demonstrating the potential of protecting the natural resources of oceans and coasts in bringing social and economic benefits from a blue green economy. At the current session, the MCS D would bring together experiences and lessons learnt in sustainable development in preparation for Rio+20, and decide how the MCS D should move forward in the coming years.

Election of the Steering Committee

9. In accordance with Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure and following the customary consultations, the Commission elected its new Steering Committee as follows:

President: Ms Jelena Knezevic (Montenegro)

Vice-Presidents: President of the Bureau of the Contacting Parties (Morocco until the meeting of the Contracting Parties; France thereafter)
Mr Lotfi Ben Said (Tunisia)
Mr Franck Lauwers (Malta)
Mr Hossam Allam (Development for the Arab Region and Europe, CEDARE)
Mr Gilles Pipien (World Bank)

Rapporteur: Ms. Sanna Al Sairawan (Lebanon)

Agreement for the Implementation of the Programme of Integrated Coastal Zone Management of Montenegro

10. Ms Jelena Knezevic (Montenegro) said that the current session provided an appropriate opportunity for the signing of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Programme of Integrated Coastal Zone Management of Montenegro, which would make an important contribution to the sustainability and protection of the Mediterranean. Mr Predrag Sekulic, Minister of Sustainable Development and Tourism of Montenegro, and Ms Maria Luisa Silva Mejias, MAP Coordinator, signed the Agreement.

Adoption of the agenda

11. The agenda contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG. 358/2 was adopted. The agenda appears as Annex IV to the present report.

Introductory Remarks on Rio+20

12. Mr Brice Lalonde (Executive Coordinator, Rio+20) outlined the preparatory process for Rio+20, which aimed to secure renewed political commitment for sustainable development with a view to producing a focused political document. The way was fully open for the Mediterranean Commission to make an ambitious contribution to that process by providing input to the themes to be addressed. Areas for consideration on that score could include: targets to be set with respect to new and emerging issues; components of a road map to a green economy in the context of sustainable development; and strategies for improving the institutional framework for sustainable development.

13. Mr Emilio D'Alessio (President, Italian Local Agenda 21 Association) emphasized the participatory role of civil society in the preparations for and follow-up to Rio+20. Indeed, the contribution of the major groups defined in Agenda 21 could help to frame the structure of the outcome document and in turn the action programmes to be established subsequently. His Association accordingly looked forward to playing an active part in the process and strongly advocated an MCSD contribution to the so-called zero draft. The contribution should cover, inter alia: an implementation road map that included regional strategies and visions; the strengthening of governance structures; and enhancement of the role of major groups in the entire process.

14. Mr Najib Saab (Secretary General, Arab Forum for Environment and Development - AFED) expressed the hope that the Arab Spring would usher in a new direction for economic and environmental stability; stronger political will, effective public policy, the voice of civil society and better governance should have positive spill over effects on environmental governance. The constraints and challenges faced by Arab economies had hindered the transition to a green economy which was now not just an option, but an obligation for the region in order to secure the path to sustainable development. Indeed it was to be the focus of the Rio summit and should be seen as a novel approach, setting new criteria for national and international development agendas, rather than simply as a new name for old practices. AFED had taken the lead with its Green Economy Initiative in advancing the concept of a green economy as the basis for transforming Arab economies. In effecting the transition, under the guidance of the international and regional environmental agencies, governments should ensure that their policy decisions were informed by input from civil society and community groups.

15. During the ensuing discussion, participants stressed the role of the Barcelona Convention as the only formal United Nations forum bringing together all the countries around the Mediterranean, providing a unique opportunity to protect the marine and coastal environment and also to address the root causes of the region's problems and its future prospects. The inclusion of both governmental and non-governmental actors within the MSCD was a great asset in moving the agenda forward. Significant inputs could be expected from socio economic actors, local authorities and academic institutions for a series of major upcoming meetings on green economy. MIO-ECSDE expressed their commitment to assisting in the preparation of the next phase of the Commission's work, with concrete proposals for specific activities. Furthermore, cooperating with the European Union and other regional organizations on important projects such as the Horizon 2020 initiative demonstrates that it is quite possible to build bridges between the demands of local communities, the priorities of countries and broader sustainable development solutions. Participants were reminded of the meeting that MIO-ECSDE has organised, both at Rio in 1992 and in Johannesburg in 2002, the Mediterranean Multi-stakeholder side events, in cooperation with UNEP-MAP, with support from the EU and participation of Mediterranean Personalities (e.g. HE Prince Albert of Monaco, etc.) and MIO-ECSDE offered to assist and join forces in the framework of MCSD in doing the same for Rio+20. It was noted that the

only appropriate dates for such an event will be in June 2012 and there is a need for immediate registration.

16. It was pointed out that the green economy was not a new concept and that it was important to learn from the experiences of the many relevant activities implemented over the previous 20 years. Attention was drawn to the need to go beyond gross domestic product (GDP) as an indicator of economic performance and to measure social well-being and sustainability of development. Preparations for Rio+20 should therefore include consideration of the need to strengthen national capacity and national and regional information systems, and to develop tools for data collection and appropriate indicators in those areas as a means of providing the statistical evidence for ensuring environmental accountability. Attention should also be drawn to the high economic costs of environmental degradation, previous environmental targets set by the United Nations, and the importance of environmental governance. It was essential to articulate the economic arguments for environmental protection in order to convince decision-makers, and to link environmental to socioeconomic indicators. The Mediterranean had valuable examples to offer, such as the ICZM Protocol, which was already being replicated elsewhere in the world.

International experience towards a green economy

17. Mr Moustapha Kamal Gueye (Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, UNEP), outlining UNEP's work towards a green economy, pointed out that while the global economy had grown in recent decades, there had been serious loss of ecosystems despite the adoption of several important multilateral environmental legal instruments. Its 2011 report: *Towards a green economy: pathways to sustainable development and poverty eradication*, showed that investment in natural capital and resource and energy efficiency could result in higher rates of GDP growth, reduce poverty and transform the dynamics of employment, creating green jobs in many sectors while reducing ecological scarcities and environmental risk. Governments would need to play a major role, in particular by establishing appropriate regulatory frameworks and removing harmful subsidies. Since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, there had been a marked increase in ecological innovation. Rio+20 must send a similar strong signal to the private sector. Encouraging activities were already under way in many countries, and it was important to capitalize on the progress made to date.

18. Mr Gilles Pipien (Senior environmental economist, World Bank) said that recent reports from UNEP, OECD and the European Union had provided proposals for meeting the main challenge over the coming years – how to link the environment, growth and job creation. The cost of environmental degradation as a percentage of GDP was rising in Mediterranean countries yet it had not been adequately quantified. Recognition of the importance of natural capital stimulated efforts to ensure economic growth that took account of the environment, known as “green growth” which could raise ecosystem resilience, create jobs and reduce poverty. The World Bank and its partners had applied proven economic analytical methods to the environmental problems of the Mediterranean, the aim being to convince non-environmental decision-makers of the economic need to take the environment into consideration and to develop relevant decision-making tools. In addition, the Mediterranean sustainable development programme (Sustainable MED) had been established to integrate the environment into the socioeconomic development policies of the countries in the south and east of the Mediterranean, focusing initially on the management of water resources and coastal zones.

19. Ms Angela Bularg, Environment Directorate, OECD presented an overview of OECD perspectives and green growth activities. OECD had started work on the development of a green growth strategy. It had published an analytical framework for strategy development

and report on indicators to measure the progress towards green growth and was now integrating green growth strategies in its work. She outlined OECD's definition of green growth and the potential benefits in terms of development dividends, including poverty reduction and acceleration of progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), fiscal revenue, and increased economic resilience, as well as the preservation of natural capital. OECD had analysed the essential requirements for green growth policies which included international cooperation and institutional capacity for reforms. Future OECD work in the area would include cooperation with countries in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, and in the Middle East and North Africa.

20. On the basis of issues raised during the keynote addresses and presentations, a discussion ensued with a view to establishing a common understanding of the green economy in the Mediterranean context, including with respect to revision of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD) and of National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSDs) in the light of the outcome of Rio+20.

21. General views expressed during the discussion were that the increasing focus on green issues had been partly stimulated by the global economic crisis and that the increasing attention now devoted to those issues called for a very significant change in approach. Covering as it did a broad range of areas, the green economy was seen as a practical and action-oriented tool for addressing many of the current challenges of sustainable development, the objectives of which nonetheless remained unaltered.

