



United Nations Environment Programme



UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.226/2
24 February 2003

ENGLISH



MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

First Meeting on the Evaluation of MAP

Athens, Greece, 6 March 2003

INTRODUCTORY PAPER ON MAP EVALUATION PROCESS

A. INTRODUCTORY PAPER ON MAP OVERALL EVALUATION PROCESS

1. At its 12th meeting held in Monaco in November 2001, the Contracting Parties requested the Secretariat to commence the preparation of a strategic assessment of the general framework of the Barcelona Convention (the operational bodies and the Coordination Unit); and by October 2002 to draw up a report, in cooperation with the Bureau, for submission to the next meeting of the MAP National Focal Points (NFP).

2. The Contracting Parties allowed the Bureau to select the method and the timetable. The objective was to hold a wide-ranging debate at the next meeting of the Contracting Parties, based on the document to be elaborated, concerning the MAP structure – including the MCSD -its adaptation to the new international context, in particular the Johannesburg Action Plan, the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, and the countries' specific needs. The Bureau was, therefore, called on to oversee the exercise, ensuring that it was primarily prospective in nature.

3. At its meeting held in Damascus in March 2002, the Bureau decided to hold an initial discussion on the report at its subsequent meeting in Monaco in October, in order to guide the preparation of an appropriate mechanism by the Secretariat and then to consider a preliminary draft at its meeting in spring 2003. The CPs' request was for "an overall evaluation of the MAP structure", which implied not only administrative components but also the structures in countries (NFPs), meetings, the MCSD and even UNEP to the extent that it contributed to the MAP under its regional seas programme.

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

5. At its meeting held in Monaco in October last year, the Bureau held an exchange of views on the proposal of the Secretariat and reached an agreement on its working methods and the broad outline of the evaluation. At this meeting the Bureau requested the Secretariat to set up as soon as possible a "Think Tank" to prepare the global assessment of the MAP, composed as follows:

- a. The President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Monaco);
- b. A representative of a Mediterranean country member of the EU (Greece);
- c. A representative of a southern or eastern Mediterranean country (Syrian Arab Republic);
- d. A representative of a Mediterranean country included in the next enlargement of the EU (Slovenia);
- e. Two experts to be appointed by the Secretariat.

The group could consult intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and would focus its evaluation on the following:

- A prospective approach;
- Adjustment of the MAP, in particular of the MCSD, to the post-Johannesburg context, and consideration of the task force deliberations on the future of the MCSD;
- The MAP's integration into the European context (Euro-Med Partnership, EU legislation, etc.)
- Criteria for more active participation of MAP in technical assistance activities for the countries.

An interim progress report would be submitted to the Bureau at its next meeting for subsequent transmission to the meeting of the Contracting Parties.

6. In order to prepare the sound base for the first meeting of the Think Tank, the MAP coordinator, as requested by the Bureau decision, invited in December 2002, the MEDU professionals and RACs to express their points of view on the basis of their working experience and general knowledge of MAP, its partners and programs, Mediterranean countries and other partners, ongoing and past sectorial evaluations, on several important questions related to the Barcelona system performance and its efficiency on a prospective basis. The philosophy of the exercise was to apply an integrated, participatory and general evaluation approach to provide the Bureau with a self assessment introductory paper of the overall MAP system in line with MAP objectives set since 1995, and highlighted every two years by the Contracting Parties.

7. To this aim, a questionnaire was prepared and distributed addressing issues such as the following:

- ratification, legal frame,
- institutional strengthening of MAP system, including MEDU, RACs and their programs,
- the implications of EU enlargement process to the overall MAP performance and the future cooperation with other programs.
- MAP involvement in concrete actions on a national level in balance with the cooperation frame approach,
- the collaboration with other institutions and organisations in particular with other conventions,
- management of human and financial resources,
- relations with Parties.

