



United Nations Environment Programme



EP

UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/2
11 February 2002

ENGLISH



MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

Seventh Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission
on Sustainable Development (MCSD)

Antalya, 13-16 March, 2002

REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (December 2000- February 2002)

Table of Contents

Body of the report

- I. Introduction
- II. Brief history of the MCSD: benchmarks and decisions
- III. MCSD Steering Committee
- IV. Inter-sessions Thematic Activities
- V. MCSD Assessment and Prospects
- VI. Implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action
- VII. Orientations for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy
- VIII. New Issues and Re-examination of previous themes
- IX. Major Groups and the MCSD
- X. MAP, MCSD and the WSSD
- XI. Eighth MCSD meeting

Annexes

- Annex I MCSD Assessment and Prospects
- Annex II "Implementation and Follow up of MCSD recommendations and Proposals for Action" and related decisions by the Contracting Parties
- Annex III Conclusions of the 5th Meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee
- Annex IV Summary of Conclusions of the 6th Meeting of the MCSD
- Annex V List of the MCSD Steering Committee Members
- Annex VI List of the Members of the MCSD Major Groups

(A separate document will include proposals for new issues and follow up of previous themes)

I. Introduction

The present progress report is submitted by the Secretariat of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) in compliance with its Terms of Reference. It covers progress in the implementation of various decisions taken by the MCSD and its Steering Committee as well as the Contracting Parties, during the period November 2000 - February 2002.

Organization and implementation of the activities during this period were largely based on the intersessional activities of the thematic Working Groups, the Strategic Review, assessment of the follow up of MCSD proposals, and assessment and prospects for MCSD as well as preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

The Seventh meeting of the MCSD, kindly co-financed by Turkey, will be held in Antalya, Turkey from 13 to 16 February 2002, with three full working days, the fourth being mainly devoted to the adoption of the report of the meeting, which is expected to be closed at 13.00. If possible a detailed report, and not just a summary of conclusions, will be adopted at the end of the meeting.

Previously, it was planned to hold the 7th MCSD meeting from 3 to 6 October 2001 and due to the international context and its impacts on the region, this meeting was postponed until March 2002. Meanwhile and considering that the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties was taking place on 14-17 November 2001 in Monaco, it was decided to organize an Extraordinary meeting of the MCSD just before it so as to present some of its results and proposals to the attention of the Contracting Parties.

The main objective for holding this Extraordinary MCSD meeting was to review the findings and conclusions of the last three Thematic Working Groups, together with the general issue of the implementation and follow up of the recommendations, and present their proposals to the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties.

Consequently, this report will not refer to the findings and proposals of the Working Groups on "Industry and Sustainable Development", "Urban Management" and "Free Trade and Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context", as these were considered by the Extraordinary meeting of the MCSD and related recommendations adopted by the Contracting Parties; even though the issue of the implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action was also considered by the Extraordinary MCSD and the Contracting Parties meetings it was decided to discuss it further at the 7th MCSD meeting.

In addition to this latter issue, the agenda of this meeting includes several items, most of them requiring in-depth discussions for further steps, and notably:

- The MCSD assessment and prospects; strengths, weaknesses and ways and means for improving its efficiency;
- The "Orientations" for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy; Strategic Review, findings and recommendations; key position papers to structure this Regional Strategy, preparatory process;
- The new issues of the MCSD next programme of work; as seven of the eight thematic Working Groups have completed their tasks, the "free trade" group pursuing its activities, new issues will be proposed and their relevance and feasibility discussed.
- The "Major Groups"; their participation and contribution to the MCSD will be discussed, with first draft proposals.

If necessary for in-depth discussions in small groups for certain items such as the "Orientations" for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy and the new issues, ad hoc break out sessions could be organized throughout the meeting, mainly the second day; to that end, three meeting rooms, including the main one for plenary sessions, would be made available, but simultaneous (English/French) interpretation would be ensured only in the main one.

Suggestions from MCSD members and observers are welcome so as to organize the meeting sessions and related facilities accordingly in due time.

II. Brief history of the MCSD: benchmarks and decisions

The post-Rio era was an important period in the history of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) during which the Governments of the Mediterranean region and the European Community, in cooperation with concerned partners, started the process of translating and adapting UNCED principles to the Mediterranean context through the preparation of Agenda MED 21, reorientation of MAP, the Barcelona Convention and its protocols and the creation of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD).

The MCSD was established in 1995 within the framework of MAP, as an advisory body with the following mandate:

- to identify, evaluate and examine major economic, ecological and social problems set out in Agenda MED 21, make appropriate proposals thereon to the meetings of the Contracting Parties, evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of decisions taken by the Contracting Parties and facilitate the exchange of information among institutions implementing activities related to sustainable development in the Mediterranean;
- to enhance regional cooperation and rationalise the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean basin for the integration of environment and development issues.

At their Extraordinary Meeting (Montpellier, 1-4 July 1996), the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted the Terms of Reference and the Composition of the Commission. According to the Terms of Reference, the Commission is composed of 36 members, sitting on equal footing, consisting of high-level representatives from each of the Contracting Parties (21), representatives of local authorities, socio-economic actors and non-governmental organisations (15), working in the fields of environment and sustainable development.

During its first meeting (Rabat, December 1996), the Commission elected its first Steering Committee; it agreed on a programme built on activities corresponding to some of the priority needs of the Mediterranean region: sustainable management of coastal regions and management of water demand, sustainable development indicators, tourism, information, awareness and participation, free trade and environment, industry and sustainable development, management of urban and rural development.

The method of work consisted in organizing thematic Working Groups with Task Managers and Support Centres to deal with each selected theme. The MAP funds allocated to the MCSD will be considered as seed money since the task managers and support centres are expected to look for the necessary additional human and financial resources and expertise for the activities of the thematic Working Groups.

The second meeting of the Commission (Palma de Majorca, May 1997) has mainly reviewed progress achieved and problems encountered since its first meeting.

At their third meeting (Sophia Antipolis, October 1997) the members of the MCSD agreed upon sets of recommendations and proposals for action related to management of water demand and sustainable management of coastal zones, together with MCSD's draft rules of procedure, before presenting them to the Contracting Parties that adopted them at their tenth meeting (Tunis, November 1997).

At its fourth meeting (Monaco, October 1998) the Commission examined the progress made by the six "medium-term" thematic Working Groups, as well as issues related to follow-up of recommendations, new themes, method of work and cooperation with UN agencies and other partners. Moreover and in conformity with the MCSD's specific rules of procedure, a new Steering Committee was elected.

The fifth meeting of the MCSD (Rome, July 1999) agreed on sets of recommendations and proposals for action related to "Sustainable Development Indicators" and "Information, Awareness, Environmental Education and Participation"; the ones related to "Tourism and Sustainable Development" were reviewed and finalized some weeks later; they were then all presented to the 11th meeting of the Contracting Parties (Malta, October 1999) who adopted the three sets of recommendations; moreover, the MCSD members agreed on the set of criteria to be applied for the preparation of pre-feasibility studies for and selection of possible new themes for the next programme of work of the MCSD.

The fifth Meeting of the MCSD and the 11th Meeting of the Contracting Parties have discussed aim, organisation and method of work for the preparation of the Strategic Review for the year 2000, as agreed upon in the Terms of Reference of the MCSD;

Fifteen new members representing the three Major Groups (Local Authorities, Socio-Economic Actors and NGOs) were selected by the Contracting Parties at their 11th meeting, in 1999; These members are expected to attend the 6th and 7th MCSD meeting, and participate to the intersessional activities throughout the period between the 6th and 8th MCSD meetings.

At the sixth meeting of the MCSD (Tunis November 2000), the fifteen new members representing the three Major Groups took over and participated to the meeting that was mainly devoted to the examination of the Strategic Review and its recommendations and proposals for action as well as to a draft "Tunis Declaration"; this meeting comprised an important High Level Segment with several Ministers of the Environment; it was also the occasion for a very animated debate on the follow up of MCSD proposals, possible new issues and method of work, preparing the ground for relevant discussions in the next MCSD and Contracting Parties meetings. These subjects were also taken up in the 5th meeting of the MCSD Steering Committee (Monaco, May 2001).

At its first Extraordinary Meeting (Monaco, 12 November 2001), the organization of which was decided because of the international context and the holding of the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties (Monaco, 14-17 November 2001), the MCSD members discussed and prepared four sets of findings and proposals related to: "Industry and Sustainable Development", "Urban management and Sustainable Development", "Free Trade and Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context", and "Implementation and Follow up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action"; proposed recommendations were then reviewed and approved by the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties.

Moreover, considering that the mandate of the present MCSD members representing the three Major Groups will expire before the 8th meeting of the MCSD, fifteen new members were selected by the Contracting Parties; the list of these new members together with present and previous members is attached in annex VI of this report.

In order to ensure continuity and satisfactory transition, new and present members representing the three Major Groups will be invited to participate to the inter-session activities between the 7th and the 8th meetings of the MCSD, keeping in mind that, as was done previously, the new members will take over at the latter meeting.

III. MCSD Steering Committee:

In conformity with its Rules of Procedure, a new Steering Committee is expected to be elected at the beginning of the 7th MCSD meeting; in principle, it would include Turkey, the host country, and Monaco, as President of the Contracting Parties since November 2001. Two other members from the Contracting Parties and one member from each of the Major Groups need to be designated.

The list of present and previous members of the Steering Committee is attached in annex V of this report.

MCSD members are requested to inform the Secretariat in due time about their interest in joining the Steering Committee;

IV. Inter-sessions thematic activities:

Since the last ordinary meeting of the MCSD (Tunis, November 2000), the Secretariat and its Support Centres have been working on two major set of issues in the framework of the MCSD; these concern: the thematic Working Groups and the follow up of the conclusions and decisions of MCSD meetings.

Regarding the thematic Working Groups, three out of eight themes of the work programme of the MCSD that were still on-going have constituted the main items of the agenda of the Extraordinary MCSD meeting; they concern: "Industry and Sustainable Development", "Urban Management and Sustainable Development" and "Free Trade and Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context"; related recommendations and proposals for action were adopted by the last meeting of the Contracting Parties; if for "Industry" and "Urban" Working Groups, as for the previous other five thematic Working Groups, their activities are considered as terminated with the adoption of proposed recommendations, it was decided to pursue the activities of the "Free Trade" Working Group considering the importance of this issue in the context of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and its impacts on the Mediterranean Regional and National environment and sustainable development. Decisions on "Free Trade" as adopted by the Contracting Parties are in report UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3.

During this period, various other activities were undertaken; these concern: the issue of implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations, the MCSD assessment and prospects, the new issues, the Major Groups contribution to the MCSD, and the MAP/MCSD contribution to the WSSD preparatory process; progress and proposals, as appropriate, are dealt with in the subsequent sessions.

Moreover, and following the recommendations of the 6th MCSD meeting, the "Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean" was finalized and published

together with a Synthesis for a wider dissemination. In view of promoting information and awareness on environment and sustainable development issues, the MAP/MCSD Secretariat has promoted, and provided support for, the preparation of national brochures in 14 countries; a similar one is also being prepared by the two major NGO networks; in some cases, the preparation of this brochure has been the opportunity for very interesting multi-stakeholders meetings.

It would be interesting to have the other countries and Major Groups prepare similar brochures, for dissemination of information at national and regional levels; this could also be an excellent contribution to MAP and MCSD visibility;

V. MCSD Assessment and Prospects:

Since the first set of MCSD recommendations was prepared and adopted by the Contracting Parties in 1997, a series of questions were raised concerning its method of work, the quality and usefulness of the results, the implementation and follow up of the recommendations and the membership and participation issues.

Five years after its creation, with various institutional and intersessional meetings, a review and assessment of the MCSD organization and method of work was considered necessary in order to define options for further evolution so as to make the MCSD more efficient in advising the Contracting Parties and all other concerned partners in their respective tasks towards sustainable development.

In fact, the important question of the MCSD assessment and prospects in relation also with the selection of new themes ended up in animated debate during the 11th CP meeting and the 6th MCSD and its 5th Steering Committee meeting. Over the last two years, issues related to MCSD activities and their follow up have been raised and discussed on several occasions. These discussions are summarized in respective reports of these meetings.

At the last meeting of the Contracting Parties, several Ministers and other delegates have expressed general satisfaction as regards to MCSD achievements while highlighting the need for strengthening its role with appropriate means in promoting sustainable development, improving communication for reaching directly all concerned national actors and regional partners, providing strategic proposals with adequate measures for their implementation and inducing establishment of National Commissions on Sustainable Development and their networking.

In order to prepare for this important discussion that is expected to come out with at least a series of orientations and prospects for an improved, better organized and more efficient MCSD, all members as well as MAP components were requested to submit their views and thoughts on the assessment of the MCSD activities and its prospects. Moreover, a qualified expert and active member of the MCSD since its inception was asked to prepare an in-depth report (see Annex I) based on his own expertise and the contributions received from members and partners, giving due consideration to:

- the actual mandate and composition of the MCSD
- its method of work and various results
- the nature of the discussions in the MCSD meetings, where several voices were raised on criticism and/or expectations, but also
- the first ideas regarding the creation of the MCSD before the final decision of the Contracting Parties with its actual composition and method of work.

As a result, 16 members and partners sent their contributions: 9 Contracting Parties, 5 NGOs, 1 Local Authority, 1 MAP Component/RAC and no Socio-economic group.

The report on MCSD Assessment and Prospects provides background information and guidance for a thorough discussion on this crucial issue for the future of the MCSD before raising up this question to the next Contracting Parties meeting for a decision on the MCSD strengthening and empowering prospects. Obviously, the MCSD, through its experience since its establishment, has also cumulated success stories to its credit.

Without any attempt to summarize the report on MCSD Assessment and Prospects, some of the main problems and strengths identified and the proposed solutions are highlighted here below for discussion.

It is felt that the MCSD could fulfil more efficiently its major role as think tank and forum for dialogue; the report-producing mechanism has been the usual practice and the environmental perspective and participation has been predominant. Membership, qualification, interest, nomination, participation and follow up issues have raised concerns by several members. The MCSD programme of work required more than just MAP existing capacities for an efficient implementation and follow up. Budgetary and staff limitations have represented an important handicap.

However, the relevance of the MCSD to MAP and the Mediterranean region was not challenged. Despite the various constraints, the MCSD has provided a unique regional forum for dialogue and a promising framework for defining a regional Sustainable Development Strategy. Its composition, pluralism, participatory approach as well as its method of work, its frank discussions and results gave to the MCSD a distinctive and interesting character in the Region. It became a reference in the region, promoting information and awareness on sustainable development issues. Even though just an Advisory Body to MAP, it has been progressively perceived as an "institution" of its own.