22. The need to work for full decoupling was emphasized; a safe operating space for humanity had already been exceeded and a reduction of the negative impact of economic growth on environment and resources was therefore vital. A comprehensive analysis of the modalities employed by countries in the region for the achievement of sustainable development goals would help countries to strike a balance between economic growth and the preservation of natural resources. There was also a need for outreach programmes to raise awareness among the public and policymakers of the many more job opportunities that would be created by a green economy. Case studies in that regard would prove useful. A compilation of examples of best practices, activities and toolkits encompassing the green approach was also suggested as a means of providing guidance for policymakers.

23. A further point made was the need to avoid duplication by making use of work already under way or in the pipeline which promoted greening even if it is was not necessarily green in itself, as in the case of cooperation with Egypt, Lebanon and others with GWP-Med and OECD for financing the water sector within the framework of the Mediterranean Component of the EU Water Initiative (MED EUWI). Other opportunities to maximize resources in the process of creating green growth were provided by the indicators already developed by such entities as OECD, the European Environment Agency and Blue Plan, and by work in the areas of biodiversity preservation, coastal zone management and land-based pollution carried out by MAP components. Participation in forthcoming regional and sub-regional events on green economic issues (e.g. on "Financing Non Conventional Water Resources", Athens, 14-15 September 2011; "Green Banking", Barcelona, 21-22 November 2011, etc., etc.) would also be beneficial in building a green economy agenda for the Mediterranean, particularly in view of preparing for Rio+20. New initiatives for seeking synergies with WB's Sustainable Mediterranean and other alternative sources of financing should also be pursued.

24. Examples of green activities already being implemented at the national level were cited, including home energy-saving projects, solar and wind energy projects, strategies and action plans relating to waste management, sustainable development, education, SCP and renewable energy, and initiatives for the recycling of agricultural waste.

25. Commenting on the discussion, Mr Lalonde said that countries must now demonstrate the political will to follow up on greening work already done by setting concrete goals for Rio+20. Solidarity was a key concept; that current inequalities would be unacceptable if Earth were a single country. Collective action was more efficient and cost-effective than national road maps. Participants stressed that the Commission was uniquely placed to infuse a regional perspective into the Rio+20 process. It was also important to establish mechanisms for the effective follow-up and assessment of actions mandated at Rio+20 in order to avoid a repetition of the shortcomings in the implementation of Agenda 21. In conclusion, he suggested that the Commission could take its lead from the calls to update Agenda 21 by producing its own version for the Mediterranean region in the form of a checklist of priority goals and missions to be achieved over the next 10 years. The international commitment to spend 0.7% of gross national product on official development assistance must be fulfilled. The introduction of certain greening measures should also be gauged in the light of such factors as population increase, which might affect their suitability. A tangible outcome from Rio+20 could be achieved by building on the many successful experiences of the energy and marine environment sectors and also on strategic partnerships with civil society and think tanks. Other areas meriting focus in the Rio+20 context included those of sustainable tourism and management of the ocean and marine environments. Ms Bularga confirmed that consumer policies were an integral part of economic greening and efficiency improvements, however, could lead to higher consumption of resources. The policy toolkit should therefore include strategies to counter that risk. She welcomed the emphasis placed on outreach activities and stressed the need to engage non-environmental communities in the greening process by, inter alia, using economic arguments and addressing legitimate concerns over socioeconomic effects. Finally it was noted that the discussion had highlighted the importance of developing a road map for addressing the challenges associated with national and regional measures for aiding the transition to a green/blue economy. Such measures included the development of an appropriate institutional and regulatory framework. In view of the higher global profile of marine and coastal issues, the region's experience could usefully be shared.

Activities towards a green economy in the Mediterranean: Sustainable consumption and production (SCP)

26. Mr Lotfi Ben Said (Directorate General for Sustainable Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, Tunisia), presenting sustainable consumption and production patterns in the context of Tunisia's NSSD, outlined the background and time-frame of Tunisia's NSSD approach and policy, which were consistent with the MSSD. Achieving SCP objectives required action in respect of both consumption and production patterns, and in specific sectors, with four key sectors identified, namely agriculture, industry, tourism and construction. Specific targets had been set for sustainable consumption in such areas as drinking water and energy, including electricity, gas and renewable energy consumption. Measures to promote sustainable production included the publication of guides, eco-labelling, and technical specifications and incentives for energy savings in the building industry. A pilot project for sustainable public procurement had been launched.

27. Mr Bernard Brillet (Ministry of Sustainable Development, France), presenting French policy on SCP, observed that consumer attitudes in France were changing, with some three quarters of the population now sensitive to the need for SCP. The Government's approach was based on the findings and decisions of a multi-stakeholder forum known as the "Grenelle de l'environnement" and the ensuing legislation. It advocated taking action in respect of both supply and demand, utilizing a mix of tools and adopting new, participatory governance methods. He described some of the key measures taken and incentives offered to reduce

emissions, strengthen thermal standards, introduce eco-labelling, ensure sustainable public procurement and promote fair trade. Strong emphasis was placed on corporate social responsibility, with, inter alia, a strengthening of legislation in that respect. A key tool to achieve SCP was consumer product labelling, and a pilot project on environmental product information was under way.

28. Ms Marijana Mance Kowalsky (Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction (MEPPC)) said that Croatia had developed its NSSD on the basis of the MSSD. Its sustainable development strategy, adopted in 2009, was to be implemented through four action plans. Following a pilot project, its SCP action plan had been developed by MEPPC in close cooperation with, notably, UNEP/MAP and CP/RAC, the goals being to ensure quality of life, wise use of resources, minimization of waste and pollution, use of renewable resources within their capacity for renewal, attention given to product life-cycles, and intergenerational and intragenerational equity. She outlined the institutional framework, mechanisms and time-frame for implementation of the plan and highlighted the main tools, measures and incentives provided for in its five-year programme.

29. Mr Enrique de Villamore Martin (Director, CP/RAC) presenting an overview of regional SCP activities said that transition towards green economies would be driven by green entrepreneurs who integrated environmental, economic and social aspects into their businesses and provided innovative SCP solutions. The first phase of the CP/RAC action plan on green entrepreneurship, a situation analysis undertaken with technical support from partners, had comprised reports and case studies from a range of countries and sectors. The study had provided useful information on common assets and challenges, and had shown that green entrepreneurship was still an unknown concept in the region. The second phase, awareness-raising among business and financial institutions, had been launched and successful cases of green entrepreneurs were going to be presented during the ECOMEDA Green Forum to be held in November 2011. A plan of action was being developed for the third phase, provision of training to business schools students and technical assistance to green entrepreneurs.

30. During the ensuing discussion, it was suggested that the countries should be supported in developing tools, setting standards and building capacity for the transition to green economies and SCP, and the implementation of NSSDs and ICZM. MCSD activities should include the development of strategic guidelines for legal, fiscal, socioeconomic and educational responses, the formulation of road maps for the transition to green economies, and the establishment of a platform for regular exchange of information. Particular attention should be given to education on SCP and sustainable development (ESD), taking advantage of activities organized for the United Nations Decade for Sustainable Development to raise awareness, influence attitudes and empower younger generations to demand policy change. Participants were informed about the efforts initiated by MIO-ECSDE, Greece and UNESCO in cooperation with UNEP/MAP and UNECE in 2005 for the preparation and adoption of a Mediterranean Strategy of ESD. This Strategy is foreseen in the MSSD, adopted in Portoroz (14th Conference of the Parties of the Barcelona Convention, 8-11 November 2005, Portoroz, Slovenia) but is not implemented yet. Now the prospects for promoting such a Strategy (to use to a large extent the UNECE one as source of inspiration) are good. This is also an initiative to be placed under MCSD and promoted in Rio+20. Countries should be encouraged to actively participate in the drafting. Finally it was stressed that, in MCSD work, emphasis should also be placed on tourism, which was of particular importance to the Mediterranean region, and consideration given to eco-labelling of services and eco-incentives. The focus should be on a realistic set of priorities and linkage activities to existing sustainable development and sectoral strategies.

31. Efforts should be made to clarify the new terminology, operational definitions and the meaning of a Mediterranean green (and blue) economy, which might differ from green (and blue) economies in other regions, and to ascertain how those concepts could be incorporated into the MSSD and whether the text would require amendment accordingly. Environmental questions should be analysed carefully, as actions that might be environmentally beneficial in one area might have adverse effects on others. It was important to learn from the many national and international activities under way and to seek consensus on an integrated SCP response.