8. During the MEDU and RACs directors meeting held in Sophia Antipolis in January 2003, the MAP evaluation was deeply discussed. Possible options for MCSD and the future mandate of PAP, PB and CP RACs were broadly addressed; The conclusion drawn was to wait for the Task Force evaluation paper in view of making proposal to the Think Tank and the Bureau.

9. On the basis of the answers to the questionnaire, conclusions of several meetings and past evaluation for some RACs and MEDPOL, the Secretariat prepared an introductory paper, herewith, for submission to the first Think Tank meeting for discussion and follow up.

10. At this stage, the Secretariat feels that the Think Tank group could

- Select those topics which will deserve further discussions
- Add those topics which the Think Tank would find relevant
- Discuss the methodology to be used which could include:
 - a) A questionnaire to be distributed to the National Map Focal Points and some IGOs and/or NGOs,
 - b) an additional analysis either by a member of the Think Tank, by an external expert or by the Secretariat, undertaken on some specific points

11. The secretariat is of the opinion that it might be of some interest to have inputs from National Focal Points (NFP), IGOs and NGOs especially related to the EU enlargement process impact, the role of MAP, the ratification process, implication of international obligations for the national legal frame and the cooperation with other conventions, programs and donors to assure as maximum synergy as possible with. MEDA, REReP(Regional Environmental Reconstruction Program), CARDS regional (Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation), UNECE/CEP (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe/ Committee for Environmental Policy) frames, the accession and stabilisation & association processes being very important regional initiatives where Mediterranean countries are participating actively in and needing to be very well known by MAP. In this context MAP with a strong support from the Parties has to be politically more active and could offer a high level of technical expertise in several programs and projects if necessary means are available.

12. If a questionnaire will be decided to be sent, the Secretariat would like to request the MAP focal points, in preparing their answers should involve their national respective MAP system focal points network.

13. Some NGOs and IGO selected on the basis of criteria decided by the Think Tank, could be invited to give their suggestions. The Secretariat feels that the selected ONG and IGO should have to have some experience and basic knowledge about MAP components and activities, good cooperation in other programs and be aware of the main development political and economic trend of the Mediterranean region. In this context, UNEP regional office for Europe, IGOs, regional seas programme, and, the Mediterranean networks of NGOs might be invited to participate to this process.

14. An in-depth evaluation of the issues related to the MCSD should take place at the second meeting of the Think Tank after the MCSD task force has completed its work.

15. The secretariat would propose the following time schedule for the remaining steps of the evaluation process:

During winter/April 2003

- Work of REMPEC and CAR/SPA evaluation
- Work of the MCSD Task force

6 March 2003:

- First Think Tank meeting to:
 - o review the introductory papers prepared by the Secretariat
 - o further decide on the evaluation approach to be followed
 - o Select the IGOs and NGOs

April 2003

- Review of MCSD proposal by its Task Force

End April/Beginning May 2003

- Second meeting of the Think Tank

20 May 2003

- Review by the Bureau of the interim report, options, proposals and recommendations to be submitted to the MAP NFPs and CPs.

20 June 2003

- The finalisation of the evaluation reports in both languages

B. THE MAP FUTURE CHALLENGES

The new international context, in particular the Johannesburg Action Plan, the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, the recent developments of the EU integration, accession, association and stabilization process and the ongoing development in the field of multilateral environmental agreements call for a new dimension of the overall MAP system efficiency to meet its ambitious Phase two objectives and the relevant decisions of the Contracting Parties.

To this end, policy, legal and institutional, programming of activities as well as financial and management issues require adaptation in order to further enhance the results of the MAP in its leading role in the protection of the Mediterranean environment and its growing contribution toward the sustainable development in the region. Such improvement will further build on the achievements made in particular during the last decade and expedite the realization of the remaining objectives and goals.

To this aim, the main emerging issues to be faced and tackled successfully by MAP could be highlighted as follows:

1. Efficient Implementation of the Convention and related Protocols

1.1 Main findings

1.1.1 Ratification process

The integrated cycle of the implementation of an international agreement is made up of several important steps as ratification and its entry into force, introduction in to the national legal frames, compliance and enforcement, its reporting and monitoring.