Considering that the findings and conclusions of the "MCSD Assessment and Prospects" Report reflect the views of several MCSD members and not just the expert's opinions, most of the proposed actions would deserve due attention during the discussion.

In this respect, and in order to make the Commission more efficient, it is proposed in this "Assessment" report:

- to improve and strengthen the role of the MCSD as an open and autonomous think tank and forum for consultation and dialogue dealing more with the political and strategic aspects of the issues rather than with technical and downstream aspects;
- to reinforce the autonomous, advisory, consultative and representative nature of informed experts, members of the MCSD;
- to review and improve the mode and period of nomination of members as well as the *modus operandi* of the Commission, and its Working Groups and ordinary meetings;
- that MCSD members be nominated on their personal capacity as eminent experts and not as representatives of an institution; regional/ international eminent experts could positively contribute to the MCSD and a few seats could be attributed to them;
- that the MCSD proposals should not be all necessarily approved by the Contracting Parties, and that in any case these proposals should include ways and means for their implementation;
- that specific budget and adequate staff be allocated to the MCSD if more efficiency, increased visibility and improved cooperation are expected.

The Secretariat considers that this "Assessment" report has, except for the contents of the work programme, dealt with most questions related to the MCSD that were raised during the last few years. There are obviously different categories of actions that could contribute to improving the efficiency of the MCSD; some are of MCSD's direct competence while others, such as issues related to statute, mandate, composition and selection of members come under the responsibility of the Contracting Parties. Yet, the MCSD members could discuss these issues and submit their views and advices to the Contracting Parties. In any case, it is a fact that the human resources that the Secretariat is able to put at the disposal of the Commission are limited; improving the efficiency of the MCSD might finally lead to creating a new position in the Secretariat.

The more important increase of staff, not less than 3 professionals with relevant budget, as requested in the "Assessment report" would definitely and substantially improve the efficiency of the MCSD and would allow for effective implementation of the original remit and TORs; however, if acceptable to the Contracting Parties, such option would require that most of the necessary funds be provided from other sources than MAP budget. Between these two options, from minimum to substantial improvement of MCSD's efficiency, there could be several other practical options, as long as relevant means are given due consideration.

In most options, it would be necessary to revise MCSD rules of procedure, with probably minor amendments to the mandate and composition. A specific Working Group, that should work closely with MCSD Steering Committee and MAP Bureau, could be established to identify a few MCSD prospect options with related revisions, .

Meanwhile, and until the Contracting Parties agree on MCSD future prospects, some step by step improvement could be done with regards to the method of work and meetings so as to re-orient towards the think tank and forum role, to the dynamic participation of members and partners, to the type of outputs and issues to be dealt with.

The MCSD members are expected to discuss and propose ways and means for improving efficiency in fields directly under their responsibility, and to advise the Secretariat on further steps regarding issues under the responsibility of the Contracting Parties, so as to raise relevant questions with the Bureau of the Contracting Parties and then work out detailed option if applicable.

VI. Implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action

Since the launching of the MCSD activities, the question of implementation and follow-up of MCSD proposals (that would become later on recommendations or decisions when adopted by the Contracting Parties) has been regularly brought up during MCSD meetings; more precisely:

- In its terms of reference, the MCSD is expected to "make proposals to the meeting of the Contracting Parties" but also "to evaluate the effectiveness of the follow up to their decisions";
- During the 11th meeting of the Contracting Parties, this issue was subject to an intensive discussion that ended up by the recognition by the Contracting Parties of the "need for follow up measures to the recommendations and proposals for action by the MCSD"; the Secretariat was requested to "draw up a strategy for this purpose", that would also be "designed to help in evaluating the effectiveness of the action undertaken";

Consequently, the Secretariat has prepared draft "Guidelines for the implementation and follow-up of MCSD proposals (hereunder the "Guidelines");

The preparation of these guidelines was based on information provided by most MCSD members in a questionnaire on actual experiences (even though very short) and expectations of concerned institutions and persons; in addition to the information collected from the questionnaires, and MAP relevant activities, twelve pilot studies were undertaken, analyzing ways and means applied by a given country in implementing the MCSD decisions of the Contracting Parties.

This item was on the agenda of the November 2001 MCSD Extraordinary meeting that, after a first debate, decided to reconsider the subject at the 7th MCSD meeting; during the discussion, members of the MCSD have underlined the following:

- the objectiveness and frankness of the draft "assessment";
- the implementation gaps and possible ways to remedy them;
- the problem of communication and circulation of the information
- the necessity for having sound and operational proposals for action;
- the staffing shortage both in the Secretariat and in various countries when limiting the scope to the environmental sector;
- the lack of participation of certain members;
- yet the spirit of consultation between different actors, the setting up of networks, the innovatory thinking, were highlighted;

Whereas it was decided to readdress this issue at the 7th MCSD meeting, a set of recommendations was submitted to the Contracting Parties that adopted them; these recommendations are in annex II of this report.

While reviewing once again the assessment of the implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations and proposed draft guidelines, one should keep in mind that it is sometimes not easy to precisely identify what was implemented as a direct consequence to MCSD proposals. In some cases, the process for preparation and contribution to MCSD related activities could have had a practical impact in the way concerned actors deal with the issue; this was probably the case in at least a few countries in the fields of "Management of Water Demand", "Tourism" and "Indicators", a kind of implementation before adoption. However, this is actually difficult to assess but it should not be neglected.

In view of the related further discussion at the Antalya's meeting, members of the MCSD were requested to submit their comments in writing to the Secretariat, so as to review the report accordingly; soon after the Extraordinary meeting, a reminder was sent to all members; unfortunately only one member sent comments which, together with inputs from the Secretariat, guided the revision of this "implementation and follow up assessment".

Whereas discussions on this issue were very animated during the meeting only two members, from all MCSD members, including previous and present Major Groups representatives and MAP Support Centres, submitted comments on a draft report that was considered rather interesting at the Extraordinary meeting of the MCSD by several members (one NGO before the Extraordinary meeting and one Contracting Party after).

Consequently, *after a new exchange of views on the findings and proposals of this "assessment", the MCSD members could discuss and identify ways and means for the implementation of related decisions as adopted by the last meeting of the Contracting Parties*, especially for what concerns "improving communication", "preparing national plans with necessary means", "promoting twinning projects" and "using all available instruments and means to finance their implementation" by the Contracting Parties and other members, as well as "preparing specific guidelines", "assisting in disseminating information" and "assessing every 4 years the implementation" by the Secretariat.

VII. Orientations for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy

According to its terms of reference, the MCSD shall "assist the Contracting Parties by making proposals on the formulation and implementation of a regional strategy for sustainable development in the Mediterranean". Considering the contents of the Strategic Review, the 6th MCSD meeting proposed to use it as background information for the preparation of a strategy for sustainable development; to that end, it was agreed that next step would be to prepare first a brief draft strategic framework document or Strategic Orientations that would be submitted to the 7th MCSD meeting.

1. Strategic Review and Sustainable Development

Analysing mainly the political and institutional actions towards sustainable development, the Strategic Review wonders if another type of development which would ensure a smooth transition towards Sustainable Development was possible? Another type of less production-related growth and development which would be more respectful of the Mediterranean ecosystem and its natural resources, which are seriously compromised for the near future in the current context of relation between Europe and the developing countries in the Region?

Sustainable development appears to exert no influence on the policies of many partners in the Mediterranean, apart from its environmental protection component. Sectoral visions and priorities still predominate heavily, and environmental policies have little impact on development policies. Economic efficiency continues to be the driving force behind policy for most Mediterranean countries, an aim towards which they move along the shortest possible route, using existing tools. The current international situation in terms of globalisation and competitiveness exerts pressure towards the adoption of such an aim. The Mediterranean partners are facing increasing challenges in terms of wider economic, technological and socio-cultural change such as the globalisation of world markets, increased competitiveness, geo-political restructuring, the growth of tourism, and technological progress in telecommunications and information dissemination, in transport and travel.

Echoing growing global concern towards Sustainable Development, several Mediterranean countries are preparing to adopt the necessary measures to revise their national policies, and the priorities and actions which stem from them; relevant actions towards integrating environmental concerns within sectoral policies in particular, and development in general, tend to be few; however, Sustainable Development stakes are being included or even integrated in development plans on an increasingly frequent basis, at least as far as the objectives are concerned.

Whilst environmental policies exist in practically all Mediterranean countries and in the regional organisations, they tend to have fragmentary perceptions of Sustainable Development. Cross-board links are hardly taken account of, and under the best circumstances environmental concerns are incorporated in development policies in an unsuitable manner. Most relevant Sustainable Development policies in the Mediterranean have not managed to face up to at least the three important problems: reforming policies in the key sectors, particularly agriculture and tourism; controlling urbanisation and littoralisation; developing infrastructure whilst respecting local resources and heritage.

2. Global and Regional Sustainable Development

As for the Johannesburg Summit, the crucial challenges for the Mediterranean Strategy will be to present Sustainable Development as a set of choices which are relevant to all Mediterranean Partners and actors, a set of principles which can guide future action and a set of practical policies at local, national and regional levels.

Pursuing Sustainable Development is essentially a task of transforming governance, and preparing and implementing a Sustainable Development Strategy could be considered as a test case for good governance. Therefore, moving towards Sustainable Development will require adequate structural changes in economic, social, environmental and political sectors: reforming fiscal policies, inequity and inequality of access to assets and resources, integrating environment in development policies, decoupling environmental degradation and resource consumption from economic and social development, reorienting and increasing public and private investment towards Sustainable Development.

Sustainable Development has become an overriding national policy in most Mediterranean countries, and as there can be no "one size fits all" approach to Sustainable Development, each country must chart its own course in line with its specificities and priorities. But some critical Sustainable Development challenges are regional that require collaboration by all partners and concrete responses at local/national and regional/institutional levels.

Consequently, even though Sustainable Development concerns all areas of economic, social, environmental and political life, a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy would better focus on a small number of problems which pose severe or irreversible threats to the Region, to the well being of its people and regional cooperation, so as to bridge the gap between an ambitious vision and practical political action.

The Mediterranean, as an area for "North-South" partnership between Europe and other Mediterranean countries should provide the arena in which to try out and apply the Sustainable Development concept. In the interest of greater efficiency, the basic elements which could avoid the failure of any Sustainable Development Strategy in the Mediterranean could come in the following guise:

- Allowing States to play their full role and encouraging the emerging role of local authorities;
- Drawing on all elements of Society;

- Working towards economic and social justice and taking national culture and values into account;
- Promoting scientific activity and technological achievement;
- Building / strengthening human resources and institutional capacity;

There is no doubt that only reforms which constitute various packages of statutory, fiscal, financial, commercial or economic measures will allow the rules to be changes and the outcome to be co-axed through the channels intended; there national and regional Mediterranean reforms to be considered would be rendered still more beneficial and desirable by the fact that their impact would encourage growth, alleviate poverty, protect environment and reduce income inequality. Thus the aims of the reforms and decisions to be taken would look for:

- Striving for efficiency in terms of rationalizing economic activity;
- Creating equity in terms of social justice and shared will-being;
- Preserving the natural resources base in terms of recovering the real cost of their use.

Given the multiple transition process (economic, technological, social, institutional, informational) in a more and more globalized world, a new social contract is necessary between concerned partners, providing a new equilibrium between economic growth and sustained improvement in quality of life; a dynamic and constructive interaction between globalization and decentralisation should be established, especially on governance and business partners; moreover, in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the Mediterranean could be an interacting regional case.

The challenge of realising Mediterranean Sustainable Development is to translate the Strategy into concrete objectives and concrete action in openness and dialogue among authorities, citizens and experts; the active participation of all concerned actors at different levels is necessary. Adequate mechanisms and appropriate means should be identified, especially for financing sustainable development (domestic, regional and international resources, foreign direct investments, international trade, bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation).

Designing a Regional Strategy would require a common and comprehensive vision of a more sustainable Mediterranean, with specific time-bound measures and performance indicators.

3. Methodology and guiding criteria

Considering the regional context, available resources and major regional and international events (WSSD, 8th MCSD and 13th Contracting Parties meetings), the following preparatory process for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy is proposed:

- *The MCSD members and other participants to the 7th MCSD meeting will discuss and advise on the sub-sequent issues;*
- *Defining and agreeing on a common and comprehensive vision for a Sustainable Mediterranean, or at least defining its key constitutive elements with measures and expected achievements, including related milestones;*
- *Defining and agreeing on major "orientations" for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, relevant to the key pillars of Sustainable Development and*

more precisely "environment and natural resources issues", "economic development and social equity", and "governance, political and institutional issues";

- Defining a *minimum set of guiding principles for the elaboration of the "Orientations"* and then the Strategy, such as: multi-stakeholder and participatory approach, involvement of civil society and business sector, extensive dialogue and communication, integration and partnership, etc;
- Defining a *minimum set of criteria for the selection of a limited number of the most pressing problems*, so as to make the concept of Sustainable Development more operational; such criteria would include: the degree of threats and related trends, the irreversibility risk, the time dimension, the Mediterranean dimension, the human, technical and institutional capacity, etc;
- A group of 3 to 4 qualified experts will prepare the "Orientations" for a Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, giving due consideration to above advices and decisions; a "position paper" on each of the above three pillars could be prepared, before synthesizing them into the "Orientations" framework.
- With the support of the Government of Spain together with relevant budget from the 12th meeting of the Contracting Parties, the experts will meet to define more in detail their respective tasks and coordinate among themselves, in close cooperation, under the coordination of the Secretariat and in close cooperation with the MCSD Steering Committee; a major workshop would be organized in October 2002 in Spain to review and finalize these "Orientations" and agree on a detailed table of contents for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy with relevant programme of work in view of producing a preliminary draft for the 8th MCSD meeting, March-April 2003 and , a first draft for the 13th meeting of the Contracting Parties in the last quarter of 2003.

Available funds would allow for the preparation of the "Orientations" including the major workshop in reasonably good conditions; however, additional funds would be necessary for the preparation of the Strategy itself, the bulk of related work being foreseen between October 2002 and September 2003, at least until the next meeting of the Contracting Parties.

VIII. New Issues and Re-examination of previous themes

In conformity with previous MAP and MCSD meetings, and considering the necessity of going through a "maturing" process before deciding on whether to retain a proposed new issue, ten pre-feasibility studies were presented and submitted to the attention of the MCSD members at their 6th meeting in Tunis, November 2000. The Commission went through a rather critical exchange of views on the necessity and appropriateness for considering and selecting new issues before closing up the on-going programme and agreeing on the follow up of proposals derived from already studied ones.

Consequently, the pre-feasibility studies were not reviewed and it was finally agreed to pursue preparatory work for mainly three issues for which a more detailed report (a feasibility study) will be prepared for the attention of the 7th MCSD; these concern: "Agriculture and Rural Development", "Urban Waste Management and Consumption Patterns" and "International Cooperation, Financing and Partnership". Moreover, the possibility for re-examining already studied themes in view of a more in-depth analysis or review and

updating of the recommendations with more practical proposals, including through pilot projects, has been already repeatedly raised.