Activities towards a green economy in the Mediterranean: climate change adaptation

32. Ms Silva, introducing the item, recalled that climate change issues, in particular adaptation, had featured prominently in the discussions and final declarations of the two most recent meetings of the Contracting Parties. The 2009 Marrakesh Declaration emphasized collective action to address the challenges of climate change and specifically called for adaptation to climate change to be fully taken into account in the review of the MSSD, which was to be broadened to include an analysis of the structuring of the Strategy in order to integrate adaptation into development policies, including at the regional level. On the basis of that mandate, the Secretariat had engaged with experts in order to evolve ideas for subsequent follow-up through MAP's official decision-making mechanisms. The outcome of that exercise was contained in the document entitled "Towards a regional adaptation framework for climate change in the Mediterranean" (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.358/3), which members were invited to consider.

33. Mr Mohammed Boulahya (UNEP/MAP Consultant) gave a presentation outlining the information contained in the document now before the Commission, which was the result of his work with fellow consultants Mr Ante Baric and Mr Gilles Sommeria. He emphasized that the document remained a work in progress and that the goals, outcomes and actions suggested as next steps were no more than indicative. He looked forward to comments and feedback from members in the interest of refining its content.

34. Participants acknowledged that the document provided a useful basis for the development of a regional adaptation framework. In the ensuing discussion, emphasis was placed on the need to add value to framework by including a well-constructed matrix, identifying gaps and needs, and conducting an exhaustive survey of all national and local adaptation activities under way in the region. Indeed, it was deemed vital to avoid duplication by integrating all relevant processes into the framework, including European Union policies, strategies and initiatives, the draft "Strategy for Water in the Mediterranean" in the context of the Union for the Mediterranean and ongoing work by UNFCCC, which could also serve as a medium for strengthening the Mediterranean voice. Areas to be highlighted in the framework included the physical and social consequences of climate change, its impact on tourism and other economic sectors, and education on sustainable development. Other issues for inclusion were: health, biodiversity, intersectoral management of water resources; land-use planning and mapping of vulnerable areas; and forecasting of specific climatological events. It was pointed out that an exhaustive survey of "all" adaptation initiative is time and resources consuming and to a large extent not particularly useful. A lot of adaptation is taking place by individuals, enterprises, local authorities, etc. "ad hoc" and without long term considerations (see rapid increase in air conditions in the last few years). Priority for the region is to ensure that regional institutions in place are sufficiently robust to deal with unpredictable events and assist smaller countries in coping with natural disasters. In that context the framework should stress the importance of the ICZM Protocol.

35. Emphasis was also placed on the need for initiatives to raise local awareness of the risks and impact of climate change in order to engage communities and secure their involvement in the design and implementation of adaptation activities. Support for capacity-building among civil society would therefore be an investment on that score. In the same vein, it would be useful to produce guidelines concerning the dissemination of information to the public and businesses on adaptation to more sustainable ways of living and operating. The document contained a host of recommendations for promoting adaptation measures. The next vital step, however, was to turn those recommendations into concrete proposals. Collection of reliable quantitative data was a prerequisite for successful action, and countries were encouraged to exchange information on national data and plans.

36. Given the financial implications of implementing adaptation activities, economic analyses should be undertaken to support the establishment of priorities for action, taking into account local needs. Efforts should be made to mobilize resources through existing funding mechanisms. Countries would require capacity-building support in order to develop tools for programme formulation and implementation, and for monitoring and evaluation of activities.

37. MCSD members were requested to submit proposed amendments to the draft regional adaptation strategy in writing to facilitate the preparation of a revised draft.

Presentation by a representative of Global Footprint Network

38. Mr Alessandro Galli (Global Footprint Network) presented an overview of the work his organization is undertaking to track ecological footprint trends in the Mediterranean. The goals of the initiative are to ensure consideration of resource limitations in policy debates and determine the related risks and opportunities to socioeconomic well-being. The data indicate that, for most countries and the region as a whole, demand for biological capacity ("biocapacity") exceeds supply, resulting in the shrinking of ecological credit, which together with shrinking GDP growth rates increases the risk of ecological and social instability. An interim report is available and countries were urged to participate in related consultations. The next phase of the study, the development of a biocapacity-based socio-economic risk assessment framework, is under way and the final report should be available early in 2012.

Context and institutional framework for sustainable development

Context for sustainable development in the Mediterranean

39. Ms Silva (MAP Coordinator), introducing the item on institutional issues, which would be largely informed by the independent assessment on the implementation of the MSSD for the period 2005-2010 which was foreseen in the strategy and the work of BP/RAC, noted that most countries now had NSSDs and that MAP had provided support to a number of countries for their development and implementation. Feedback would be welcome in the forthcoming discussion, which would also afford an opportunity to hear views and comments on emerging issues and developments affecting the future work of the MCSD as a tool to for setting countries on the path to sustainable development.

40. Mr Nicola Cantore (Overseas Development Institute), introducing the assessment on the implementation of the MSSD for the period 2005-2010, outlined methodological aspects and went on to present the eight findings and 13 recommendations contained in full in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.358/4 and in summary form in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.358/Info 3. The suggested amendments to the MSSD were based on changes in the

MSSD operational context, implementation problems, new and emerging priorities to be incorporated into the revised version of the MSSD, and suggested actions to improve implementation

41. It was observed that the adoption of the MSSD in 2005 had been an event of major political significance in the Mediterranean context. The strategy had been the fruit of a concerted effort within the MAP system, with the particular involvement of BP/RAC. There had been consensus on its content and on the 24 priority indicators initially selected for monitoring purposes. The indicators reflected the data available at the time, and should be seen as a comprehensive package, since no single indicator could reflect a complex reality. Subsequently, in response to shifting concerns within the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), further sectoral indicators had been added, notably on tourism, water and energy. More recent data collected and analysed by BP/RAC and graphically illustrated in his slide presentation, showed that, despite progress in some areas, there was still a long way to go to achieve all the objectives of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. It should be borne in mind that the MSSD was a regional strategy designed to guide a common effort but did not translate into an average national strategy, which would vary from one country to another.

42. In an ensuing exchange of views, participants firmly acknowledged that, together with the Blue Plan's work on indicators, the findings and recommendations contained in the assessment provided a useful basis for discussion and further work. The MSSD was a living document that continued to retain its political and symbolic value; it served, for instance, as a valuable and influential reference for NGOs and others involved in environmental lobbying activities. Although a periodic review was important to ensuring that the MSSD was updated through the incorporation of new and emerging issues, overall revision was not a matter of immediate urgency. Indeed, some participants cautioned against embarking on such a revision until after Rio+20, the outcome of which could very well encompass issues of tremendous relevance to the MSSD. The period leading up to Rio+20 was nevertheless an opportune time for consolidating recommendations concerning its revision and for determining the revision procedure, the actors who would be involved and the achievability of actions under the MSSD at the national level.

43. As to the substance of the revision, the main concern was to, whilst continuing to maintain the environmental pillar at the heart of the MCSD, to also in a gradual manner, integrate the economic and social pillars into the Strategy alongside the environmental pillar. It was also necessary to enhance the role of the private sector and other stakeholders in implementing measures for sustainable development. In that regard, specific recommendations could be developed from examples provided by other forums whose efforts to strengthen participation by the business community had borne fruit.

44. Emphasis was laid on the need for efforts to accelerate MSSD implementation. Guidance or terms of reference would be useful in that respect, as would a mechanism for translation of the Strategy into NSSDs, with due regard for national specificities. In that context, greater consultation among countries and other actors would be beneficial. The ownership of NSSDs by individual countries was stressed as imperative. Emphasis was also placed on the need for measures to extend awareness of the Strategy beyond the environmental to the socioeconomic sectors and for synergies with international stakeholders. Indeed, the opportunity of Rio+20 must be seized to increase the visibility of the Mediterranean region and the MSSD in other forums by presenting a new strategic approach to sustainable development. It was proposed to form an Expert Working Group, of experts appointed by Countries and the Stakeholders, on a voluntary basis, to review existing /already proposed indicators and, if needed, elaborate a short list of new ones based

on work already done within the UNEP/MAP “family”, EEA, OECD, etc. The above mentioned proposal on indicators received wide support.

45. It was recognised by the meeting that indicators were no easy matter, however, and the need for a sensitive approach was stressed; indicators involving only small areas, let alone an entire region, could vary enormously and they could also be affected by political or other events that were unpredicted. It would also be prudent to economize by using, improving or adapting indicators already agreed or in the pipeline. Other factors with a bearing on the quality of indicators included the reliability of data and the availability of appropriate analytical tools. On that score, indicators should be correlated in order to help, for instance, in determining whether ecological capital was in decline. Innovative composite indicators were needed in particular, as were a number of headline indicators that would raise the MSSD profile.