Since 1995, despite considerable efforts to improve and complete the existing regional legislation, only one protocol is in force. Although countries are working to implement the recommendations of the CP; the lack of ratifications represent, however, a serious problem for the image and credibility of the Barcelona system and of the whole Mediterranean region.

On a medium and long-term basis, the lack of ratifications could delay the implementation of plans and strategies thus reducing the numerous opportunities offered by the MAP for the protection of the Mediterranean.

By the year 2003 the countries are expected to take concrete actions towards the implementation of the Convention and its protocols. Thus, the ratification process needs to be encouraged.

1.1.2 Implementation

The incorporation of the obligations arising from the Convention and its related protocols into the national legal and regulatory frames is still scarce. Countries have difficulties in understanding the implications that international agreements may have on their national legal frame and probably need assistance.

The experimental reporting system, still in the first step of its implementation, seems to be a very useful exercise and should continue to be applied smoothly by all countries.

There is no compliance monitoring system still in place related to the implementation of the legal instrument of Barcelona system. In addition, the national relevant enforcement systems are weak. The cooperation with other global, regional conventions, organizations and

programs have been modest and need to be improved, particularly in the field of reporting and compliance monitoring in order to guarantee the maximum synergy, as well regular exchange of the experience and expertise.

In this context, the consolidation of the reporting exercise should continue to be considered as a priority and the sound base for the development of the compliance monitoring and promotion on a national and regional base.

1.2 Issues for discussion

1. *Which are the most efficient tools and means to be used to encourage the countries to speed up the ratification of the Convention and related Protocols?*
2. *To this end, what kind of assistance could be offered to Parties to translate the implication of Barcelona system to their proper national legal and regulatory system in:*
 - a) *identifying the relevant gaps,*
 - b) *drawing up plans to address such obstacles and gaps,*
 - c) *developing, enacting and enforcing appropriate laws, regulations or other to achieve the compliance with?*
3. *How the Secretariat could play a stronger catalytic role if e.g. the CP and the Bureau would give it a firm and clearer mandate related to the reporting and monitoring system establishment and implementation? How the Barcelona system could further follow and develop the example of monitoring compliance systems of other conventions?*

2. Sustainable development

2.1 Main findings

The contribution of MAP to the sustainable development of the region has grown significantly during recent years. MAP already covers some important topics of the Johannesburg implementation plan. However, a better integration of SD in MAP activities is very necessary.

MAP has to identify the issues of the Johannesburg implementation plan that are the most relevant for the Mediterranean and translate them to the Mediterranean context with, as much as possible, precise objectives and measurable outputs.

MAP and MCSD aims are to accompany the countries in promoting sustainable development principles, following the state of sustainable development in the Region, strengthening inter-regional cooperation, inducing and if necessary supporting the activities toward SD by the major groups, in particular: private sector, local authorities and NGOs, and support the establishment of the national SD committees.

Following recent discussions with MCSD, a task force was established aiming at improving the efficiency and visibility of the MCSD work.

2.2 Issues for discussion

The discussion will be left for the Think Tank second meeting waiting for the input of the MCSD task force.

3. Assessment documents

3.1 Main Findings

3.1.1 Production of assessment documents

During its implementation MAP and RACs have produced a number of documents about the state of the environment, scientific assessments, the TDA, legal and institutional framework of MAP, several important guidelines, the strategic review of the sustainable development in the Mediterranean, etc. The production of this information is abundant but is not being planned properly in the medium and long term basis. The global quality of these documents still needs to be further improved in order to be in line with the average quality of the European production.

Despite the achievements, the cooperation with scientific Mediterranean institutes and centers needs to be intensified. The scientific community is partly reached through these documents and the MTS series.

A better medium and long term coordination and planning, including budget allocations, within MAP (MEDU, MEDPOL and RACs), are needed to manage properly in a given timeframe the preparation, translation and production processes. A proactive attitude of MAP structures has to be strengthened following the experiences of other bodies and programs dealing with regional and global assessment.