Feasibility studies for these three pre-identified issues have been prepared and are in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3, which also includes proposals for the MCSD to re-consider the issue of the "Management of Water Demand" in its programme of work for the next few years, building on relevant work carried out by BP/RAC and concerned partners; A similar proposal is also expected to be prepared by PAP/RAC in relation to the "Sustainable Management of Coastal Regions" following the recent preparation of related White Paper and renewed interest from METAP to this important question. Combined with the findings and proposals of the "Urban Management and Sustainable Development", this new proposal could derive from their major stakes and deal with implementation and follow up of some of their recommendations through the crucial "Local Governance" issue towards Sustainable Development.

Moreover, following the evaluation of the "Historic Sites Programme" and the interest expressed by Turkey and draft proposal for establishing a Regional Activity Centre for Tourism and Sustainable Development (or Eco Tourism) and in conformity with the discussions and decisions of the meeting of MAP National Focal Points (Athens, 6 September 2001) and the MCSD Extraordinary meeting, two new issues will be dealt with by the 7th MCSD; these concern "National and Historical Heritage" and "Tourism", both to be considered in the framework of Sustainable Development.

In the first case, it is a question of knowing how the issue of "Natural and Historical Heritage" should be considered through a sustainable development approach and consequently how MAP and other concerned actors could integrate it in their programme of work; an introductory note is being prepared by the Secretariat and will be made available soon to the participants of the 7th MCSD. It will be then included in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3.

In the second case, the Turkish concerned Authorities were requested to review their proposal from the viewpoint of a 3 to 5 years programme on Tourism and Sustainable Development giving due consideration to related activities, findings and achievements by various actors in the Mediterranean, notably in MAP framework; such programme, to be prepared and implemented from a strategic point of view, would then provide the Contracting Parties with the necessary background information for their decision whether it is justified to create a new Regional Activity Centre. The Turkish introductory note and proposal is included in document UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.188/3

Considering the major importance of the natural and historical heritage for tourism in the Mediterranean, it seems necessary to closely link and as far as possible integrate respective proposals in a common work-programme under the coordination of a joint Working Group that would be requested to submit its findings and proposals for the next (8th) MCSD meeting.

Finally, and keeping in mind the capacity of MAP/MCSD in handling various Working Groups, preferably not more than 2 or 3 at the same time during a biennium, it would be important that the MCSD considers including in its work-programme for the next few years issues such as climate change and their possible impacts and policy response at the Regional level; biodiversity and desertification would also deserve attention from the MCSD think tank. To that end, a position paper and a feasibility study could be prepared and presented to the 8th MCSD meeting

IX. Major Groups and the MCSD

At its 6th meeting (November 2000), the MCSD "urged NGOs, Local Authorities and Socio-economic Actors to participate actively and effectively in the work of the MCSD and to establish networks with former members in order to benefit from their experience"; they were also requested "to organize a Forum of civil society partners within the framework of the MCSD".

In this respect, the Secretariat has regularly exchanged with the Major Groups representatives in the Steering Committee; Consequently, the required forum is expected to be held in Naples around May 2002, to be jointly organized with MAP/MCSD Secretariat and co-funded, for the time being, by the Municipality of Naples, MEDSAFE and UNEP/MAP. As all Major Group members, previous, present and newly selected ones, will be invited to participate to this forum that is expected to discuss and identify ways and means for a more active participation and more efficient contribution to the MCSD, and hence to Sustainable Development in the Region, additional financial support would be helpful.

Moreover, and in order to ensure the organization of a useful and successful MCSD Major Groups Forum, the NGO meeting previously foreseen for preceding the 7th MCSD will be extended to a Major Groups meeting that would also pave the way for this Forum, by discussing its organization, inputs and expected outputs. Representatives of the Major Groups would then present to the 7th MCSD participants their first views so as to exchange and prepare more efficiently this important forum. In addition to their participation and contribution to the MCSD, this forum is expected to discuss their contribution to sustainable development, notably in view of the Johannesburg Summit.

X. MAP/MCSD and the WSSD

In conformity with the discussions of the recent MCSD and Contracting Parties meeting requesting MAP/MCSD to contribute to the preparatory process for the World Summit on Sustainable Development that will be held from 26 August to 6 September 2002 in Johannesburg, the following documents have been or are being prepared; they will be widely disseminated, notably through, if possible, brief sheets for easier dissemination, communication and reference. They concern:

- The Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region, and its Synthesis Report;
- Combating Pollution from land based sources and the Strategic Action Programme
- Integrated Coastal Zone Management
- MAP Legal Framework
- Industry and Cleaner Production
- Biodiversity and Protected Areas
- Maritime Pollution Prevention Activities

MAP/MCSD Secretariat has also participated and contributed to the UN Regional PrepComs that concern Europe, West Asia and North Africa. Moreover, MAP/MCSD Secretariat is exploring, in connection with UNEP, the interest and possibilities for its participation at the Johannesburg events in order to present and share its achievements and experience especially in connection with the involvement of the civil society in the activities.

XI. Eighth meeting of the MCSD

Since September 2001, the Minister Land Use Planning and the Environment of Algeria has expressed in writing the interest and willingness of Algeria to host the 8th meeting of the MCSD, the organisation of which will be cost-shared. Considering the postponement of the 7th MCSD meeting by five months and the period of the next meeting of the Contracting Parties (in the last quarter of 2003), it is proposed to hold the 8th MCSD meeting around April 2003 in Algiers. The agenda of this meeting would include:

- Review of progress of the preparatory process for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy (of which a first draft would be submitted);
- Progress on new issues and feasibility studies;
- Strategy for participation and contribution of Major Groups to the MCSD and the Regional Sustainable Development Strategy;
- Follow up of MCSD prospects, progress on preparation of necessary revisions and options.

Considering the importance of the "trade and environment" issue in the region, it would be interesting to organize, back to back with the 8th MCSD and in close cooperation with the EC, a major Mediterranean Workshop or Forum on "Assessment and prospects of trade, environment and sustainable development in the Mediterranean" with national and regional presentations and for which necessary funds still need to be collected.

It is finally proposed to have two meetings of the Steering Committee before the 8th MCSD meeting, to mainly review preparations for the Mediterranean Sustainable Development Strategy, the follow up of the Johannesburg Summit and follow up of MCSD prospects. They could be held in July or September 2002 and in January 2003 respectively.

ANNEX I

ASSESSMENT OF THE ACTIVITIES [CONTEXT AND METHOD OF WORK] AND PROSPECTS [TRENDS AND ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS] OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT [MCSD]¹

SEPTEMBER 2001

¹ Prepared by N.S.Georgiades, member of the MCSD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
	page
Preamble	1
Terms of Reference	1
Introduction	1
The purpose of the Commission	2
The MCSD's initial work	3
Critical review through the formal texts, -discussions with members of the Commission, MAP NFPs, and other interested bodies and written submissions by MCSD members	3
Mandate/ Role/ Functions Follow- up Composition/ Involvement of actors Method of work Funding Co-operation with other bodies	
Discussion Current situation Mandate/ Role/ Functions Follow- up Composition/ Involvement of actors Method of work Funding Co-operation with other bodies	6
Recommendations Introduction Opportunities Mandate/ Role/ Functions Follow- up Composition/ Involvement of actors Method of work Funding Co-operation with other bodies	12
Conclusion	19
Annexes	
I. Terms of Reference for the report	21
II. Originally proposed Terms of Reference of the MCSD, as compared to the ones finally adopted	22
III. Synthesis of written contributions by MCSD and other interested parties	29
IV. Map structure	33
V. Summary of conclusions and recommendations	35

ANNEX I

ASSESSMENT OF THE ACTIVITIES [CONTEXT AND METHOD OF WORK] AND PROSPECTS [TRENDS AND ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS] OF THE MEDITERRANEAN COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

PREAMBLE

During the 6th Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development [MCSD], held in Tunis, in 2000, one of its members pointed out that the constant repetition of the discussion on the effectiveness and method of work of the MCSD four years after Rabat, showed that something was wrong.

The aim of this report is to take a closer look to ascertain whether something is, indeed, wrong and, if this is the case, to explore ways and means to rectify it.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference for the present report were to review and assess the MCSD organization and method of work, in order to define options for further evolution so as to make the MCSD more efficient in advising the Contracting Parties [CPs] and all other concerned partners in their respective tasks towards sustainable development.

The Terms of Reference are attached as Annex I.

INTRODUCTION

Since 1995, the regional framework for sustainable development in the Mediterranean evolved around the amended Barcelona Convention and Protocols, Agenda MED 21, MAP Phase II, and the MCSD.

The Tunis Ministerial Conference 'Agenda MED 21' on Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean, held in November, 1994, agreed to formulate a Mediterranean strategy on sustainable development in the context of an Agenda MED 21, and on the principle of setting up a Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) within the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) to monitor and review the implementation of this strategy.

In June, 1995, the Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, held in Barcelona, endorsed the proposal and decided to establish the Commission.

The Terms of Reference of the MCSD were developed during 1995. They were originally drafted by the Coordinating Unit with advice from a small group of experts, communicated twice to the CPs for comments, filtered through the MAP system and approved by the Extraordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties, in Montpellier, in July, 1996.

The Commission held its first meeting in Rabat, in December 1996.

THE PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION

The MCSD is an advisory body and a forum for dialogue, for defining a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development and assisting concerned partners in implementing it. The MAP Coordinating Unit acts as the Commission's Secretariat.

The Commission is composed of 36 members, representing each of the 21 CPs, as well as local authority networks, socio-economic actors and environmental NGOs.

All the members participate in the Commission as equals. The CPs are standing members of the Commission, whereas other members sit for two years

According to its TORs, the major purposes of the Commission are aimed to be:

(a) to identify, evaluate and assess major economic, ecological and social problems set out in Agenda MED 21, submit proposals to the meetings of the CPs, and evaluate the effectiveness of the follow-up to the decisions of the CPs;

(b) to enhance regional co-operation and rationalize the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean for the integration of environment and development issues.

The main functions of the Commission are aimed to be:

(a) to assist the CPs by making proposals on the formulation and implementation of a regional strategy for sustainable development in the Mediterranean;

(b) to consider and review information provided by the CPs, regarding the activities they undertake to implement Agenda MED 21, and the problems they encounter;

(c) to review the co-operation of MAP with international financial institutions, as well as the European Union, and explore ways and means for the strengthening of such co-operation;

(d) to consider information regarding the progress made in the implementation of relevant environmental conventions;

(e) to identify technologies and knowledge of an innovative nature on sustainable development and to provide advice on the various means for their most effective use;

(f) to provide reports and appropriate recommendations to the meetings of the CPs, on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of reports and issues related to the implementation of a regional strategy with regards to MAP Phase II and Agenda MED 21;

(g) to undertake a four-year strategic assessment and evaluation of the implementation by the CPs of Agenda MED 21 and decisions of the meetings of the CPs and of actions by the CPs relevant to sustainable development and propose relevant recommendations;

(h) to assume such other functions as are entrusted to it by the meetings of the Contracting Parties.

THE MCSD's INITIAL WORK

Taking into account the content of Agenda MED 21, the MCSD decided to focus on the following number of major issues for the Mediterranean, including those on which real progress could be expected:

- sustainable management of coastal zones
- water resource management
- sustainable tourism
- sustainable development indicators
- information, awareness and public participation
- free trade and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context
- industry and sustainable development
- management of urban development

The first 5 were completed and the proposals approved by the CPs. The last three are evolving. Over the last 2 years, there is a moratorium in tackling new issues. The MCSD has also conducted the four- year Strategic Review.

CRITICAL REVIEW THROUGH THE FORMAL TEXTS, DISCUSSIONS WITH MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, MAP NFPs, AND OTHER INTERESTED BODIES AND RECENT INPUTS BY MCSD MEMBERS

This section aims to identify the major concerns, as expressed through a number of discussions, meetings and documents, and recent written comments and proposals submitted by a number of MCSD members, a synthesis of which is presented in Annex II. This report draws heavily from the above sources.

Concerns and critique have targeted particularly the following issues:

Mandate/ Role/ Functions

According to its TORs, the Commission should function as a forum for dialogue among partners, in order to contribute to the implementation of a Mediterranean strategy for sustainable development. However, members are concerned that this 'think- tank' function of the MCSD, has been relegated to secondary importance and the Commission is turning into a report- producing mechanism.

It has also been pointed out, that there is a contradiction between the MCSD's mission (sustainable development) and the predominantly environmental perspective with which it approaches the issues, which represents a major handicap.

Follow- up

From the time its first proposals were adopted, the issue of their follow-up gave rise to significant debates at the meetings of the MCSD. Criticism has been raised as to the total absence of impact of these recommendations and that the 'trigger' required for them to be implemented, is missing. Lack of progress by the CPs in implementing their decisions has actually turned into a drawback for the MCSD, as the tackling of new themes has, in all effect, been suspended. In the view of certain of its members, the absence of follow-up calls into question the credibility and effectiveness of the MCSD.

In theory, the proposals of the MCSD, once submitted and approved by the CPs, should be integrated into the programme of work of the CPs and MAP. However, the concerns are that this has seldom been the case.

Another problem identified has been that, in practice, it is often the same representatives of the CPs in the MCSD who discuss the latter's recommendations during the meetings of MAP NFPs, and who are later involved in taking or influencing decisions at the meetings of the CPs. Thus, very often, the same person may wear three hats, mostly different, whilst tackling the same issue and, sometimes, the type of hat determines the way he approaches the issue.

Composition/ Involvement of actors

The integration of new members within the current working system of the MCSD and the continued participation of outgoing members have also periodically surfaced as issues of concern. Although it was decided that as far as possible both the former members and the new ones should be involved in the work programme during the inter-session period, the fact remains that members and working groups tended to feel that they have to be there forever. Concern has also been expressed on the requests made by several former members of the MCSD who were not CPs to take part in the Commission's meetings as observers, as bringing to the surface a 'club' mentality, where no one wants to leave.

The procedure for the renewal of members other than the CPs has also caused concerns, as it has proven to be tedious, has to be set in motion quite frequently and does not allow enough time for rationality in the selection process.

Another concern has been that very few candidatures are normally received, particularly from the groups of local authorities and socio-economic actors.

The method for the designation of candidates from the last two groups has also been targeted for criticism, as proposals for these two groups should be submitted through and by MAP NFPs. However, as one MAP NFP put it, this function is undoubtedly not the most appropriate for the designation of new members, as NFPs are not always aware of the most representative networks and groups.