46. Any revision of indicators must take into account new and emerging issues, including climate change, the ecosystem approach and health. In that vein, suggestions were tabled for new indicators covering such areas as: key ecosystems; urban pollution; social well-being; school education on sustainable consumption and lifestyles; partnerships; and SCP, in which regard the SCP framework indicators developed by CP/RAC should prove useful. More work on sustainability indicators was also needed, particularly with respect to critical thresholds. A number of suggestions were also made for improving the updated set of MSSD indicators set out in table 1 of the assessment report. It was noted that many of the existing indicators contained in the first column of the table appeared to resemble objectives.

47. Summing up the discussion, the continuing value of MSSD was highlighted and the need to improve implementation and monitoring. On that score, MSSD-related processes could be subject to more systematic monitoring. Insofar as the MSSD aimed to adapt international commitments to national contexts, it was agreed that any review of the Strategy should perhaps be deferred until after Rio+20, the outcome of which could then be taken into account, along with such other recent instruments as the “Aichi Plan of Action” agreed in Nagoya by the COP of CBD on 18-29 October 2010 (Biodiversity targets for 2011-20). Indeed, the MSSD should be periodically reviewed in line with global developments. As to the forthcoming review, further contributions and input of relevance would be welcome with a view to enhancing the Strategy’s effectiveness and implementation.

Strengthening NSSDs

48. Mr Nicos Georgiadis (MAP Environmental and Planning Adviser) introduced the review and assessment of NSSDs contained in document UNEP(DEP)/ MED WG. 358/8. Despite measures taken by most countries in response to the new initiatives and policy frameworks at national and international levels, sustainable development still exerted limited influence on policies, and sectoral visions and priorities continued to predominate.

49. Members acknowledged the findings of the review and assessment, which showed that, while all countries had developed an NSSD or similar strategy, and that political commitment was strong, many weaknesses clearly remained in relation to governance, capacity-building, reporting, monitoring and evaluation, and development of long-term strategies and objectives. Many of the national findings were similar to the regional findings revealed by the MSSD assessment and it was clear that a regional dimension was indispensable for raising the profile of sustainable development. Good governance was the key to ensuring the formulation and implementation of NSSDs with clear priorities, objectives and indicators, and strong stake-holder involvement. It was proposed that the MSSD revision should include the incorporation of guidelines for translating its concepts into action to support countries in formulating second-generation NSSDs that were tailored to country needs and included new

strategies with sustainable development goals, such as ICZM, SCP and climate-change adaptation.

Institutional framework for sustainable development in the Mediterranean

50. Mr Harry Cocossis (UNEP/MAP Consultant) introduced the analysis of the role and modalities of the MCSD contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.358/5. He drew attention to the main points for consideration by the Commission, namely the scope, methods of work, roles and functions of the MCSD in a changing global and regional context.

51. In the ensuing discussion, members agreed on the need to rethink the role, modalities and priorities of the MCSD, broadly along the lines proposed, given the institutional and paradigm shifts that had come about in recent years both in the wider global context and in the region. The role of the Commission had already evolved since its inception with the adoption of new terms of reference in the Governance Paper (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG. 339/Inf.6).

52. Emerging issues such as the ecosystem approach, climate change adaptation and the green economy approach should be taken on board. In view of the need for integration and coordination with the many other existing supranational and regional sustainable development and environmental programmes, policy frameworks and initiatives, it was crucial to focus on the MCSD's comparative advantage and the input it could provide in facilitating environmental mainstreaming and integration, with the focus on sustainable development, and strengthening cross-sectoral and intersectoral environment/development policy coordination at national and regional levels. The Commission's unique multi-stakeholder composition and its participatory nature were a particular asset. Its role was as a regional governance mechanism, and it should serve as a platform of reference and a tool for enhancing regional dialogue on environment and development issues, assisting Contracting Parties in introducing environmental concerns into sectoral policies, drawing to the extent possible on national expertise, and raising sustainable development issues beyond the national level.

53. It was agreed that the MCSD should serve primarily as an advisory body, but would additionally function as a think-tank for exploring future issues. Emphasis was placed on the valuable support it could provide to countries in terms of capacity-building and in developing their NSSDs, incorporating the ecosystem approach, SCP patterns, ICZM and other relevant new approaches into national development policies, as well as assisting them in addressing new and emerging challenges.

54. The question whether participation in the MCSD should include non-environmental sectors and stakeholders prompted a number of comments. While acknowledging that the legal basis for the MCSD was the Barcelona Convention, which was based on the environmental pillar of sustainable development, and that current expertise within the Commission was somewhat restricted, members pointed out that the new terms of reference contained in the Governance Paper and the current context argued strongly in favour of moving, if gradually, towards the other areas of sustainability in the interests of integration. Support was expressed for the proposal to expand the work of the MCSD to include other stakeholders, thus giving the Barcelona Convention broader appeal. Regarding priority areas, the MCSD should be actively concerned with specific development sectors such as tourism, transport, particularly marine transport, and agriculture, as a major user of water. The working groups that had been set up on such issues had delivered good results, and members advocated the establishment of similar groups on topics to be determined, serving as showcases for sustainable development action on the ground.

55. Regarding methods of work, members stressed the need to establish a coherent monitoring system for the MSSD and its periodic review, to improve synergies at the regional level among key international-level stakeholders, to mobilize further key private sector and civil society actors, and to ensure optimum flexibility in the organization of MCSD activities in order to reflect new sustainable development priorities. A pragmatic approach was advocated, having due regard for budgetary and time constraints. Every effort should be made to ensure that the MCSD, currently underutilized, could play an active and practical role and help to enhance the visibility of the Mediterranean region at the global level.

56. The image and visibility of the MCSD itself should be improved, and its website should be up and running. In the interests of making its work more widely known, it was suggested that, in the preparations for Rio+20, contacts might be made, for instance by the incumbent President of the Commission, with environmental and other ministries.

57. The activities of the MAP components, in particular CP/RAC, PAP/RAC, BP/RAC and MED POL, were recognized as providing vital input to the MCSD's work and to the sustainable development debate in the wider context. To that end synergies among the components and between them and the Commission should be improved, particularly in the light of the Commission's limited resources. Emphasis was again placed on MAP's exemplary work on ICZM which could feed into the wider debate through the MCSD. A participant expressed the view that the Coordinating Unit, together with the MAP components, are the executive arm of the MCSD, and that the future of the MCSD was therefore very much linked with that of the Coordinating Unit. Many of the proposals made at the current meeting, including those on visibility, should accordingly be addressed to the MAP system as a whole.

58. Ms Silva noted a consensus on the primary function of the MCSD as an advisory body, focusing on creating synergies for regional integration, and on the need for practical action, drawing on national expertise, in pursuing its work. She acknowledged the proposal to set up working groups, which would have the added advantage of reaching out to the national level. She further noted the comments on visibility and on the priorities set by members. The Secretariat would prepare a proposal for consideration by the Contracting Parties via the Focal Points, setting out the resources and support needed from the Secretariat to carry out the proposed activities, which would be taken into account in preparing the programme of work, subject to the availability of funds.

Programme of work of the MCSD

59. Ms Virginie Hart (MAP Coordinating Unit), introducing the programme of work contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG. 358/6, said that the proposals before the Commission could more aptly be described as orientations for a programme of work for 2012-2013. The activities proposed fell into five categories: MSSD implementation, MSSD enhancement, MSSD revision, information/communication and stakeholder involvement, and she noted that the many comments and recommendations made during the meeting fitted well into those thematic areas.

60. Under MSSD implementation, the main areas were: lessons learned from NSSD formulation, implementation and monitoring; incorporation of NSSDs into national policies and plans, contribution of MAP and its components; contribution of new initiatives; capacity-building; and monitoring of MSSD. The main areas covered by MSSD enhancement, pending its subsequent revision, were: improved climate change adaptation framework; introduction of SCP indicators; use of toolkits produced by OECD and others; assessment of good examples of green economy initiatives in the region; and integrating of ICZM and the

ecosystem approach. MSSD revision as such would not be undertaken until 2015, but, in preparation for that process, provision was being made in the programme of work for such activities as: inclusion of the green economy, SCP and climate change adaptation, MSSD review and assessment, working groups and work on indicators, as well as the preparatory activities for participation at the Rio+20 Summit. In anticipation of the revision of MSSD, consultations would be held on the inclusion of financial and social, as well as environmental, parameters. The many comments on information and communication would be taken into account in the programme, including upgrading of the website. Finally, stakeholder involvement included coordination with key regional and international actors and initiatives.