3.1.2 Visibility of documents

Within this positive trend of abundance of production of documents, the Mediterranean dimension in the global assessments documents dealing with e.g. biodiversity, pollution, etc., is either lacking completely or partially ignored. In fact, the data and assessment documents are quite known in the Mediterranean but not as well out of the region. There are several important global assessment documents where the relevant MAP contribution is not taken into consideration at all, despite of some recent progress made as the GEO -3-.

3.2 Issues for discussion

How the MAP could address in a better way the taking into consideration of its abundant and qualitative documents or other contributions by the global assessment processes? This matter is very much related to the MAP visibility and credibility:

- 1. To be more proactive towards the international decisions related to the global or regional assessment to avoid in due course the exclusion of the relevant MAP contribution?*
- 2. Through a better knowledge and follow up of such processes from their beginning?*
- 3. Through closer cooperation and contacts with the Mediterranean and other eminent academic & scientific community (institutions and experts) involved in such processes?*
- 4. Through regular consultation of the similar assessment documents prepared under the frame of other IGO, programmes or conventions?*
- 5. other?*

4. Assistance to countries

4.1 Main findings

Since its establishment the MAP has offered its assistance to countries to carry out several assessment and research activities, to built capacities on a national and regional level etc.

MAP has recently become more and more involved in action-oriented types of activity, funded either by the Trust Fund or external donors. A number of Parties have already shown their positive reaction to this recent change of assistance trends towards the intervention at national or local levels.

However, the implementation of action-oriented activities requires additional important financial resources to be found in close cooperation with several partners, programs and countries. **In this regard the GEF/SAP Med, CAMPs experiences deserve some consideration.**

A better knowledge of EU funding facilities available to Mediterranean countries and their relevant programs of support could substantially help give MAP a clearer picture of national and regional priorities. For example:

- SMAP/MEDA,
- CARDS Regional and CARDS National (Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation) available for Mediterranean Balkans Countries,
- REReP (Regional Environmental Reconstruction Programme that provides a donor coordination framework for environmental actions in South Eastern Europe (including Mediterranean Balkans countries), and targets the institutional and civil society reforms to create the conditions for sustainable environmental improvements in this region,
- LIFE,
- National Poverty Reduction Strategies and WB country strategies,

A strategic paper addressing the external funding possibilities and the potential MAP involvement in such processes could be helpful. The MAP focal points could play a significant role in this process.

4.2 Questions for discussions

1. *How can the present balance between the cooperation and the intervention approaches can be kept and further strengthened? Which are the most appropriate mechanisms?*
2. *Should MAP and its structures be dimensioned and used as an instrument for obtaining external funding?*
3. *Is it worthy to investigate if the non-Mediterranean countries historically interested in environmental projects could be potential donors? What about funds available in the countries through either international funding organizations or bilateral agreements with developed countries and their cooperating agencies?*

5. Partnership

5.1 Main findings

MAP is occupying an important role in the region and is being increasingly considered as a politically and technically reliable partner by other institutions, organisations and programs. An efficient and mutual partnership could contribute stronger to MAP political and technical visibility.

5.1.1 Cooperation with EU

Cooperation with EU is increasing and more oriented to funding rather than to concrete partnership. . The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the enlargement, accession, stabilization and association processes have to be followed carefully. MAP could offer and play an important role in assisting countries to fulfill the relevant requirements or conditions and strengthen their national partnership profile in the field of environmental protection.

5.1.2 Cooperation with IGOs and other Conventions

Since its establishment and especially during its second phase, MAP has closely cooperated with IGOs dealing with marine environment protection and sustainable development. The cooperation with other conventions is still scarce. The Barcelona system is generally coherent with other regional and global conventions.

There is a need for more dynamism in order to better cooperate with UNEP, especially with the regional seas programme, UNECE, mainly in relation to the process Environment for Europe which follows in particular cross cutting issues as public participation, information, EIA, SEA, liability and compensation, reporting, compliance and enforcement, and the technical standards, the Council of Europe in relation to Berne and Landscape conventions, and other UN conventions. Attention should be more devoted to any development that could affect the Barcelona system.