The need to ensure a more effective and active participation of the local authorities and socio-economic actors has also given rise to the expression of great concerns, particularly during the 6th meeting of the MCSD, in Tunis. As a generalization, members

from such groups have been the target of criticism that they appear not to have always taken advantage of the outstanding opportunity offered by the setting up of the MCSD.

Method of work

Of major concern has been the scale of the task undertaken and the ability of the MCSD to carry out the ambitious programme initially adopted. Although it was agreed that the MCSD's work programme should not be overloaded, the end result have been calls that led to the adoption of a policy that any new theme should undergo a preparatory stage, which would involve a feasibility study as well as the necessary time to "mature".

In general, the themes tackled by the MCSD have been considered as having been selected in the absence of any specific criteria, and without real concern on the added value they offered when compared with work already undertaken, particularly at the state level. In fact, it was pointed out that, as long as the themes had made it possible to draw on MAP's experience and expertise, things run smoothly, but with the themes still under way, things looked very different.

Major concerns centred around the three issues still being tackled, as being too broad and conceptual and having either necessitated the carrying out of costly and lengthy comparative studies or of original research, which raised questions on the risk of changing the MCSD status from a task force to a research institute.

External experts were also heavily involved in drawing up the various reports, as the standard methodology adopted would involve the establishment of a task force, under the coordination of the Secretariat, composed of MCSD members and independent experts. In fact, the question was raised whether it would be better to bring in new players such as international organizations or leading Mediterranean experts on questions where MAP does not have the requisite expertise.

Funding

This has been an issue of major concern, as there has not been any specific budgetary component for the Commission, and activities that are linked to sustainable development are spread throughout the MAP programme of activities. Fears have also been expressed that funding MCSD activities through the MAP budget would ultimately lead to the shrinking of MAPs traditional activities.

Co-operation with other bodies

MAP

For certain MAP NFPs, the meetings of the CPs have approved programming activities that have given to the MCSD an effectively operational role, thus resulting in interference with the remit and work plan of the Regional Activity Centres [RACs], as well as causing institutional and staff problems within the Coordinating Unit.

Other intergovernmental bodies

Although it was decided for the MCSD to base its work on the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development [UNCSD] model and to establish working relations with the latter, this goal is generally felt as having proved fruitless, leading to the expression of some bitterness as to the interest of UNCSD on the issue. On the other hand, this may not have been a negative development, as a concern was expressed that, following the pattern of institutionalised bodies, the Commission runs the risks of falling into the pattern of a 'business as usual' attitude.

DISCUSSION

Current situation

There is no doubt that there is increasing frustration among the members, who feel that they are powerless to influence policy-making and the scheme of things. The MCSD has experienced its most productive phase during 1997- 1999. A certain "inertia" has since settled in, whereas the status of MCSD within MAP remains ambiguous.

In general, however, the MCSD is considered to be an innovative and timely response to the changes required for the transition from the traditional economic growth concept to the paradigm of sustainable development, and as a potentially effective body to provide advice and guidance on sustainability matters, a potential not having been effectively utilised so far.

The discussion that follows, analyzes the previous part from the point of view of the author, reflecting, in certain critical issues, on the comparison between the original (draft) Terms of Reference of the Commission as amended and finally accepted the CPs. The comparative text is attached as Annex III.

Mandate/ Role/ Functions

Bearing in mind the decisions of the Rio Conference, the task of the MCSD was supposed to deal with the practical and concrete aspects of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. Yet, as one member put it, the MCSD, at the end, may not be what states had in mind in Tunis.

The final mandate of the MCSD, was a reflection of the debate that preceded its establishment. Countries were more or less divided whether it should be a consultative body or something else. What prevailed, at the end, was to convert it from a [proposed] 'functional' body to an 'advisory' one, proposing only to the CPs, which maintained the final word. Proposed functions such as an operational character, or the rationalisation of decision-making capacity in states, were left out of the MCSDs TORs. The Commission was established as a technical tool of MAP, to 'produce products of added value' and not at the level of MAP and has fallen short by far in becoming a 'high-level political forum'.

Moreover, the responsibilities and mandate of the Commission were not clearly defined. In fact, they are so general to such an extent that even its members were and many of them still are confused on the issue. Although the final TORs of the Commission were

mostly linked with and centred around Agenda MED 21 and in 'inventing' a sustainable development strategy, the whole philosophy collapsed, as Agenda MED 21 was not actually approved and adopted by the CPs. Thus, no actual commitments were undertaken and Agenda MED 21 remains a non- paper. It is highly unfortunate that this text was never formally adopted and no reporting by the CPs ever took place, apart for the purposes of the 2000 Review.

In fact, if one looks to the TORs in detail, practically none materialized. Nothing ensued enabling the MCSD to evaluate the effectiveness of the follow-up to the decisions of the CPs; no initiatives to enhance regional co-operation and rationalize the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean basin took place; no information was provided to consider and review the CPs activities to implement Agenda MED 21, and the problems they encounter; none enabling any substantial analytical review of the co-operation of MAP with international financial institutions, as well as the European Union; none enabling any assessment of the progress made in the implementation of relevant environmental conventions; nothing to identify technologies and knowledge of an innovative nature; no reports related to the implementation of a regional strategy related to MAP Phase II and Agenda MED 21 were submitted; no other functions were entrusted to the Commission by the meetings of the CPs.

Therefore, the bulk of the original remit was not, could not be, pursued. Such gaps and uncertainties meant that the Commission was constantly shifting directions, emphasis and approaches, in response to ad-hoc initiatives of some of its members who had a clearer objective in mind. The Commission found itself operating in a void and quickly adapted by filling it with what was originally aimed to be covered by resorting to panels of wise persons. As a result, the MCSD had to identify issues and tackle them. It also undertook the strategic assessment and evaluation of the implementation by the CPs of Agenda MED 21 and relevant decisions and actions of the CPs, although the method selected placed heavy reliance on the work of experts which, to a large extent, predetermined the nature of the final outcome.

Follow- up

As expected, during the debate for the MCSD's TORs, this subject attracted most of the responses by member states, nine of them. Most were in favour of a softer text. Thus, provisions for effective progress monitoring were actually removed from the TORs, provisions that would have allowed the MCSD to have an actual involvement in follow-up itself. CPs remained solely responsible for implementing the recommendations adopted. As states remained the only ones responsible for follow-up, the MCSD has mostly left the initiative for operations up to the CPs. Although the implementation and follow-up of recommendations has been discussed at length over the last 5 years, no clear-cut, formal decisions to change the current situation were taken.

The very recent review and discussion on reporting by the MAP Working Group on Reporting System, is a very good example on how little the issue of following up recommendations is appreciated. In the above meeting, a separate reporting on issues arising directly from the terms of the Convention and Protocols, and on other issues arising from resolutions and recommendations, was agreed. This means that formal reports will, by necessity, not include information in connection with the non-legal components of the MAP in terms of recommendations adopted during CPs meetings,

unless specifically required by any specific article of the Convention or one of its Protocols. As the Barcelona Resolution on the Environment and Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Basin was not adopted in terms of any of the regional legal instruments to which Mediterranean States are parties, the latter have no legal obligation to submit national reports on activities undertaken in the same sense as reports specifically stipulated by the legal instruments in question. There is, of course, the moral obligation to submit periodic progress reports. However, morality seldom figures as a decisive parameter in decision-making equations.

On the other hand, there has been a realization [i.e. 11th Meeting of the CPS] of the "need for follow up measures, recommendations and proposals for action by the MCSD"; the CPs have thus requested the MCSD to "draw up a strategy for this purpose". The Secretariat has launched a preparatory process for the preparation of guidelines for the implementation and follow-up of MCSD proposals once they are adopted as recommendations by the CPs.

It should also be taken into account that the MCSD does not address its recommendations to the representatives of the CPs (basically to the Ministries for the Environment, who not always have the authority, powers, resources or responsibilities on most of the themes being dealt with) but to the states themselves. A related gap, has been that the specific bodies which should be the ultimate receivers and action originators were not defined in the recommendations.

Anyhow, as a consequence of the above, MAP NFPs took no initiatives for implementation and follow up, nationally, neither did they incorporate decisions in their mainstreaming activities. MCSD state members took no initiatives, likewise. Other actors erroneously assumed that proposals and recommendations were simply addressed to the CPs, and not to themselves and their peers as well. Thus, the recommendations were not taken up by anyone and, apart from the states with their unquestionably greater responsibilities, the non-governmental members' own performance in disseminating results and acting to ensure follow up, can also be brought into questioning.

Actually, the only real follow-up has been taken up by the RACs. On free trade and environment, the Blue Plan submitted a joint project with METAP for financing by METAP, the World Bank and the European Union. Calculation and analysis of the 130 indicators is going on with the co-operation of all countries. As it regards to tourism, a major project was prepared by BP/RAC and submitted for EU's consideration and funding within the MEDA/SMAP framework. Finally, with regards to Coastal Zone Management, a major project was prepared by PAP/RAC together with BP/RAC and ERS/RAC and submitted for EU's consideration and funding.

Composition/ Involvement of actors

The CPs were initially divided on the composition of the Commission. The originally proposed [draft] TORs gave preference to a governmental body. The final ones were better than the original [much more representative and pluralistic], but the Commission paid a high price for this choice: too many restrictions and checks were introduced, i.e. no voting, no high level advisory group, everything approved by the CPs.

As far as the categories of members are concerned, the various groups were, so far, characterized by inconsistencies and differences.

With regard to state members, those who understood their function as being that of an impartial expert and not having strong connections with, or also being, MAP NFPs, were more straightforward, eager to listen to the other actors and formulate their positions accordingly. It also seems that they were more committed to the goals and work of the MCSD. Others, had entirely the opposite characteristics. Consequently, they were more interested in promoting government lines and approached most suggestions from the government point of view and how they affected, or could affect, national responsibilities. They were also more prepared to keep the MCSD within bounds and to maintain the dominant role of MAP, which was never challenged anyway.

The groups of socio-economic actors and local authorities, exhibited many of the weaknesses, particularly in their effective involvement, which was generally being problematic.

Most of the socio-economic actors and the local authorities were virtually absent from discussions and debates. Also, so far, there were no representatives of powerful networks of industry or large chambers of commerce with substantial influence.

As far as local authorities are concerned, their participation and involvement has also been rather disappointing, and it so seems that proposals for membership did not pay due attention to the capacity of those proposed for effective involvement.

Initially, several NGOs expressed their concern that additional NGOs not directly represented on the Commission would not be allowed to attend as observers, thus indicating that, the whole exercise of representative participation may not have been fully understood.

Nevertheless, NGOs have been the most active of the non-governmental partners. However, it appears that participation relied a lot on the personal commitment and capabilities of the particular persons being members at any one time, rather than to the broader involvement of the organization represented. It is also accepted that, some NGOs are handicapped by the lack of funds that may not enable them to fully participate in the workings of the Commission.

Finally, a missed opportunity has been the rejection by the CPs of the initial proposal for a high level advisory group, although it appears that only one country had originally some reservations. A proposal to give 4 seats to eminent experts, did not gain ground, either.

Method of work

Although the identification of priorities by the MCSD was correct and was the outcome of a rational consultation process, its work programme was initially very much influenced by the Bleu Plan, that was mostly handling the issue of sustainable development and contributed a lot to the preparation and launching of the MCSD. The process, nevertheless, suffered from two major drawbacks:

(a) for reasons not yet fully understood, the MCSD mostly stayed away from traditional MAP activities, such as pollution and biological diversity;

(b) in addressing the issues selected, working groups mostly relied on work already done within MAP, thus generally not taking account of other similar work done in other fora.

In consequence, the MCSD did not make any real impact on traditional MAP sectors. Actually, MAP components concerned with pollution and biological diversity were not, and it seems that they are not, looking for being an active partner in the MCSD. Yet, it cannot be ignored that things in these sectors cannot continue under a business as usual approach. Considering their area of activity [Annex IV], these sectors could also benefit from re-examination from outsiders and civil society, and not only from within, particularly if fresh and innovative ideas are to come forward. In fact, a significant part of MAP's activities have been mostly oriented to technical issues and the expertise required to cover the broader aspects of sustainable development does not exist within the NFPs structure, which lacks exposure in some crucial parameters of the new task environment within which they now have to operate.

In retrospect, looking at the working groups system, it so appears that, in some cases at least, these groups did not precisely establish what was to be done on the basis of actual needs and gaps. As a result, the MCSD did not produce as much of the innovation and added value it was aiming at, as many of the proposals made were a repetition of things already proposed and acted upon, more comprehensively, by other people, in other fora. Groups mostly had to draw heavily and capitalise on the knowledge and expertise of the Blue Plan and PAP and where such expertise was not available, the groups did run into problems in completing their work and mostly resorted to outside consultants. Lack of adequate funds has also limited participation in the activities of the working groups.

The working groups also assumed a life of their own and followed various paths, depending on the personality of their leaders, their commitment and the support they receive from concerned MAP components, as well as the funds they managed to secure.

As far as the body of the whole is concerned, it rarely had time for actual contribution, and was mostly content to provide editorial comments to texts already prepared. Anyhow, at any one time, there were members who did not feel comfortable with the issues debated, as they did not previously have the opportunity to be exposed to broader issues.

Other key threats are, the dealing with downstream aspects rather than strategic ones and, in some cases, the lack of rigour evidenced.

It should also be pointed out that, in the beginning, the Commission exhibited an encouraging tendency to address issues rather informally, the distinction between members of the various groups appearing to be rather blurred. However, procedures gradually got more complex and formal, similar to the ones characterising the functioning of an intergovernmental body. This unavoidably led to an inherently slow process and, somehow, to the loss of the initial 'fresh' approach.

Funding

Considering the budgetary limitations and uncertainties, the results obtained by the MCSD can be considered as very significant.

When the MCSD was set up, the price tag was neglected or was not made explicit from the beginning. Thus, despite its relatively wide remit, in practice the Commission has rarely managed to have the resources to exercise it. Unavoidably, the operation of the MCSD ultimately competed for the limited funds with the MAP traditional activities, causing frictions.

MAP did allocate funds to the MCSD as start-up capital to allow task managers to catalyse the activities of thematic groups and, where necessary, to receive support in the form of technical expertise. However, such an approach has not been taken for other MAP bodies and it should be recognised as what it is: unfair. A body cannot function when it has to resort to appeals as to its importance, hoping that Mediterranean countries and international organizations concerned would voluntarily add to its resources, either financially or by making staff available.

Co-operation with other bodies

MAP

As regards to its relationships with MAP, they have been characterized by suspicion, to say the least. In particular those of the members who are also MAP NFPs, or MAP NFPs not members of the Commission, are viewing the MCSD with some skepticism, especially when its initiatives on a particular issue make those 'responsible' for it feel threatened. Generally, there is an inherent tendency by MAP NFPs to view the Commission as competitor.