61. During the ensuing discussion, it was proposed that the orientations for the programme of work should be revised to give greater priority to MSSD implementation and monitoring of implementation. In relation to information and communication, it was considered essential to develop the web platform as soon as possible to stimulate exchange of information within the MCSD, and with other stakeholders in order to raise the Commission's profile. Other items suggested for inclusion in the programme were: establishment of a working group to consider indicators; further consideration of the Mediterranean contribution to Rio+20; an education component promoting the Mediterranean Strategy on ESD and consideration of the use of social networking in work on information and communication; development of proposals for SCP activities to promote a green economy; and further work on ICZM. Given the resource limitations, it would be important to establish priorities for action in arriving at a realistic programme for the forthcoming biennium, taking seriously into account the opportunities offered by a series of initiatives already launched or in the pipeline within various programmes such as Horizon 2020, MED EUWI, UNEP/MAP MedPartnership, etc.

Mediterranean contribution towards Rio+20

62. Mr Coccossis introduced the proposals for a contribution to Rio+20 contained in document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG. 358/7, which comprised a written contribution to be prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the MCSD Steering Committee, and the organization of a side event.

63. Members agreed that a contribution should be prepared, taking into account the main themes of the Conference. As it would need to be submitted by 1 November 2011 if it was to be included in the Rio+20 zero draft for negotiation, urgent action was needed to accelerate the process and to clarify the timetable. The contribution should distinguish between policy, focusing on the MCSD and the ICZM Protocol, and implementation of the various regional activities on sustainable development, which should include references to ICZM, SCP, a blue/green economy and biodiversity. Members were encouraged to submit inputs for the contribution in writing as soon as possible, and it was agreed that advantage should be taken of the opportunities provided by other relevant meetings to consult further. Montenegro expressed willingness to present in a proper form, that is to be agreed in the scope of consultations under UNEP/MAP and MCSD umbrella, the contribution of the MCSD through its participation at the High Level segment of the Rio+ 20 Conference. While a side event would be desirable, it might be difficult to ensure that it had the desired impact, as there would be many such events. It would require careful planning and would have financial and logistic implications. A joint event with regional partners, accompanied by a concise document that would emphasize the synergies in the region, was a more feasible option. The member from Montenegro suggested that her minister might present a message from MCSD in his statement to the RIO+20 Conference. Members were urged to ensure that their individual contributions included information on the work of MAP. In addition, it was proposed that UNEP be requested to present the MCSD as a successful model for regional sustainable

development, and that the possibility of securing a reference to MSCD in the European Union statement should be explored.

64. Ms Silva, welcoming the valuable comments by members, expressed the hope that it would be possible to prepare a sophisticated contribution to Rio+20 for the Bureau of the Contracting Parties, the Focal Points and the Contracting Parties. Owing to the constraints of the MAP calendar, the contribution would be submitted most probably shortly after the November deadline for the zero draft.

Next MCSD meeting

65. Mr Franck Lauwers (Malta Environment and Planning Authority) announced that Malta would be pleased to host the next meeting of the MCSD. Ms Silva, on behalf of MAP, thanked Malta for its kind offer.

Adoption of conclusions and recommendations

66. Participants were invited to consider a set of draft conclusions and recommendations, formulated on the basis of the discussions held during the course of the meeting. Following comments and amendments, the conclusions and recommendations were adopted, on the understanding that a revised version incorporating the proposed amendments would be circulated electronically for final approval.

Closure of the meeting

67. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 1.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 1 June 2011.

Annex I

Conclusions and Recommendations of the 14th Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development

1. The 14th Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD), held in Budva, Montenegro on 29 May to 1 June 2011 discussed on the Mediterranean perspective on sustainable development and in particular as it relates to the two main themes of Rio+20: green economy and institutional framework for sustainable development. It was widely accepted that the Region benefits from a long tradition in environmental cooperation on the protection of the marine environment and coastal areas which extends over relevant sustainable development issues including unique and advanced instruments such as the ICZM Protocol which has just entered into force and the ecosystem approach . It also benefits from an adopted Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development which provides a guiding framework for activities at the regional and national levels and incorporates contemporary and future challenges, as evidenced by an interim assessment. MCSD can provide a useful platform to support MAP activities and provide input to global concerns on sustainable development issues from a Mediterranean perspective.
2. For these reasons it was decided to recommend to prepare a contribution to CSD 2012. Mr Brice Lalonde, Executive Coordinator, Rio+20, was present to reflect on current developments towards CSD 2012 as a basis for MCSD discussions.
3. The members of the MCSD, on the basis of the discussions held propose the following conclusions and recommendations:

Green economy/sustainable consumption and production (SCP)

4. *Recognizes* the importance of a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, which provides substantial opportunities for strengthening the environmental pillar of sustainable development by incorporating the potential of economic instruments in environmental protection for a transition to a low-carbon, resource efficient economy which in the case of the Mediterranean can focus on the marine and coastal resources, adopting a blue-green economy approach. The green economy can contribute to new employment and stimulate growth, while reducing ecological scarcities and environmental risks. It was particularly noted that not all green economy activities in isolation are necessarily sustainable. The need to explore the Mediterranean dimension of a green economy was emphasized taking into account synergy among all relevant stakeholders, in particular the work of UNEP, WB, EU, OECD and others.
5. *Acknowledges* the contribution of MAP to Green Economy related activities through the work done on SCP by the MAP components as CP/RAC, Blue Plan, PAP/RAC and SPA/RAC
6. *Recognizes* the potential of a green/blue economy approach focusing on key marine and coastal resources, the status of marine ecosystems and coastal communities, climate change adaptation, and priority on a low carbon efficient economy, using ICZM as a tool.
7. *Recommends* that ongoing and future initiatives and projects that use a green economy approach are identified, with emphasis on existing policies and activities within MCSD and UNEP/MAP, in order to facilitate synergies.
8. *Recognizes* the need to incorporate the potential of the green economy in the priorities of NSSDs, creating enabling conditions for a green economy through regulatory frameworks, removal of harmful subsidies, green investment, use of market mechanisms and taxation, education,

capacity building and technology transfer, etc., in order to capture the benefits of the green economy to coastal areas and communities.

9. *Recommends* that, in order to successfully implement sustainable consumption and production policies, programmes should be developed which include tools and mechanisms for implementation such as strategic guidelines, legislation, environmental accounting and fiscal measures, socially and environmentally responsible companies and business operations, education, capacity building, etc; specific measures should be taken for the introduction of sustainable consumption and production principles into sectoral policies, particularly in: waste management, agriculture and food, tourism, construction, chemicals management, transport and energy, green public procurement, eco-design, and technology transfer; and institutional coordination and integration mechanisms, and to , provide support to companies for clean technology innovation and dissemination; *recommends* that in the context of the Mediterranean green economy guidelines are expected to focus on biodiversity, water, ICZM with particular attention to fisheries, agriculture and tourism, as key priority sectors.

10. *Recommends* that successful cases of green entrepreneurship should be further disseminated and supported among the Mediterranean countries so that they can have a better knowledge on the environmental, social and economic benefits brought by those initiatives to the transition to green economies.

11. *Recognizes* that there is a need to pursue a transition towards a green economy by developing, inter-alia, roadmaps, education for sustainability, capacity building, and awareness raising, incentives, eco-labelling, and exchange of information and experience.

Regional Framework for Climate Change Adaptation

12. *Acknowledges* the need for a Regional Framework for Climate Change Adaptation in the Mediterranean (document UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.358/3) for integration into the MSSD, agreed on its main objective, namely to ensure that Mediterranean people, their livelihoods and their environment are resilient to the risks and impacts of climate change.

13. *Proposes* a series of concrete suggestions to strengthen the Framework, which include an analysis of impacts associated with key economic sectors, greater detail on the major relevant processes and legal instruments, the need to address health issues and ecosystem services, to assess complementary initiatives including civil society initiatives, to consider existing 'ad hoc' measures for adaptation to climate change (e.g. air-conditioning, winter tourism, water management, cleaner energy etc), with clear guidelines for alternative, more sustainable options, and the need to include the role of ICZM as a tool for adaptation in coastal zones; *recommends* that particular focus is given to adaptation in the most vulnerable areas or hotspots.