5.1.3 Cooperation with civil society

The cooperation of MAP with the civil society and NGOs has evidently improved during these last years. The cooperation with business and private companies is still very limited. The cooperation with scientific and academic community could be intensified.

In connection with MAP Type II Partnership Initiative, the WSSD Plan of Implementation offers a good framework for strengthening cooperation and partnership with relevant international and regional organizations, in particular NGOs and business

5.1.4 Cooperation with Funding and Implementing Agencies

The partnership and cooperation with other funding agencies (World Bank, EIB, EU,) is rather weak. (See chapter 4)

5.2 Issues for discussions

Which could be the mechanisms to be encouraged that:

- *MAP and its RACs to be fully taken into consideration by all the partners, due to their consolidate reputation, experience and expertise, as a catalytic North/South intergovernmental organization to promote the protection of the environment and wise and sustainable use of resources.*
- *MAP focal points to communicate closely with the SMAP correspondents, REReP task force representatives, Regional/National CARDS and EEA (Environmental*

European Agency) Focal Points, country representative to Committee for Environmental Policy (CEP/UNECE)?

- A cooperating working process with Euro Mediterranean Partnership to be strengthened with a view of implementing the Athens Declaration.*
- A cooperating working process with REReP and CARDS programs to be established?*
- A proactive attitude of MAP towards any regional or global development in the field of environmental multilateral agreements, programs and global assessment processes to be present and visible?*
- How private business sector could be promoted to participate in joint MAP activities?*

6. MAP Visibility

6.1 Main findings

MAP visibility is significantly linked to its efficiency and performance and could be ensured by the:

- Taking into consideration and making reference of its assessment documents into global assessment ones
- Making use of the recommendations of the assessment documents or technical guidelines by the relevant decision making bodies on a national and regional level or other stakeholders
- Undertaking a large and continuous public awareness campaign about MAP and its profile, and its activities through the production and dissemination of the appropriate information and a stronger cooperation with civil society, NGOs, media and MAP national focal points and if established, with the national sustainable development committees.
- Being increasingly present in the countries implementing several projects and keeping a certain balance between “the traditional “ and action oriented ones

The MAP has only recently considered the information as a priority. MAP visibility depended on its target that was mostly MoEs and NFPs;

6.2 Issues for discussions

Apart from the issues raised in chapter 3, 4 and 5 related to the visibility vis a vis the assessment documents, partnership and assistance to countries, the following questions could be addressed:

- 1. How could the information could be better promoted towards civil society ?*
- 2. Should a more proactive approach in targeting a wider public including the scientific community be followed?*
- 3. What kind of networking with media needs to be established?*
- 4. Apart from MAP NFP and Ministries of Environment, what other bodies could be targeted?*

7. Institutional, Management and Financial issues

7.1 Main findings

To tackle all the above challenges, an efficient institutional chart and a proper and careful management of the human and financial resources of MAP is needed. The growing MAP profile towards sustainable development, action-oriented activities, assistance to the

countries to better achieve compliance with the Convention and its protocols, call for more resources.

With regards to the institutional aspect, the MAP structure is rather heavy in its different components.

Some RACs mandates are old and do not respond properly to the MAP second phase objectives. MCSD is under evaluation by a Task Force.

MEDPOL should continue to be a permanent and important programme managed by MEDU.

It is obvious that there is a discrepancy between the tasks given to the Secretariat and the allocation of financial resources. This could lead to a superficial approach of some issues especially in the field of the sustainable development, which should be avoided.

If the Think Tank is of the opinion of re-dimensioning MAP structure, including also the RACs, It should take into account the actual level of financial resources coming from contributors that can not be substantially increased.

7.2 Items to be discussed:

- Should MAP structure (not including the MCSD) be kept as it is or is there room for reforms?
- Is there need for renovating the mandate of some centers?