The CPs did not take up the potentials of this body to their full extent. Indeed, the existence of the MCSD is not well known even within national Environment agencies. CPs do not, generally, feel comfortable with the cross-sectoral issues introduced by the MCSD, as, mostly, national administrative structures have not changed to respond to the issues of sustainable development through the preparation and adoption of national sustainable development strategies.

These uncomfortable relationships of the MCSD with the MAP NFPs and the CPs did not, neither the MCSD to assume ownership of its proposals, nor the MAP NFPs to feel that they have ownership of the final texts adopted by the CPs.

The best relationships were established with the Coordinating Unit, which is the Commission's secretariat, which made every possible effort to manage the whole process, coordinate activities, look for satisfactory results and proposals, somehow follow up the implementation of the recommendations, induce concerned members through specific projects, promote visibility of the MCSD and get more active partners in addition to the necessary fund raising activity. However, until today, only one professional at the Unit is working on MCSD issues, and this one only partly, as he has

other responsibilities. In fact, several of the shortcomings identified in this report are also due to the lack of appropriate staff at the Coordinating Unit.

The MCSD operation has also shifted the relative importance of the RACs, not without causing some ill- feelings. Thus, the role and visibility of the Blue Plan and the PAP increased, as they were more prepared and focused to deal with the issues considered by MCSD to be a priority. On the other hand, centres dealing with the traditional MAP sectors like MED-POL, REMPEC or SPA, mostly remained in the background, this, however, mostly having to do with the issues the MCSD decided to deal with.

Other intergovernmental bodies

Co-operation problems with the UNCSD proved to be rather disappointing. The UNCSD did not, actually, contribute anything to the MCSD, which was mostly ignored. It cannot be denied, however, that the MCSD does not, yet, exist as an entity that would have assured it a seat of its own. This led the Coordination Unit to try and assert its presence at UNCSD meetings as part of UNEP's delegation, not without some problems. Good co-operation was only fruitful on the 'indicators programme', with the specific UNCSD working groups. Things could have been better with other issues, if the Coordinating Unit had adequate staff to follow them and/or funding to facilitate the active participation of some MCSD members.

Other intergovernmental organizations did respond more positively, but they were mostly content to be passive observers.

RECOMMENDATIONS²

Introduction

It is clear that the current situation is not sustainable and that a revised approach of some kind is not only appropriate but also urgently needed. Since a crash restructuring would create more problems and imbalances, changes should rather aim to remove the weaknesses identified (e.g., role ambiguity, inadequate understanding of processes and its 'power base', insufficient information, lack of resources, insufficient active participation of stakeholders), and build on the opportunities offered by the strengths of the Commission and a positive task environment.

The recommendations that follow are based on the previous sections and are not constraint by the MCSDs formal TORs, which will have to be amended, following the decisions finally taken.

Opportunities

There is no doubt that existing strengths should form the basis for any organizational renewal, whilst the changing situation at the present time creates a number of opportunities upon which to build:

The strengths of the Commission, not challenged by anyone, are the following:

² A summary of the conclusions and recommendations is attached as Annex V.

a] Within the limits imposed upon it, the MCSD has played its part, by providing a regional forum for dialogue and a promising framework for defining a regional sustainable development strategy in the Mediterranean. Its regional nature and its composition constitute an innovative contribution to promote the integration of environmental concerns in development policies.

b] Effective informal structures and networking have been established and good international contacts and collaboration are in place between many of the individuals and organisations involved so far.

c] All actors are now more aware of each other's way of thinking, priorities and constraints within which they operate.

d] The task manager system was a most positive co-operation model.

e] At the meetings, discussions were frank and honest and, considering the time devoted, rather comprehensive.

f] All parties involved are committed to the process.

g] New and broader themes relating to sustainable development, a new and highly significant dimension extending the potential role of MAP far beyond the competence of the CPs, the RACs and other partners, are waiting to be tackled.

h] An efficient and flexible mechanism, that is the MAP Secretariat, is in place, and has learned to live and cope with this body, which, although peculiar, presents, however, a significant opportunity for MAP to reform its current mostly medium- based and state-dominated approach, and move towards a more integrated and participatory one.

The Commission should also capitalise on the following factors which have created a most favourable task environment and are here to stay:

- the revision of the Barcelona Convention in 1995, in order to give legal status to the commitments made at Rio
- the existence of Agenda MED 21 since 1994, setting out the regional partners approach to sustainable development
- the revision of the Mediterranean Action Plan [MAP II], setting more ambitious goals, going beyond simply combating pollution and calling for the integration of environmental concerns upstream, in the region's development policies
- the perseverance of the problems
- the CPs recognition of the need for follow-up measures on the recommendations and proposals for action by the MCSD
- with the Strategic Review 2000 in place, the Commission can now resort to an objective and participatory analysis of the state of play on sustainable development in the Mediterranean, upon which to build

Mandate/ Role/ Functions

As far as its **Character** is concerned, the MCSD should maintain its open, autonomous, advisory and representative nature. It should remain,

- an Independent body
- an Advisory body
- a Consultative body
- a body of Informed experts

The MCSD should maintain its character as a bridge between different actors and remain a forum of consultation and dialogue between the representatives of the various sectors, the CPs and other bodies.

A major **Objective** should be to stick to the initial TORs of the MCSD, namely issuing opinions, identifying, evaluating and examining the major environmental, economic and social problems in the region and providing multidimensional advice. It should,

- advice all the bodies within MAP on any issue
- provide inputs to all major initiatives and changes
- monitor the evolution of sustainable development

As to its **Role and Functions**, the Commission should assume greater independence from the CPs. It should act upon direct request from all institutions of MAP and outside institutions as well, on any issue relating to the environment and sustainable development. The Commission or any of its members should also be allowed to attract the attention of any of the above bodies to the necessity and usefulness of consulting the Commission on any relevant matter. The MCSD should also be free to deal with issues on its own discretion, and in accordance with their importance and to reconsider an already tackled issue, to complete assessment or draw up new proposals.

Follow- up

The conclusions, suggestions and recommendations of the MCSD should not be restricted to a mere formal approval by the CPs, which have the major responsibility to deliver. To this respect, the format of the reports drawn up by the CPs should be changed, in order to provide a clear picture on how the MCSD's recommendations have been implemented.

Not all proposals have by necessity to be addressed to or be endorsed by the CPs and this would be facilitated by identifying the specific bodies to which recommendations are being addressed. Also, other partners should undertake their obligations and have texts or proposals approved by the bodies which they represent.

Follow-up responsibility should mainly be entrusted to the Coordinating Unit, which should be empowered to request short reports from both governments and the other actors on the progress made.

As it is advisable for CPs to appoint different persons as MAP NFPs and MCSD members, it will have to be made amply clear that it is both's responsibility, in consultation and co-ordination, to disseminate information nationally, inform accordingly and act on implementation.

Composition/ Involvement of actors

The MCSD is characterized by a balanced number of representatives from the various sectors concerned and there is no particular reason to change the current arrangements, only to make them more flexible.

The Commission should thus continue to consist of 36 members, but all with particular competence in the field of the environment and sustainable development. Members should be figures from national governments, industry and business, local and regional authorities, academia, professional associations, and environmental protection and consumer organizations.

The government members should be selected not because of their position, but on their ability to really contribute something new. They should be different from MAP NFPs, participate on their personal capacity, have as broad an area of expertise and responsibilities as possible, undertake to widely consult nationally on an issue, be required to interact with the MAP NFPs, and widely disseminate decisions.

The 15 seats should continue to be reserved for the non- government sector, however there should be more flexibility in their allocation. The overriding goal should be to allocate 4 seats each to,

- local/regional authorities
- industry/business
- environmental protection/consumer associations

but the balance could shift, depending on the interest exhibited and the suitability of those proposed. Nevertheless, there should not be, at anyone time, more than 6 and less than 2 persons from any of the above sectors.

The remaining 3 seats should be allocated to eminent personalities, coming from any sector, governmental or not, the academia or professional associations.

Candidatures or proposals for candidates from the non- government sector should be submitted directly to the Coordinating Unit, but MAP NFPs and MCSD state members should be kept informed and have the right to express opinion on their nationals. Proposals should not relate to agencies or organizations, but to personalities well known in their respective fields and taking into consideration their ability to effectively participate. The Coordinating Unit as well as any other MAP NFP or MCSD member could also identify relevant candidates. The Coordinating Unit should take account of the proposals, include in the list its own candidates, particularly for eminent personalities, and take the final decision, which should not have to be endorsed by the CPs. The

members would be appointed on their personal capacity, for a period of four years, that could be renewed once.

Members proposed by non- government partners should accept that they are there in their personal capacity, they have a responsibility to make their participation visible without trying to substitute experts and that they should also consult with their peers on any particular issue.

A way should be considered to associate former members of MCSD in information exchange, consultations and voluntary work.

The Commission should be able, on a proposal from any of its members or the Coordinating Unit, to invite any person having a particular competence in a matter included on the agenda to participate in any particular meeting as an ad hoc member.

A Chairperson and two Vice- chairpersons should be elected by the Commission for a term of two years that could be renewed once. They will constitute the Bureau of the Commission.

Method of work

The MCSD should redefine its major priorities, after consulting, through the Coordinating Unit, with all NFPs and the RACs. In pursuing this goal, the following issues should be targeted:

- placing particular focus on the integration of the environment in those sectoral policies, through the expression of positions, the provision of input prior to decisions, and the formulation of statements on issues
- reinforcing its public profile
- assuming a more independent role
- encouraging the principle of joint responsibility
- ensuring public access to information
- enhancing public understanding of issues
- exploring mechanisms to ensure implementation, monitoring and follow up, taking into consideration the relevant report currently prepared
- proposing initiatives to enhance public participation

Irrespective, however, of whatever is said and done, it will be only when sustainable development becomes a standard approach in the CPs, that the Commission' work will have real value added. Thus, it should devote part of its activities to assist and support outreach efforts by the Coordinating Unit to put pressure on the CPs to set up- or enhance the activities of existing ones-, National Commissions on Sustainable Development, perhaps modeled after the MCSD.

The practice of using working groups for an issue should be maintained, but it does not, by necessity, have to be followed in all cases. Thus, Standing Working Groups should

be established composed only from among the MCSD's members and focusing on issues to be agreed upon.

Ad-hoc groups could also be established in cases where there is no time luxury for spending a lot of time on an issue or for going ahead with a full analysis, when an issue is not covered by a Standing group, or in order to review and advice on the activities and programmes of RACs.

The Standing Working Groups would deal with the major issues of their concern which should be of major significance to the Mediterranean that need constant attention. Problems like coastal area management or water will never go away. This would secure focusing and involvement of members, allow for in-depth consideration of issues, provide opportunity for more consistent follow up efforts, and enable quick response to requests for action. The Groups would also be able to deal with any associated subject of the major issue of their concern (e.g. fiscal instruments under coastal, etc.). The 36 members of the Commission allow for the establishment of 6 such groups, with 5-6 members each. This would also allow, from time to time, the establishment of up to 5-6 ad-hoc groups of 4-5 members each, working in parallel with the Standing Groups and without causing undue operational problems in their workings.

Each working and ad hoc group will have a task manager/coordinator and a rapporteur, and be facilitated by one RAC, which would also provide the necessary scientific and secretariat support.

Maximum effort should be employed in order for the consideration of any issue not to extend for more than 1 year, i.e. between plenaries.

The plenaries should not be considered as seminars or workshops, but as brainstorming and interactive sessions between experts, who are there to contribute, with free exchange ideas, comments and suggestions. The dialogue should concentrate on policy priorities and strategic issues.

In the reports of the meetings, specific reference should be made to the members intervening and contributing to the discussion. The debate should take the form of a structured dialogue between the members, not aimed to reach consensus, but rather to identify the most widely accepted concerns, issues or suggestions. For every issue, one member, preferably a group rapporteur or a concerned professional from within MAP, should undertake to present basic talking points in order to initiate discussion. Rapporteurs of groups would likewise present their evaluations as working papers for consideration. The holding of break- out sessions during the MCSD meetings (not in parallel with plenary sessions), should be pursued with more determination, so as to provide the plenary with results on issues that would have been more thoroughly discussed.

The Commission should hold ordinary meetings once every year. Meetings should not last for more than three days. Issues to be debated at any one time should be restricted to two or three. Discussion texts should be distributed 2 months in advance.

Preferably, all the meetings should take place in Athens, to be better served by the Coordinating Unit's resources, This offers a big advantage from the secretarial point of view. Nevertheless, this proposal presupposes the approval of the suggestion under the

next heading, that is for the MCSD to have its own budget and for MAP to finance the meetings. Although the option to hold meetings in other countries should not altogether be given up, proposals to host such meetings should be accompanied by a real commitment from the host country to make every effort to secure visibility of the MCSD and its meeting, highlight what has been achieved in the country through the implementation of MCSD recommendations, and to support the meeting with a substantial financial contribution.

Funding

As MCSD is not a project- oriented or fund- raising body, the philosophy of just providing seed funds should be put aside. More stable and dedicated financing, from MAP's ordinary budget, should be secured. Thus, there should be a separate budget line for the Commission in MAP's Budget, including all the activities of the Coordinating Unit and the RAC's wholly or partly related to the Commission's work.

A specific programme for the MCSD, with a targeted budget and adequate staff at the Coordinating Unit, would also allow the Commission to raise its status as a duly recognized, independent body, allow for the promotion of its visibility (as well as of MAP) and facilitate better co-operation with concerned institutions. The secretariat would remain within the MAP Coordinating Unit.

On the other hand, in implementing recommendations approved, the Coordinating Unit and the RACs should be encouraged to secure funds from other sources as well.

Co-operation with other bodies

MAP

In order to enhance interaction and visibility and support to its proposals, the MCSD chairperson should attend the meetings of the CPs and of the MAP Bureau.

The Coordinating Unit should continue to provide the secretariat to the MCSD and its Bureau, but its capacity in staff handling the MCSD, needs to be considerably enhanced. Although appropriate staff appraisal should be made, it appears that at least 3 full time professionals, with adequate support staff, would be necessary in order to have a MCSD operating in a satisfactory manner and under the expanded mandate proposed in this report.

Hiring the services of a professional PR firm is also proposed, to give greater visibility not only to the MCSD but to MAP itself, which still remains relatively not well known by national administrations and civil society.

The Unit would also act for,

- results dissemination
- monitoring the progress of action undertaken
- encouraging all actors to engage in the process
- fostering flow of information
- launching an MCSD awareness campaign
- encouraging CPs to adopt national environmental framework programmes

All RACs should be drawn in the process, as they have a lot to offer and a lot to gain. They should aim to facilitate the MCSD and the groups, by, inter alia, reviewing [not researching] particular issues in order to establish baseline conditions and identify policy gaps and concerns in order to serve as background contribution to the actual work of the Commission. They would also provide insights and comments on the recommendations produced, render some secretariat support to the groups they deal with, raise issues for advice and consideration, etc. RACs should also focus their annual programmes towards more sustainable development issues, connect them to MCSD recommendations and aim to facilitate implementation at national level.