14. *Recommends* that some of the first priority actions to be implemented include the introduction of adaptation measures into land-use and water resource planning in the coastal zone; the creation of vulnerability maps in all countries, awareness raising programmes targeted to decision makers, local communities and the population at large, and ensuring that early warning systems are in place to predict extreme events, *stresses* the need to use all forms of media for this purpose, *agrees* that the funding mechanism for the framework should be developed, and importance should be given to those "win-win" adaptation measures that could also create opportunities in key sectors such as sustainable tourism.

15. *Recommends* that an inter-sectoral systemic approach is adopted, including the analysis of costs long term considerations on investments and operations as well as introduce a strategic environmental assessment framework.

16. *Notes* that because healthy ecosystems and fisheries are more resilient to the immediate impacts from climate change; the work of UNEP/MAP and other organizations and institutions in protecting the marine and coastal environment should be promoted.

The context for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean/ MSSD Assessment

17. *Welcomes* the assessment of progress towards MSSD and *recognizes* the usefulness of its recommendations, (Annex II) acknowledging the need to prioritize implementation through proper monitoring and the development of key sustainability indicators, and including new indicators that are easily measurable, SCP and climate change adaptation indicators, capturing the natural and social/human capital and the pressures of human factors on resource degradation etc; *further suggests* that an element of planning and prospective studies be introduced. It needs to specifically address the need to include environmental, economic and social parameters and indicators, drawing on the wealth of work undertaken by other initiatives and processes, including ICZM, ecosystem approach and SCP, and strengthen the institutional and implementation arrangements of the MSSD for the future. Working groups may be established to address issues such as the revision of MSSD indicators. Suggests that measurable SCP indicators should be introduced in the MSSD indicators. Accordingly the SCP framework indicators developed by CP/RAC should prove useful.

18. *Welcomes* the contribution of BP/RAC as presented in its report "*Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development Follow-Up: Main Indicators, 2011 Update*", and invites BP/RAC to continue its work in formulating indicators in close coordination with the expert group in the context of the MCSD.

19. *Recognizes* that at present there is no need to formally revise the MSSD, given the time needed for its approval, but this has to be considered in the context of its review in 2015, *however requests* that the Secretariat in the mean time will identify the process for the review.

20. *Recognizes* the need to seek ways and means to increase the visibility and impact of the MCSD.

Strengthening National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSDs)

21. *Acknowledges* the assessment and progress made in NSSDs and *reconfirmed* the importance of the MSSD as a framework to guide the NSSDs in ensuring that they all include a regional Mediterranean dimension.

22. *Recognizes* the complexity of the NSSD implementation, and *stresses* that the successful implementation of NSSDs can only be achieved if they are linked directly or integrated into national policies and plans. It further recognized the need for continued MAP support to countries in developing their national strategies

Institutional framework for towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean: The role of MCSD

23. *Recognizes* that the MCSD, should focus on creating synergies for environmental integration and should serve primarily as an advisory body, but would occasionally function as a forum for debate or as a think-tank for exploring future issues.. In terms of modalities it should take advantage of available national expertise and introduce a flexibility to mobilize key stakeholders as appropriate. The MCSD focus should be to support the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention ensuring synergies with sustainable development and involving multi-stakeholder participation with a view to strengthening the environmental dimension in development policies; the need to consider the role of MCSD as a driving force to provide support to countries incorporating environmental concerns in economic and social aspects of development, sustainable consumption

and production patterns, integrated coastal zone management and to deal with new and emerging challenges.

24. *Recognizes* that the MCSD does not have the resources needed to deal with all aspects of sustainable development, and *suggests* that to that end working groups of national experts could support the MCSD in ensuring a balanced expertise between the environmental, economic and social aspects of sustainable development for the future.

Programme of Work

25. *Proposes* basic orientations of the Programme of Work for 2012-13 and *agrees* that the priority should be on the implementation of the MSSD and the contribution to the Rio+20, whilst noting that the MCSD cannot operate without a strong communication mechanism in place to share progress and documents, within the MCSD members as well as communicating to a broader network of stakeholders.

26. *Requests* that a more detailed programme of work be developed around implementation of MSSD including related activities such as the adaptation to climate change framework, SCP, ICZM and its relationship with IWRM and MSP (Marine Space Planning) and all work of the MAP and its Regional Activity Centers related to the MSSD, along with the new activities towards RIO+20 the finalization and promotion of a Mediterranean Strategy on ESD, preparation activities towards the revised MSSD etc.

Contribution to Rio 20

27. *Considered* the Mediterranean contribution to Rio+20 and *stressed* that the Mediterranean presents a unique example with a regional plan for sustainable development covering three continents, cultural and natural heritage, natural resources etc that should therefore be promoted at Rio + 20.

28. *Requests* that the contribution should be further expanded, in synergy with other partners, to include details of documents, brochures, posters etc if relevant, and ensure that the contribution is enriched adopting a blue/green economy perspective by including references to biodiversity, SCP, ICZM, and ecosystem approach. *Further agrees* to explore the possibility of a side event at Rio+20.

29. *Agrees* that this consolidated contribution to Rio+20, will be under the MAP/MCSD umbrella with the presence of all partners in the Mediterranean region.

30. *Encourages* its members in parallel to promote the work carried out in the context of MAP in their individual contributions to Rio+20. *Acknowledges* the offer of Montenegro to present MCSD contribution at the High Level Segment of the Rio+20 Conference following the view and position to be agreed under umbrella of UNEP/MAP's work towards the preparation for the participation at the Rio +20.

Annex II

Summarised recommendations of the Assessment on the Implementation of The Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD)

- i. ".....the MSSD contains a number of indicators which can be updated according to the current context and which cannot be clearly used to monitor the MSSD progress. We recommend updating the list of indicators on the basis of the suggestions..."
- ii. "...the revised MSSD should put more emphasis on orientations, actions and indicators concerning emerging priorities such as adaptation and green economy. New indicators such as those related to migration caused by climate change would allow the monitoring of adaptation processes with greater detail."
- iii. "...Annex I of the MSSD explaining synergies between objectives and priorities and the Annex II containing the list of follow up indicators should be integrated to reach a solid and systematic set of indicators to monitor the MSSD performance as in many cases we find inconsistencies and/or overlaps between the two tables."
- iv. "All MSSD targets should refer to indicators for which data are available and fully discussed in terms of methodology, rationale and purposes."
- v. "Actions should incorporate a more precise timing horizon, orientations should fit operational functionality criteria and clearly allow MSSD users to understand the involved actors, policy directions, potential benefits and the indicators that would be affected. Objectives should be incorporated in the discussion concerning indicators as in many cases they overlap."
- vi. "Quantitative orientations expressed in terms of numerical values should be improved with the explanation of the criteria by which the targets are set. Qualitative orientations should be translated in numerical targets and/or clearly associated to specific MSSD target indicators."
- vii. "Orientations and actions about the financing of sustainable development should be more accurately explained by incorporating concrete targets about capacity building, information exchanges and education".
- viii. "...the MSSD should be revised in order to clearly incorporate guidelines explaining in greater detail the procedures, resources and organization for the transformation of the MSSD into actions at national level".
- ix. " In terms of revision, the MSSD document should explicitly mention as much as possible opportunities for synergies with programs, organizations and initiatives and, when feasible, indicate timing and modalities by which these synergies may arise.
- x. "In terms of modalities of implementation and governance, UNEP/MAP should create or adapt existing work units to provide a service of monitoring the existing programmes and push forward activities of knowledge sharing, information exchange, networking."
- xi. "... a harmonization of the NSSDs at Mediterranean level will be encouraged by the strengthening of the MSSD in terms of operational influence through the elaboration of guidelines for the national incorporation of the strategy and through support, capacity building, information exchange and fundraising support activities implemented by UNEP/MAP."
- xii. "The consequent insight is that in order to achieve MSSD targets, policy makers should implement complex packages of policies because the magnitude of the impact of single policies is not always high according to our simulations. This finding confirms the importance of the existence of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development providing orientations for a series of policies covering different development and environment aspects"
- xiii. "...a wide consultation participatory process is needed to achieve an agreed institutional structure of the MSSD which may encourage an effective accomplishment of the MSSD targets. A different organization of MAP components roles and coordination is needed to define changes necessary to transform MSSD in a "lively" document. "