Representatives from the RACs should take part in the meetings of the MCSD, the Bureau and the groups, when their contribution is required and at the request of the Chairperson in consultation with the Coordinating Unit.

Other intergovernmental bodies

Pursuing relations and co-operation with the UNCSD should not be given up, but it should not be an overriding goal, at least until when more positive response is exhibited from this body. Closer ties should be more actively pursued with FAO, UNDP and WHO, SMAP and METAP.

Attendance of representatives of the above bodies should be on a selective basis, depending on the issues tackled in any one meeting and their sphere of competence or expertise. Attendance should not be limited to public relations, networking or lobbying, but should be extended to substantial contributions and interventions at any time during the debate at any meeting.

CONCLUSION

The establishment of any new, special- purpose, body, intervening within a long-established structure, even if accompanied by a clear elaboration of its mandate and adequate authority to carry out its task [so far this has not been the case, anyway], always creates problems to the existing system.

This is especially true in the case of bodies dealing with issues that by definition have a longer- term perspective and are being dealt within the context of sustainable development which, unfortunately, is still at its gestation period. As one member has put it, the MCSD is still a 'young', multi-stakeholders body that needs time to take off, get mutual understanding and fruitful and tangible results.

The MCSD enables the MAP approach to the protection of the Mediterranean to be brought up to date and respond to contemporary global concerns and is bringing it closer towards the understanding and resolution of environmental problems and its members have proven that, if adequately encouraged and supported, they can exhibit 'vision, imagination, ambition and audacity'.

Although there is no blueprint for success, renewal and change are always advisable and this is what is suggested. Complacency is the worst enemy of institutions.

The emerging driving forces in the new millennium are all positive, and the revised model proposed to be pursued is aimed to capitalise on them.

| They are,

- the overwhelming public environmental awareness
- changes in peoples' values and priorities
- highly pluralistic decision- making systems and transparency
- new actors
- grassroots initiatives
- strong national political environmental agendas
- the Rio+10 process.

ANNEX I

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Since the first set of MCSD recommendations was prepared and adopted by the Contracting Parties in 1997, a series of questions were raised concerning its method of work, the quality and usefulness of the results, the implementation and follow up of the recommendations, the membership and participation, etc.

Five years after its creation, with various institutional and intersessional meetings, a review and assessment of the MCSD organisation and method of work is necessary, in order to define options for further evolution so as to make the MCSD more efficient in advising the Contracting Parties and all other concerned partners in their respective tasks towards sustainable development.

Therefore, considering:

- the actual mandate and composition of the MCSD
- its method of work and various results
- the nature of the discussions in the MCSD meetings, where several voices were raised on criticism and/or expectations, but also
- the first ideas regarding the creation of the MCSD before the final decision of the Contracting Parties with its actual composition and method of work,

an in depth report should be submitted assessing the past and present of the MCSD and defining a series of few realistic options for the MCSD prospects, as well as analyzing and synthesizing information provided by MCSD members on the subject.

ANNEX II

SYNTHESIS OF WRITTEN CONTRIBUTIONS BY MCSD AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

Introduction

In view of the preparation of the present report, the Coordinating Unit requested MCSD members to submit their views and thoughts on the assessment of the MCSD activities and its prospects.

Altogether, 16 such contributions (a disappointingly low response, considering the critical turning point which the MCSD has reached), were submitted by September 9. They have been taken into consideration in the report.

It is noteworthy that contributions were overwhelmingly received from members that are representing states and NGOs.

As regards to the substance of the contributions, the following observations are highlighted:

- From the issues addressed (in the Appendix they have been classified in line of the subheadings in the main report), it is obvious that the major concerns refer to the method of work and the interrelated issues of mandate and follow-up.
- A number of the responses were influenced by the recollection of the more recent discussions during the 6th MCSD meeting, as well as from the length of a respondent's exposure to the work of the Commission.
- In some instances, unfair criticism has been leveled on the dominance by a certain institutions or members, which have actually saved a process or a meeting.
- With (perhaps) two exceptions (one explicit one implicit), none have challenged the relevance, uniqueness and potentials of the Commission.
- Practically all submissions aimed at identifying weaknesses for making the MCSD more efficient, giving it the value it deserves, and allowing it to better fulfil its mandate.
- MCSD is considered to be still a 'young' that needs some time to take off, get mutual understanding and fruitful and tangible results, and that it is in the right track from this point of view.
- The uniqueness of the Commission's composition, its pluralism and its participatory and consensus-building approach, have been identified as its strengths by practically every respondent.

- The effort to harness solidarity among riparian states at different levels of economic development are considered as positive and commendable elements in the Commission's operation.
- Despite its shortcomings, the MCSD may be considered as an asset to UNEP/MAP and the Mediterranean region, which is the only one which has established such a Commission.
- The specific choice of the themes addressed by the Commission, the work undertaken and the recommendations developed and adopted, have contributed to the promotion of the objectives of sustainable development in the region.
- Although there are widely differing views on the debate for an advisory or an operational character of the Commission, there is broad consensus that the major underlying issue is on how to secure implementation of the decisions adopted by the CPs based on the recommendations of the MCSD, and therefore for a stronger involvement of the Commission in the follow- up process, although there is a variety of contradictory proposals on the best way to go about it.
- The MCSD should extend its interface not only with the MAP but with other institutions and main sectors in society, as sustainable development can only be achieved with the unqualified backing of people and public opinion. In this respect, one of the problems encountered which has to be addressed is the lack of exposure and visibility of the MCSD, even among citizens and the national administrations of the CPs.
- The Strategic Review 2000 gives the necessary orientations to the MCSD for addressing the priority sustainable development issues in the Mediterranean Basin.

A synthesis of the main issues and recommendations made is presented below:

Mandate

1. The original aims for the setting up of MCSD five years ago are even more valid today. However, five years after its establishment, its role remains unclear.
2. On paper, the MCSD role, which confines the Commission to being an advisory body to the CPs to the Barcelona Convention, does not always allow it to formulate recommendations that secure an integrated regional approach to the interdependent problems that persist in the Mediterranean Basin. Therefore, the role of the Commission need not be limited to the CPs. Although sustainable development is structured on environmental principles, it is not only a matter of the environment and the advise of MCSD should reach wider sectors in national governments and international governance.
3. The Commission, although required to reflect upon and work on problems of sustainable development and touch questions that are both sectorial and horizontal, is

pursuing this goal under an environmental approach. This is a contradiction in the mission and mode of operation of the MCSD that constitutes a serious handicap to safeguarding the passage to the implementation of its recommendations.

4. The MCSD should aim to become a forum of substantive and regionally accepted experts, providing the needed advice and strategic framework for the promotion, planning and implementation of sustainable development in the region.

5. Caution needs to be exercised in extending the mandate of the Commission, otherwise, a state of opinion may be created among its members according to which the MCSD recommendations should be adopted automatically by the CPs.

6. The characteristics of the MCSD have caused a tendency for it to want to take on an executive role which, in theory, it should not play, a tendency that may cause discrepancies regarding the functions of the MCSD and those of the CPs.

Follow- up

7. Although a few initiatives were taken in some of the fields dealt with by the MCSD, their impact among Mediterranean states has been minimal and implementation of the recommendations issued by the MCSD was not sufficiently realized.

8. If the MCSD is to be recognised by Mediterranean states as a useful regional forum, it needs to take a more active role in seeing to the implementation of its proposals. The MCSD should be given the role of monitoring the process accordingly, receiving and discussing, as well, a formal report about the follow- up results, or by allowing its major Working Groups to continue their work in a lighter way, in monitoring the implementation of their recommendations. The proposed 'Guidelines for Implementation and Follow-up of MCSD Recommendations and Proposals for Action', when finalized, should be adopted and implemented by the CPs.

9. Environment Ministers representing their countries in MAP, should commit to make sure that MCSD advice reaches much more widely in their governments, and also report back to MCSD on how its advice has been used so that MCSD can refine and improve its input. There is a need to enhance the responsibilities of the members of the Commission on the national level, as well as for the involvement of a wider range of participants from other ministries and government bodies.

10. The launching of a regional sustainable development strategy, if it is not based on national sustainable development strategies adopted by the countries concerned, will face similar implementation problems. Similarly, CPs should be encouraged to adopt national environmental framework programmes, that could contribute in ensuring coherence, complementarity, synergies and follow up.

11. To attract attention and increase their implementability, proposals made by the MCSD have to be results - oriented with specific objectives, concrete actions, targets and time-frames and the identification of financing mechanisms and prospects, so that recommendations gain strength and the progress made becomes more visible and easier to follow.

12. Recommendations already proposed and adopted should now be followed up with a process of adaptation and operationalization to sub-regional and/or national circumstances, with a view to identifying the sub-regional or national needs for implementation and the potential role that regional cooperation could play in such implementation.

Composition

13. Specific criteria should be established for the selection or appointment of members, their role, the expected commitment and contribution by them, the time they will devote and the resources they will have at their disposal.

14. The two-year term of service of non- governmental members in the MCSD is a handicap in achieving an effective contribution, as it is too short for allowing substantial participation. Thus, the turnover of the representatives of the civil society should be reduced, by extending their membership to 3 or 4 years.

15. Selection of representatives of societal groups for the MCSD by the CPs is definitely not the best way. Such groups should have full independence to nominate without interference their representatives through their federations and networks, although in certain instances there are no mechanisms for self-selection at the present. Such nominations have to be made more precise.

16. State participants in the MCSD meetings largely overlap with participants in the meetings of the MAP CPs, leading to a general criticism that, in a way, MCSD can be described as the MAP system self-advising itself. Such members confuse their duties with those in their countries or in the MAP and they come from Ministries of the Environment that do not always have exclusive responsibility on the subjects tackled, giving the impression of a 'Club environnemental' . Hence, membership should also be extended to some high calibre personalities who cover at the same time the environment, sustainable development, land planning, the economy and social issues, thus moving the 'centre of gravity' beyond what is now the MAP.

Method of work

17. The themes tackled so far are generally important for all Mediterranean countries. However, some of them are too global and broad in nature characteristics that do not enable the formulation of implementable conclusions and recommendations, and should be put on a 'secondary' perspective'. The means, timetables, and programme of work of the MCSD do not allow the simultaneous tackling of more than 3 themes. At present, the basis of the selection of the new thematic issues is neither clear nor convincing; thus the situation could be greatly improved. The issues selected need to be the most important ones and where there an added value to be gained, not only for the region.

18. Rather than being more broad, regional and all- embracing, new themes should be more related to concrete national and local problems with a high degree of possible realisation. The work of the Commission should focus on policy priorities and dialogue on strategic issues, paying

more attention on the social dimension of development, making economic growth, social development and environmental protection mutually supportive, in identifying technologies and knowledge of an innovative nature for sustainable development and providing advice on their most effective use.

19. There needs to be a follow-up to previous themes by revisiting and deepening previous work through intensifying participation of all members, increasing contributions from other actors on the national scene, and operationalizing the recommendations.

20. The MCSD engages far too much in the kind of search for political compromise on its outputs that would better fit in the meetings of the CPs, discussions at the meetings being largely dominated by few governments and governmental institutions, often leading to a feeling that decisions have been pre-determined.

21. In general, the contributions of the members representing the three non-state groups appear to be not at a very high level. This is partly due to the fact that members were not delegated a more substantive role in contributing to the successful implementation of the activities and they should thus be encouraged to make their participation visible, without feeling the pressure to try and substitute experts. At least in the case of NGOs, their participation in the working groups as well as in other meetings related to MCSD work, is severely limited by the unavailability of resources to cover travel and professional work. Therefore, the MCSD should identify ways to facilitate NGO participation in working groups and other working sessions. A proper scheme should be considered in order to associate former members of MCSD in information exchange, consultations and voluntary work.

22. The planning and actual work of the Commission and its Working Groups is undertaken by the RACs, in cooperation with one main member, the task manager, that is in many cases from the north. Other members of the group and other members of the MCSD are presented with a finished product including a set of recommendations to comment on and accept. Thus, there is a limited sense of ownership of the outcome. Part of the responsibility lies with participants, but the organization of work of the Commission does contribute to it.

23. Often, the Working Groups do not include the leading Mediterranean experts of the subject matter and this brings question marks to the quality of their recommendations, which could have been build up by the Coordinating Unit and the RACs. The assistance of the latter should be better utilized.

24. The activities of the Working groups should not be prolonged for more than it is necessary.

25. The products from MCSD Thematic Groups at various stages should be regularly submitted to all MSCD members by the relevant supporting RACs or the MAP Unit.

26. The outcome of the work of the MCSD could also take the form of manuals, guidelines, studies, other publications, etc., dedicated to the Mediterranean region as a whole, groups of countries or to specific problems of individual countries, providing concrete advise (e.g. specific means, technologies, institutional arrangements) for

solving problems. These texts do not have to be prepared by the MCSD, but by the Coordinating Unit, the RACs, the CPs, and the other actors.

Funding

27. The financial means put at the disposal of the MCSD were à priori limited when compared with the expectations from it by the CPs, thus restricting the MCSD activity to a forum for debate, with no effective move to the level of reality.

28. The capacity of the Commission to secure finance should be enhanced, in order to assure that the recommendations become more concrete and are accompanied by specific actions, resulting in giving more credibility to the whole system.

29. There are various options to consider for improving funding, such as charging costs to the current MAP budget (this may mean that the MAP should cease to carry out or restrict its traditional activities), the approval of the Commission's own budget by increasing the contributions of the CPs (an alternative considered not feasible in the present circumstances), or looking for international funds (more advisable).

Co-operation

30. The present UNEP/MAP and MCSD structure must be strengthened, if needed, with additional staff and eventual external expertise to facilitate their work.

31. The MCSD should concentrate its efforts and resources on strategic initiatives and draw upon the Coordination Unit and its RACs. Also, in certain instances, the Commission could get involved with the work of MAP and the EUROMED process.

32. MCSD appears to work under the strong guidance of the Coordinating Unit, which has also dominated the process of the preparation of the Strategic Review report.

33. The right partnership with the RACs has not yet been found [in one instance, there appears to have been an antagonistic relationship between a Working Group and a RAC], that would give more added value to the MCSD recommendations. RACs should focus their programmes towards more sustainable development issues and facilitate implementation at the national level.

34. A closer exchange of views and experiences should be secured with UNCSD and other advisory bodies on sustainable development operating at national or international level.

APPENDIX

SYNTHESIS OF WRITTEN CONTRIBUTIONS BY MCSD AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

Member	Mandate	Follow up	Composition	Method of work	Funding	Co-op.
C.Ps						
1.			+	+	+	+
2.	+	+		+		
3.		+		+		+
4.		+		+		
5.	+			+	+	
6.	+	+		+		
7.	+			+		
8.	+	+		+	+	+
9.	+	+	+	+		
L.A.						
1.				+		
S-E.						
N.G.Os						
1.	+	+	+	+		
2.	+	+	+		+	+
3.	+	+	+	+	+	+
4.	+	+	+	+	+	
5.	+			+		
Other						
1.	+		+	+	+	

ANNEX III

ORIGINALLY PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, COMPARED TO THE FINALLY ADOPTED ONES³

Introduction ~~A. Status and purposes of the Commission~~

1. In accordance with the recommendations of the Tunis Ministerial Conference, held in November 1994, as approved by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries meeting in Barcelona in June 1995, a A-Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) is hereby established as an advisory body a functional commission to make proposals to the Contracting Parties within the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan ~~of UNEP (UNEP/MAP);~~

A. Purpose of the Commission

2. The purposes of the Commission ~~is~~ are:

(a) to identify, evaluate and assess major economic, ecological and social problems set out in Agenda MED 21, make appropriate proposals thereon to the meetings of the Contracting parties, evaluate the effectiveness of the follow-up to the decisions of the Contracting Parties and facilitate the exchange of information among the institutions implementing activities related to sustainable development in the Mediterranean;

~~(a) to ensure the effective follow-up of the decisions of the meeting of the Contracting Parties and of actions by the Contracting Parties in relation to Agenda MED 21 and provide appropriate recommendations thereon;~~

(b) to enhance regional cooperation and rationalize the inter-governmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean basin for the integration of environment and development issues;

~~(c) to examine the progress in the implementation of Agenda MED 21 at the national and regional levels, fully guided in its endeavour by the principles of the RIO Declaration on Environment and Development and all other aspects of the UNCED Conference, in order to achieve sustainable development in all Mediterranean Countries.~~

B. Functions

3. The functions of the Commission shall be:

(a) to assist the Contracting Parties by making proposals on the formulation and monitor progress in the implementation of a regional ~~Mediterranean~~ strategy of for sustainable development in the Mediterranean, taking into consideration the resolutions of the Tunis and Barcelona Ceonferences and ~~of~~ the context of Agenda MED 21 ~~as well as other activities of and~~ MAP Phase II~~and the Barcelona Convention and its related protocols;~~

³ Additions to the original draft text shown underlined, deletions shown in strikethrough.

(b) to consider and review information provided by the Contracting Parties, in accordance with Article 20 of the Barcelona Convention, including periodic communications or reports regarding the activities they undertake to implement Agenda MED 21, and the problems they encounter, such as problems related to the integration of environment into national policies, capacity building, financial resources, technology transfer, and other relevant environment and development issues ~~they find relevant~~;

(c) to review ~~at on a regular intervals basis~~ the cooperation of MAP with the World Bank and other international financial institutions, as well as the European Union, and explore ways and means for the strengthening of such cooperation, and particularly to achieve the adequacy of funding and mechanisms, including efforts to reach agreed objectives of Chapter 33 of Agenda MED 21, ~~and targets where applicable~~;

(d) to consider, ~~where appropriate~~, information regarding the progress made in the implementation of relevant environmental conventions, which could be made available by the relevant conferences or by the parties;

(e) to identify technologies and knowledge of an innovative nature on sustainable development in the Mediterranean region and to provide advise on the various means for their most effective use, ~~and~~ in order to facilitate exchanges among the Contracting Parties and to enhance capacities for national development;

(f) to provide reports and appropriate recommendations to the meetings of the Contracting Parties, through the MAP Secretariat, on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of reports and issues related to the implementation of a regional strategy related to MAP Phase II nd Agenda MED 21;

(g) to undertake a four- five year strategic assessment and evaluation of the implementation by the Contracting Parties of ~~the regional strategy on~~ Agenda MED 21 and decisions of the meetings of the Contracting Parties and of actions by the Contracting Parties relevant to sustainable development in the Mediterranean region and propose relevant recommendations thereon; the first strategic review should be undertaken for the year 2000 ~~on a high level representation~~ (with Ministerial participation), with the objective of achieving having an integrated overview of the implementation of ~~the regional strategy relevant to~~ Agenda MED 21, examining to consider emerging policy issues and providinge the necessary political impetus.; The Commission shall make the best use of the main results of MAP activity centres in the field of sustainable development, and those of the MAP Mediterranean Environment and Development Observatory, as well as those of national environmental observatories;

(h) to assume such other functions as are entrusted to it by the meetings of the Contracting Parties, it deems appropriate to further the purposes of the Barcelona Convention, MAP Phase II and Agenda MED 21.

4. The rules of procedure of the Commission shall be the Rules of procedure of the meetings and Conferences of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, until the rules of procedure of the Commission are proposed by the Commission and adopted

by the meeting of the Contracting Parties, considering that the Commission shall not have any voting system-

C. Composition

5. The Commission shall be composed of a maximum of 36 members, consisting of representatives from each of all Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and representatives of local authorities, socio- economic actors and non- governmental organizations working in the fields of environment and of sustainable development. All representatives shall participate in the Commission on an equal footing.- ~~Representatives should be at a high level with two representatives from each contracting party, in order to reflect interdisciplinary participation of relevant ministerial bodies of the Contracting Parties (i.e. ministries of environment, economy, development, finance, energy etc.)-~~

~~D. High Level Advisory Group~~

~~6. The Commission, whenever it is deemed appropriate, shall appoint a high level advisory group of eminent persons designated on their personal capacity, to advise the Commission on the various aspects of its work, particularly on the implementation and evaluation of the regional strategy for sustainable development in the Mediterranean region-~~

~~D. E. Observers~~

~~6.7. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure adopted by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, any State established practice of MAP, any Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean which is a member states of the United Nations or the specialised agencies, and any other intergovernmental international governmental or any non-governmental organizations the activities of which are related to the functions of the Commission , may participate in the Commission's work as an observer. Such observers may contribute, within their competence, to the deliberations of the Commission but without the right to vote.~~

~~E. F. Meetings of the Commission and Responsibilities of the Secretariat~~

~~7.8. The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development shall hold ordinary meetings at least once every year, up to the year 2000, then shall meet at least once every two years. meet normally every two years for a period of one week The meetings shall be convened at the premises of the Coordinating Unit of MAP, without prejudice to the convening of its meetings in other Mediterranean venues upon a recommendation of the meetings of the Commission approved by the Meeting of the Contracting Parties.~~

~~8. 9. At the opening of each session, tThe Commission shall elect at the commencement of each session, a Bureau composed of a President, Chairperson, four three Vice-Presidents Chairpersons and a Rapporteur, from among its members on the basis of the principle of equitable geographical distribution and among the various groups.~~

~~9.10.~~ The Coordinating Unit of MAP, serving as the Secretariat of the Commission, shall provide for each session of the Commission an analytical report containing information on relevant activities to implement ~~the regional strategy relevant to~~ Agenda MED 21 and other sustainable development activities recommended by the meetings of the Contracting Parties, ~~the~~ progress achieved and emerging issues to be addressed.

F. G. Relationship with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development and with national and regional commissions on sustainable development

~~10.1.~~ The Commission shall ~~maintain be brought into~~ relationship with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, ~~and shall facilitate the exchange of information and experience among national and regional commissions on sustainable development.~~

~~112.~~ The Commission, in discharging its functions, shall take into account the experience and expertise of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, and shall submit ~~a relevant progress reports~~ to the United Nations Commission ~~on Sustainable Development~~, through the Contracting Parties' meetings ~~on any issues that may be of interest for sustainable development in the Mediterranean region.~~

~~12.~~ The Commission and the Contracting Parties shall, as far as possible and taking into account the particular needs of the Mediterranean countries, utilize the existing reporting system of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, with a view to streamlining and avoiding duplication of work.

G.H. Relations with the Specialised Agencies, Intergovernmental Organizations and Non- governmental Organizations

~~134.~~ The Commission shall, ~~through the Secretariat, co-ordinate and~~ strengthen its activities with relevant United Nations Specialised Agencies and other inter-governmental bodies within the United Nations System, including international, regional and sub-regional financial and development institutions, in particular regarding projects for the implementation of the regional Mediterranean strategy related to Agenda MED 21 and the decisions of the Contracting Parties.

~~14.5.~~ The Commission shall, ~~through the Secretariat,~~ enhance the dialogue with, and the participation of, relevant non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and the independent sector, and receive and analyse their inputs, within the context of the overall implementation of the Mediterranean regional strategy for sustainable development.

ANNEX IV**MAP STRUCTURE****MAP Coordinating Unit (MEDU)**

The Unit was established to coordinate activities within the framework of MAP. MEDU coordinates all activities of MAP and performs such secretariat functions in the name of UNEP as provided by the

Convention, such as for the MCSD. It also prepares meetings with their necessary documentation, transmits notifications, and considers inquiries. The Unit also coordinates and supervises the work of six Regional Activity Centres of MAP, as well as the MED POL component.

MED POL

It is the environmental assessment component of MAP and deals with marine pollution trend monitoring, compliance monitoring and biological effects monitoring, addressing pollution from land-based sources and activities.

Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC)

Studies present and future environment and development interactions in the Mediterranean basin.

Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC)

Addresses immediate problems, of a developmental nature, acting as the main body for the implementation of the coastal zone management programme.

Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean (REMPEC)

It plays a fundamental coordinating role in the implementation of the relevant Protocol by the Mediterranean countries and its role has been expanded to include accidental pollution by hazardous substances.

Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC)

It has an essential role in the implementation of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biodiversity in the Mediterranean and the creation and management of protected areas, and works on the implementation of specific action plans for the protection of endangered species.

Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre (ERS/RAC)

It concentrates on the application of remote sensing techniques to the observation and study of the state and changes of marine and coastal areas in the Mediterranean basin.

Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (CP/RAC)

Its main activities include the encouragement and cooperation in initiatives and programmes for waste reduction at the source, information and advice about cleaner technologies, and the promotion of technology transfer between countries of the Region.

Secretariat for the Protection of Coastal Historic Sites

It aims to protect the coastal historic sites of common Mediterranean interest. The main priority fields cover underwater archaeological sites including shipwrecks, as well as sustainable development of historic sites.

ANNEX V

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

1. The relevance of the MCSD to MAP and the Mediterranean is not challenged. All concerns expressed, aim at rectifying weaknesses and in making the Commission more efficient, giving it the value it deserves, and allowing it to better fulfil its mandate. Its composition, pluralism, and participatory approach, are its strengths. Whatever its shortcomings, the MCSD should be given more time to take off and get tangible results, as it is an asset to the Mediterranean which should not be lost.

2. Despite the above, it should not be ignored that the MCSD is a body with potentials not effectively utilised: so far. It has experienced its most productive phase during 1997-1999, but a certain "inertia" has since settled in, and its status within MAP remains ambiguous. Thus, the current situation is not sustainable and a new approach is required.

3. The changes proposed aim to remove the weaknesses identified (e.g., role ambiguity, inadequate understanding of processes, lack of resources, insufficient active participation of stakeholders), and build on the opportunities offered by the strengths of the Commission (identified above and to which all parties involved are committed), and a most favourable task environment that is here to stay, characterized by the revision of the Barcelona Convention, Agenda MED 21, the revision of MAP, the perseverance of the problems, the CPs recognition of the need for follow-up measures, the preparation of the Strategic Review 2000.

Mandate/ Role/ Functions

4. The MCSD should maintain its autonomous, advisory, consultative and representative nature of informed experts, issuing opinions, identifying, evaluating and examining major environmental, economic and social problems and providing multidimensional advice.

5. The Commission should assume greater independence from the CPs and be able to act at its own discretion or upon direct request from all institutions of MAP and outside institutions as well, on any issue relating to the environment and sustainable development.

Follow- up

6. CPs, which have the major responsibility to deliver, need to change the format of their reports within MAP, in order to provide a clear picture on how the MCSD's recommendations have been implemented.

7. The other partners should also undertake obligations to have texts or proposals approved by their peers and report on progress.

8. Follow-up responsibility should be entrusted to the Coordinating Unit.

Composition/ Involvement of actors

9. The Commission should continue to consist of 36 members.

10. The government members should be different from MAP NFPs, and undertake to widely disseminate decisions at the national level.

11. The 15 seats should continue to be reserved for the non- government sector. The overriding goal should be to allocate 4 seats each to local/regional authorities, industry/business, and environmental protection/consumer associations, but they should be encouraged to make their participation visible and be associated with former members of MCSD. The balance of seats could shift, depending on the interest exhibited and the suitability of those proposed, although there should not be, at anyone time, more than 6 and less than 2 persons from each of the above sectors. 3 seats should be allocated to eminent personalities, coming from any sector, governmental or not, with a broad range of knowledge and expertise on the environment and sustainable development.

12. Candidatures from the non- government sector should be submitted directly to the Coordinating Unit. Proposals should relate to personalities, not organizations. The Coordinating Unit as well as any other MAP NFP or MCSD member could also identify relevant candidates. The Coordinating Unit could include in the list its own candidates, and take the final decision, which should not have to be endorsed by the CPs. The members would be appointed on their personal capacity and for a period of 4 years that could be renewed once.

13. A Chairperson and 2 Vice-chairpersons would form the Bureau, and be elected by the MCSD for a term of 2 years, that could be renewed once.

Method of work

14. The MCSD should redefine its major priorities, focussing on integrating the environment in sectoral policies, reinforcing its public profile, assuming a more independent role, encouraging the principle of joint responsibility, enhancing public understanding of issues, ensuring implementation and enhancing public participation

15. The Commission should support initiatives by the Coordinating Unit towards the CPs to set up [or enhance existing ones], National Commissions on Sustainable Development and associated programmes.

16. Standing Working Groups should be established composed only from among the MCSD's members and focusing on issues to be agreed upon, with Ad-hoc groups formed in cases where this is required.

17. The Standing Working Groups would deal with issues of significance to the Mediterranean that need constant attention. The establishment of 6 such groups, with 5-6 members each, would also allow, from time to time, the establishment of up to 5-6 ad-

hoc groups of 4-5 members each, working in parallel with the Standing Groups. Each working and ad hoc group will be facilitated by one RAC.

18. The debates at plenaries should be interactive sessions between experts, aimed to identify the most widely accepted concerns and suggestions. The holding of break-out sessions would be established as a policy.

19. The MCSD should hold ordinary meetings once every year. Meetings should not last for more than 3 days. Issues to be debated at any one time should be restricted to 2 or 3.

20. Preferably, the meetings should take place in Athens. They could be held elsewhere, if the host country commits to secure visibility of the MCSD and to support the meeting with a substantial financial contribution.