ANNEX III**List of Participants****MCSD MEMBERS**

ALBANIA / ALBANIE	<p>Ms Erinda Misho Expert Environment Institute Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Waters Biloku "Vasil Shanto" Rruga e Duresit, Nr 27 Tirana, Albania Tel: [355] 4223466 Fax: [355] 4223466 Email: erindamisho@yahoo.com</p>
ALGERIA / ALGÉRIE	<p>Mr Abdelhamid Hallaci Inspecteur Régional de l'Environnement-Est Ingénieur Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Environnement et du Tourisme Rue de 04 Canons, Alger Centre, Algerie Tel/Fax: +213 38541794 E-mail: h_abd_elhamid@yahoo.fr</p>
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	<p>Mr Tarik Kupusovic Special Advisor to the Minister of Physical Planning and Environment Hydro Engineering Institute Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment Stjepana Tomica 1 Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina [387] 33 207949 [387] 33 207949 E-mail: tarik.kupusovic@heis.com.ba</p>
CROATIA / CROATIE	<p>Ms Marijana Mance Kowalsky, Director Directorate for International Relations and Sustainable Development Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction Republike Austrije 14, 10000 Zagreb , Croatia Phone: + 385 1 3782 154 Fax: +385 1 3717 135 E-mail: marijana.mance@mzopu.hr</p>
CYPRUS / CHYPRE	<p>Mr Charalambos Hajipakkos Senior Environment Officer Environment Service Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment 1411 Nicosia, Cyprus Tel.: +357 22 408927 Fax: +357 22 774945 Mob.: +357 99 650343 E-mail: chajipakkos@environment.moa.gov.cy</p>

EGYPT / EGYPTE	<p>Ms Mawaheb Abu El Azm Chief Executive Officer Cabinet of Ministers Email: mawaheb@eeaa.gov.eg</p> <p>Ms Heba Sharawy Director of International Organization Dpt. International Co-operation Central Dept. Email: heba_shrawy@yahoo.com</p> <p>Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) 30 Misr-Helwan El-Zyrae Road P. O. Box 955 Maadi Cairo, Egypt Tel: [20] 2 5256452 Fax: [20] 2 5256490</p>
FRANCE	<p>M. Bernard Brillet Inspecteur Général au Ministère de l'écologie, de l'énergie, du développement durable et de la Mer (MEEDDM) Mob: +33 623720515 E-mail : bernard.brillet@developpement-durable.gouv.fr</p>
GREECE / GRECE	<p>Mr Ilias Mavroidis Expert Department of International Relations and EU Affairs Hellenic Ministry for the Environment, Energy and Climate Change Department of International Relations and EU Affairs 15, Amaliados Str., 115 23 Athens, Greece Tel: +30 210 6426531/ 213 15 15 666 Fax: +30 210 64 34 470 E-mail: i.mavroidis@tmeok.minenv.gr</p>
ISRAEL	<p>Mr Gilad Ben Ari Ministry of Environmental Protection Advisor of the General Director 5 Kanfei Nesharim St., Jerusalem 95464 Tel: 972-2-6553720 Mobile: 972-50-6233008 Fax: 972-2-6535939 E-mail: giladb@sviva.gov.il</p>
LEBANON	<p>Ms Sanna AL Sairawan, Chief of Planning & Programs Service- Ministry of Environment Al Azarieh Center. Block A4-Old, 8th Floor, Room 8-20 Beirut, Lebanon Tel: +961.1.976 514 +961.1.976 555 ext.450 Fax: +961.1.976 530 E-mail: s.sairawan@moe.gov.lb</p>
MALTA / MALTE	<p>Mr Franck Lauwers Senior Environment Protection Officer Multilateral Affairs Team EU and Multilateral Affairs Unit</p>

	<p>Director's Office Environment Protection Directorate Malta Environment and Planning Authority St. Francis Ravelin, Floriana P.O. Box 200, Marsa MRS 1000, Malta Tel: +356 2290 7201 Fax: +356 2290 2295 E-mail: mcsd.malta@mepa.org.mt</p>
MONACO	<p>Mlle Céline Van Klaveren Rédacteur Principal Direction des Affaires Internationales Ministère d'Etat Place de la Visitation MC 98015 Monaco Cedex Tel: +377 98 98 4470 Fax: +377 98 98 19 57 E-mail: cevanklaveren@gouv.mc</p>
MONTENEGRO	<p>H. E. Mr Predrag Sekulic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Minister Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment Rimski trg 46, 81000 Podgorica, Montenegro E-mail: predrag.selulic@mrt.gov.me Tel: + 382 020/446-340</p> <p>Ms Jelena Knezevic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Adviser to the Minister for the Environment E-mail: jelena.knezevic@mrt.gov.me Tel: +382 020/446-231</p> <p>Ms Milica Lekic Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Public Relations</p> <p>Ms Ivana Bulatovic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Chef of Cabinet, E-mail: ivana.bulatovic@mrt.gov.me</p> <p>Mr Ivana Vojinovic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Deputy Minister for Environment Protection E-mail: ivana.vojinovic@mrt.gov.me Tel: +382020/446-231</p> <p>Bosiljka Vukovic Office for Sustainable Development</p>
MOROCCO / MAROC	<p>Mme. Latifa LAKFIFI Chef de la Division de l'Observatoire National de l'Environnement Direction des Etudes, de la Planification et de la prospective Département de l'Environnement Secrétariat d'Etat Chargé de l'Eau et de l'Environnement, Rabat, Morocco</p>

	<p>Tél : +212 537 57 06 39 GSM : +212 661 08 90 51 E-mail : lakfifi_latifa@yahoo.fr , lakfifi@environnement.gov.ma</p>
SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE	<p>Mr Emil Ferjancic, M.A. Head, Office for International Relations and European Affairs Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning Dunajska cesta 48, p.o. box 653 Si- 1000 Ljubljana Slovenia Tel. office: +386 1 478 7332 Gsm: +386 41 695 040 E-Mail: ferjancic@gov.si http://www.mop.gov.si/</p>
TUNISIA / TUNISIE	<p>Mr Lotfi Ben Said Directeur du Suivi des Processus et d'Elaboration des Outils Direction Générale du Développement Durable Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Environnement Tunis, Tunisia Tel: 216 70 728 462 Mobile: 216 97 44 32 88 Fax: 216 70 728 655 E-mail: b.said.lotfi@gmail.com</p>
TURKEY / TURQUIE	<p>Mr Ufuk Kucukay Head of Regional and Bilateral Relations Division Department of Foreign Relation and EU Ministry of Environment and Forestry Tel:+ 90 312 207 5403 Fax:+ 90 312 207 5454 Email: ukucukay@hotmail.com</p>
ASSOCIATION OF ITALIAN LOCAL AGENDA 21	<p>Mr Emilio D'Alessio Presidente della Associazione Agende 21 Locali Italiane Corso Amendola 21 60123 Ancona, Italy Tel: 0039 071 202597 Fax 0039 071 2075000 E-mail: emilio@dalessio.eu,</p>
ENDA MAGHREB- ENVIRONNEMENT DEVELOPPEMENT ET ACTION AU MAGHREB	<p>Mr Souleymane Bah Responsable de Département ENDA Magreb, Environnement et Développement au Maghreb 12 Rue Jbel Moussa Apt. 13 Joli Coin, Agdal, 10000 Rabat, Maroc Tel: +212 37 671061/62/63 Mob : +212 664243818 Fax: +212 37 671064 E-mail: souleymane.bah@enda.org.ma E-mail : coord@enda.org.ma Website: www.enda.org.ma</p>
MIO-ECSDE-MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION OFFICE FOR ENVIRONMENT CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	<p>Mr Michael Scoullos Chairman 12 Kyrristou Street, 10556 Athens, Greece Tel: +30 210 3247490 Fax: +30 210 3317 127</p>

	E-mail: info@mio-ecsde.org , scoullos@mio-ecsde.org
RAED-ARAB NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT	Mr Emad Adly General Coordinator Zahra El-Maadi Str. Masaken Masr Leltaameer BuildinNG 3A – 1st floor P.O. Box 2, Magles Elshaab Cairo, Egypt Tel.: +202 25161519 - 25161245 Fax: +202 2516 2961 E-mail: aoye@link.net , e.adly@raednetwork.org
WWF MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMME	Mr Paolo Lombardi Director Worldwide Fund for Nature / Mediterranean Programme Office (WWF MEDPO) Via Po 25/c, Rome, Italy [39] 06 84497381 [39] 06 8413866 plombardi@wwfmedpo.org
CEDARE- CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ARAB REGION AND EUROPE	Dr. Hossam Allam, Ph.D Regional Programme Manager, Strategic Concerns Programme, Head, Information and Communications Technologies for Development Centre for Environment & Development for the Arab Region & Europe (CEDARE) 2 ElHegaz Street, Heliopolis, Cairo, Egypt P.O.Box 1057 Heliopolis Bahary Phone: (202) 2451-3921 / 2 / 3 / 4 Extension: 666 Fax: (202) 2451-3918 E-Mail: hallam@cedare.org Web Site: www.cedare.org
THE WORLD BANK	Mr Gilles Pipien Senior Environmental Economist The World Bank- CMI Villa Valmer, 271 Corniche Kennedy – 13007 Marseille, France Tel: +33 491 992 458 / +33 670674224 Fax : +33 491 992 479 Email : gpipien@worldbank.org

OBSERVERS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

<p>OBSERVERS - MONTENEGRO</p>	<p>Ms Ana Kusovac Ministry of Transport and Maritime Affairs, Tel: +382 Fax: +382 E-mail:</p> <p>Ms Tanja Radusinovic Chamber of Economy of Montenegro, Director Telephone: +382 Fax: +382 E-mail:</p> <p>Mr Branko Lukovac, NGO „Greens of Montenegro“, President E-mail: b.lutovac@t-com.me</p> <p>Ms Bojana Gligoric NGO „Expeditio“, President 85330 Kotor, Montenegro Tel: +382 (0)32 302 520 Fax: +382 (0)32 302 521 E-mail: expeditio@t-com.me</p> <p>Ms Jelena Marojevic NGO „Green Home“, executive director, E-mail: greenhome@greenhome.co.me Tel: +382 20 609 375 (office) Fax: +382 20 609 376</p> <p>Ms Srna Sudar Regional Env. Centre</p>
<p>ARAB FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (AFED)</p>	<p>Mr Najib Saab Secretary General AFED Secretariat P.O. Box 113-5474 Beirut, Lebanon Tel: +9611321800 Fax: +961 1 321900 Mobile: +9613622702 E-mail: saabnajib@hotmail.com nwsaab@gmail.com</p>
<p>UN CONFERENCE RIO 2012</p>	<p>Mr Brice Lalonde Executive Coordinator UN Conference Rio 2012 Email: lalonde@un.org</p>
<p>UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)</p>	<p>Mr Moustapha Kamal Gueye, Ph.D. Acting Head, Green Economy Advisory Services Unit Economics and Trade Branch Division of Technology, Industry and Economics United Nations Environment Programme</p>

	<p>11-13, Chemin des Anemones CH-1219 Chatelaine Geneva, Switzerland Tel: + 4122 917 82 55 Fax: + 4122 917 80 76 E-mail: MoustaphaKamal.Gueye@unep.org</p>
OECD	<p>Ms Angela Bularga Principal Administrator, EAP Task Force Secretariat Environmental Performance and Information Division Environment Directorate Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2, rue Andre Pascal 75775 Paris CEDEX 16 FRANCE Tel. 33 1 45 24 98 63 Fax 33 1 44 30 61 83 E-mail: angela.bularga@oecd.org</p>
IUCN CENTRE FOR MEDITERRANEAN COOPERATION (IUCN-Med)	<p>Mr Antonio Troya Director IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (IUCN-Med) Parque Tecnológico de Andalucía. Marie Curie, 35 (Sede Social) 29590 - Campanillas (Málaga) Phone: +34 95 202 84 30 E-mail: antonio.troya@iucn.org</p>
GLOBAL FOOTPRINT NETWORK	<p>Mr Yves de Soye Director, Geneva Office</p> <p>Mr Alessandro Galli Senior Scientist International Environment House 2 7-9 chemin de Balxert 1219 Geneva Switzerland T +41 (0)22 797 41 08 Mobile: +33 (0) 646244250 E-mail: yves@footprintnetwork.org, alessandro@footprintnetwork.org Web Site: www.footprintnetwork.org</p>

**PROGRAMMES AND REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRES
 OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE BLUE PLAN (BP/RAC)	<p>Mr Henri-Luc Thibault Director Plan Bleu, Centre d'Activité Régional (PB/CAR) 15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven Sophia Antipolis F-06560 Valbonne, France Tel: 33-4-92387130/33 Fax: 33-4-92387131</p>
--	---

	<p>E-mail: planbleu@planbleu.org hlthibault@planbleu.org</p>
REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE PRIORITY ACTIONS PROGRAMME (PAP/RAC)	<p>Mr Marko Prem Director a.i. Priority Actions Programme/Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC) Kraj Sv. Ivana 11 Tel: + 385 21 340 471 Fax: + 385 21 340 490 E-mail: marko.prem@ppa.htnet.hr Web-site: http://www.pap-thecoastcentre.org</p>
REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS (SPA/RAC)	<p>Mr Abderrahman Gannoun Director Boulevard Yasser Arafat B.P. 337 - 1080 Tunis Cedex Tunisia Tel: 216 71 206 851 & 216 71 206 485 Fax: 216 71 206 490 E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org E-mail: gannoun.abderrahmen@rac-spa.org</p>
REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR CLEANER PRODUCTION (CP/RAC)	<p>Mr Enrique de Villamore Martin Director E-mail: evillamore@cprac.org</p> <p>Ms Magali Outters Project Manager E-mail: mouters.h2020@cprac.org</p> <p>(Regional Centre Under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants) C/ Milanesat 25-27, 5th floor, 08017 Barcelona - Spain Tel. +34 93 553 87 90 Fax +34 93 553 87 95 Web-site: www.cprac.org</p>

**UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND SECRETARIAT UNITS
SECRETARIAT DES NATIONS UNIES**

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME/COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN (UNEP/MAP)	<p>Ms Maria Luisa Silva Mejias Executive Secretary and Coordinator Tel: 302107273126 E-mail: maria.luisa.silva@unepmap.gr</p> <p>Ms Tatjana Hema Programme Officer Tel: 302107273115 E-mail: thema@unepmap.gr</p> <p>Ms Virginie Hart, Marine and Coastal Expert Tel: +30 210 7273122, E-mail: virginie.hart@unepmap.gr Skype: virginie.hart</p>
--	---

	<p>UNEP/MAP, 48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue, P.O. Box 18019, 11610 Athens, Greece Fax: +30 210 7253196-7 Website: www.unepmap.org</p>
UNEP/MAP CONSULTANTS	<p>Mr Harry Cocossis P.O. Box 18019, 11610 Athens, Greece E-mail: harry.cocossis@unepmap.gr</p> <p>Mr Ante Baric P.O. Box 18019, 11610 Athens, Greece Tel.: +30 210 7273142 E-mail: ante.baric@unepmap.gr</p> <p>Mr Gilles Sommeria E-mail: gsommeria@gmail.com</p> <p>Mr Mohammed Sadeck Boulahya E-mail: msb_africa@yahoo.com, msboulahya@yahoo.fr</p> <p>Mr Nicola Cantore The Overseas Development Institute 111 Westminster Bridge Road, London. SE1 7JD E-mail: n.cantore@odi.org.uk</p> <p>Mr Nicos Georgiades Environmental and Planning Adviser 28 Zannettou Str., 1100 Nicosia, CYPRUS Telephone: + 357 99479028 Fax: + 357 22780385 E-mail: nicosgeorgiades@cytanet.com.cy</p>

Annex IV

Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development Montenegro, May 30 to June 1 2011

Agenda

Day I: 30th May 2011 **Opening and Green Economy**

- 09.00–10.00 Opening Towards a Mediterranean Contribution to Rio+20
- 10.00-10.30 Coffee break
- 10.30–13.00 International experiences towards a Green Economy
- 13.00-14.30 Lunch break
- 14.30-16.30 Activities towards a Green Economy in the Mediterranean: Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP)
- 16.30–17.00 Coffee break
- 17.00–18.30 Activities towards a Green Economy in the Mediterranean: Climate Change Adaptation

Day II, 31st May 2011 **Context and Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development**

- 9.00-10.30 The context for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean
- 10.30-11.00 Coffee break
- 11.00-12.00 Strengthening National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSDs)
- 12.00-13.00 Institutional framework towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean
- 13.00-14.30 Lunch break
- 14.30-15.30 Institutional framework towards sustainable development in the Mediterranean
- 15.30-16.30 Programme of Work (PoW) of MCSD
- 16.30-17.00 Coffee break
- 17.00-18.30 Mediterranean Contribution towards Rio+20

Day III, 1st June **Conclusions and Closure of the meeting**

- 11.00-11.15 Next MCSD meeting and other matters
- 11.15-13.00 Adoption of Conclusions/Recommendations
- 13.00-13.15 Closure of the meeting