Funding

21. There should be a separate budget line for the MCSD in MAP's Budget, including the activities of the Coordinating Unit and the RAC's wholly or partly related to the Commission's work.

22. In implementing recommendations, the Coordinating Unit and the RACs should be encouraged to secure funds from other sources as well.

Co-operation with other bodies

MAP

23. The MCSD chairperson should attend the meetings of the CPs and of the MAP Bureau.

24. The Coordinating Unit should continue to be the secretariat to the MCSD and its Bureau, act for results dissemination, monitoring implementation, encouraging actors to engage in the process, fostering the flow of information, launching an awareness campaign and encouraging CPs to adopt national environmental framework programmes.

25. The Coordinating Units capacity in staff handling the MCSD needs to be enhanced by at least 3 full-time professionals and support staff.

26. RACs should facilitate the MCSD by, inter alia, reviewing particular issues in order to establish baseline conditions to serve as background contribution to the actual work of the Commission and focus their programmes more towards sustainable development issues.

27. The services of a PR firm should be secured, to give greater visibility not only to the MCSD but to MAP as well.

Other intergovernmental bodies

28. Pursuing co-operation with the UNCSD should not be given up, but it need not be an overriding goal. Closer ties should be pursued with FAO, UNDP and WHO, SMAP and METAP.

Conclusion

29. The MCSD enables the MAP to respond to contemporary global concerns and, under revised TORs, it can bring it closer towards the understanding and resolution of sustainable development issues.

30. The emerging driving forces in the new millennium are all positive, and the revised model proposed is aimed to capitalise on them. They are, the overwhelming public environmental awareness, changes in peoples' values and priorities, highly pluralistic decision- making systems and transparency, new actors, grassroots initiatives, strong national political environmental agendas and the Rio+10 process.

ANNEX II

**IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP OF MCSD RECOMMENDATIONS
AND PROPOSALS FOR ACTION- AN ASSESSMENT**

ANNEX II

IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW UP OF MCSD RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

as adopted by the Contracting Parties (Monaco 14-17 November 2001)

First Assessment

Since the first set of recommendations and proposals for action were adopted, the issue of their implementation and follow up was regularly raised. In conformity with the mandate of the MCSD and following requests from the MCSD and Contracting Parties meetings, a first objective assessment was prepared through a large consultation process and specific case studies.

Implementation is generally very poor and main shortcomings identified concern dissemination of recommendations, lack of guidelines and appropriateness of the recommendations in relation to structures and resources. However, the preparatory process itself through the intersessional activities, its increased flow of information and its improved participatory approach, is perceived as a positive and constructive step.

Considering the importance of this issue, the next MCSD meeting (March 2002, Antalya) will further review and as far as possible finalise the assessment and proposed guidelines. Meanwhile, the Contracting Parties are invited to consider and adopt the following recommendations and proposals for action.

Recommendations to the Contracting Parties

1. To take the necessary steps and measures so as to improve communication and dissemination of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action, notably to concerned actors in national and local public and private sectors as well as major groups from society;
2. To prepare national plans for the implementation and follow up of the recommendations or integrate them in national Sustainable Development Strategies, identifying the necessary human, technical and financial means, notably through a participatory approach involving concerned actors;
3. To promote the development of twinning projects between Mediterranean countries and actors for implementation of recommendations and exchange of experience;
4. To use all available instruments and means, including national indicative programmes of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, to finance the implementation of the recommendations adopted;

Recommendations to the Secretariat

1. To prepare specific guidelines for implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations for each of the MCSD thematic sets, including where possible and appropriate, human, technical and financial requirements;
2. To assist the Contracting Parties and partners in disseminating the information to concerned actors at all levels and implementing the MCSD recommendations;
3. To assess the implementation and follow up of MCSD recommendations every 4 years and report to the MCSD and CP meetings;

IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP OF MCSD RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR ACTION- AN ASSESSMENT

SECTION 1:

A REMINDER OF THE FACTS- GUIDING PRINCIPLES ADOPTED FOR THE PREPARATION OF GUIDELINES

SECTION 2:

ASSESSMENT

I. Recommendations and Proposals by Theme

- A. Water Demand Management
- B. Integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas
- C. Tourism and sustainable development
- D. Information, public awareness raising, environmental education and participation
- E. Indicators for sustainable development

II. Shortcomings and Advantages of the Recommendations and Proposals

ANNEX : PROPOSED GENERAL GUIDELINES

- A. Justification and objectives
- B. Identification and assessment of capabilities and options
- C. Anticipating potential obstacles and conflicts
- D. Identification, promotion and support of measures leading to successful implementation
- E. Defining priorities for action
- F. Definition of a time frame and deadlines
- G. Definition of follow-up for each key issue
- H. Design of the “information and communication” component
- I. Planning for action
- J. Follow-up and assessment

IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP OF MCSD RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR ACTION- AN ASSESSMENT

SECTION 1:

A REMINDER OF THE FACTS- GUIDING PRINCIPLES ADOPTED FOR THE PREPARATION OF GUIDELINES

The assessment and draft guidelines contained in this document are the result of a lengthy process of reflection. The process got underway with the adoption of the first of the MCSD's sets of thematic recommendations back in 1997, when a good number of the Commission's members started raising in clear terms the issue of how these recommendations would be implemented and followed-up, believing that it would affect the credibility and efficiency of their work. The issue has since been repeatedly debated in the course of lively discussions at subsequent meetings of the Commission and the Contracting Parties.

These guidelines also derive from the very terms of reference of the MCSD and its proposals, as well as from several relevant recommendations and decisions adopted during meetings of the Contracting Parties. According to these various provisions and recommendations, the Contracting Parties and other members of the MCSD, and MAP's components and partners, are invited in particular to:

- (a) evaluate the effectiveness of implementation and follow-up of decisions of the Contracting Parties;
- (b) contribute to rationalization of the intergovernmental decision-making capacity in the Mediterranean for integration of environmental and development issues;
- (c) facilitate an exchange of information among institutions implementing activities related to sustainable development in the Mediterranean basin;
- (d) contribute to the enhancement of regional cooperation in the Mediterranean;
- (e) provide elements for the establishment of a reporting system on the implementation of recommendations and proposals;
- (f) improve communication and the exchange of information among the MCSD partners.

Consequently, the ensuing assessment and the draft guidelines annexed to it slot into the context described above, particularly as far as "evaluating the effectiveness of implementation and follow-up" and "contributing to the rationalization of decision-making capacity" is concerned. Through its decision to adopt these guidelines the MCSD is expressing its concern that its proposals for action should produce specific results.

At its first meeting in 1996, the MCSD identified eight major themes which it would need to study as a priority given their huge importance to the rational and balanced development of the Mediterranean: (a) water demand management (b) sustainable management of coastal areas, (c) tourism and sustainable development, (d) information, public awareness-raising, environmental education and participation, (e) indicators for

sustainable development, (f) free trade and the environment, (g) industry and sustainable development, and (h) management of urban development.

At this first meeting the Commission set up eight thematic working groups, each of which was coordinated by task managers and supported by one or more of the Mediterranean Action Plan's (MAP's) Regional Activity Centres (RACs). It was the responsibility of the task managers and support centres to obtain the required financial and human resources as well as the expertise required for dealing with the themes chosen. The thematic working groups were required to submit draft recommendations to the MCSD for consideration. The Contracting Parties were, in principle, solely responsible for implementation of the MCSD recommendations once adopted. Nevertheless, since some themes could usefully be included in action programmes, in practice the Secretariat for its part was also able to propose to the Contracting Parties that some recommendations could be implemented through MAP activities.

In 1997, the MCSD prepared a set of recommendations and proposals for action concerning "water demand management" and "the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas". These recommendations and proposals for action were later adopted by the Contracting Parties at their tenth ordinary meeting (Tunis, November 1997).

In 1999 at its fifth meeting, the MCSD agreed on three further sets of recommendations on "tourism and sustainable development", "information, public awareness-raising, environmental education and participation", and "indicators for sustainable development". These three sets of recommendations were adopted by the Contracting Parties at their eleventh ordinary meeting (Malta, October 1999).

Because the revised Barcelona Convention requires full account to be taken of MCSD recommendations adopted during their ordinary meetings, the Contracting Parties were invited to adopt concrete provisions to ensure that the proposals for action are actually circulated to the institutional structures as well as the governmental and other institutions concerned by each of the corresponding themes (UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.170/3). The Contracting Parties were also requested to give priority to the implementation of recommendations and proposals for action adopted or to be adopted within the MCSD framework, by establishing clear objectives and providing adequate means. In turn, the Member States and the Mediterranean Action Plan's (MAP's) components and partners were invited to become more involved in MCSD activities, particularly on themes for which they had particular expertise and could provide support.

In accordance with the MCSD's terms of reference, and taking into account the discussions and recommendations of the meetings of the Contracting Parties, the MCSD and the MCSD Steering Committee, the MAP/MCSD Secretariat launched a process for assessing the implementation of MCSD recommendations and proposals for action, and for preparing guidelines for their implementation and follow-up. This assessment as well as the guidelines were drawn up on the basis of a series of questionnaires sent to all MCSD members and MAP components. At the same time, the MAP/MCSD Secretariat commissioned the preparation of short pilot studies in the following areas: water demand management, the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas, and tourism and sustainable development. The assessment of activities related to the implementation of recommendations on the "indicators of sustainable development" and "information, public awareness-raising, environmental education and participation" themes was largely

based on relevant follow-up activities conducted by the Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre and by MAP/MEDU.

In May 2001 the MCSD Steering Committee adopted a methodological framework and some guiding principles for the preparation of guidelines, which can be summed up as follows:

- the guidelines should spell out the aims and objectives for each key issue. Although the guiding principles would be general in nature, they should be adapted to each issue dealt with by the MCSD. This approach is essential for the implementation of the guidelines because it will make for better understanding of the strategic implications, and provide a statutory framework against which progress achieved can be measured, and will thus help monitor and assess implementation. The objectives and principles should be clearly defined and, whenever possible, measurable so as to enable monitoring and evaluation. Efforts should be made to identify key aspects (geographical scope, main issues, interactions, etc.).

- The identification of the key aspects and their integration into the thematic guidelines should allow specific, practical measures to be adopted; this would facilitate follow-up and assessment. Efforts should also be made to identify ways and means for satisfactory implementation in the light of possible constraints. The guidelines should be adapted by breaking them down according to the various themes, which would make them more workable. The thematic guidelines should also specify what actions should be taken in the policy, legislative, institutional and organizational fields, and the decision-making instruments or measures to be applied- environmental assessment, cost-benefit analysis, environmental impact assessment (EIA), risk analysis, ad-hoc programmes and pilot projects; economic measures, subsidies and tax incentives, and other available means, including financial and technical resources.

- The participation of the players concerned is essential for all tasks identified by the guidelines, although participation may take on different forms in each case. Participation should, moreover, be greatly facilitated by the dissemination of information and effective communication. Several actions would require continuity through proper follow-up and evaluation, using indicators as appropriate. The guidelines should encourage the forestalling of possible obstacles. However, since not all difficulties can be anticipated the guidelines should provide a degree of flexibility in order to accommodate contingencies and thus allow adequate solutions to be found.

In perusing the assessment which follows on the first five themes dealt with, it should not be forgotten that it is sometimes difficult to judge the extent to which action was taken as a direct effect of MCSD recommendations, for three main reasons. Firstly, these themes had already given rise to activities even before the MCSD was set up, hence the difficulty in assessing what relates to these prior activities, and what was undertaken purely in response to the MCSD recommendations. Secondly, sets of MCSD recommendations only started to be adopted in 1997, the upshot being that it is still too early for any in-depth assessment. Thirdly, in attempting to establish the added value of recommendations, the possible "knock-on" factor generated by the adoption and circulation of MCSD recommendations- which is hard to measure by very definition- should not be ignored. Whilst the effect of encouragement towards broader, active participation may have varied widely from one country to another and depending on the

theme in question, an important process towards increased awareness of the need for sustainable development has none-the-less been triggered.

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT

I. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS BY THEME

A. Water Demand Management

The MCSD recommendations and proposals adopted by the Contracting Parties refer to the effective incorporation of water demand management in national water strategies and development and environmental policies. They seek to develop an awareness of the importance of loss and wastage of water and to promote a sense of responsibility among users. They also seek to improve knowledge and awareness of the potential advantages of more economical management of water demand among users, economic operators, decision makers and the general public, and to encourage the undertaking of practical demand-control activities by encouraging cooperation among groups of countries facing the same demand management problems and future shortages.

1. Implementation

Eighteen countries replied to the questionnaire sent out by the MAP/MCSD Secretariat. Fifteen of them declared having implemented a national water strategy or plan, one country declared having partially implemented a strategy, and two countries had not yet taken any steps. In all cases, the water strategy or water plan included sectoral policies, with three quarters of the countries specifically promoting investment in water saving and efficient use, primarily in agriculture and industry. An awareness and education campaign was included in the national water strategies or plans of 15 countries. MAP had assisted the Contracting Parties in implementing recommendations and proposals on water demand management by providing guidelines for the incorporation of water demand management into national development and environmental policies. Another form of assistance provided by MAP involves assistance to local projects dealing with water resource management and the distribution of the results of these projects. MAP-particularly the Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre- is participating in projects in five Mediterranean countries aimed at integrating water demand management into national strategies and plans. It has prepared a report on the water policies of 11 Mediterranean countries and has implemented the Polagwat project supported by the European Commission (DGXII) in cooperation with national partners.

The Blue Plan has prepared case studies on water-value, water-saving and water-shortage issues. In this context, a document entitled "A Mediterranean Water Vision" and other material has been produced. The Centre has also cooperated with intergovernmental organizations (FAO, IPTRID, MEDTAC, and CIHEAM) on the management of water demand. Irrigation has been the subject of several activities, particularly under the Polagwat project, and specific projects with several countries in the Mediterranean basin focused on improving the results of usage in this field. The Blue Plan has also contributed to the gathering of water statistics and indicators in 12 countries bordering the southern and eastern Mediterranean (MEDSTAT project) and has launched training activities on this subject. Statistics on water in the Mediterranean have been published. The Centre intends to continue and strengthen ongoing activities for enhancing the knowledge and capabilities of the countries involved in MEDSTAT. It is

planning to intensify the exchange of experience and know-how among Mediterranean countries on water issues, notably on water demand management and the preparation of indicators and environmental statistics.

2. Implementing provisions

Specific pilot projects on the efficient use of water have been implemented in 13 countries, and only one country has projects for improving the efficient use of water. The measures most frequently applied have been the adoption of new water management practices (one in four countries), followed by the adoption of new systems for controlling water supply (slightly less than one in four countries) and new irrigation systems (one in five). A weighted pricing and costing system has been established in a quarter of cases, and privatisation of water distribution networks is a policy followed in two countries on the northern edge of the Mediterranean. The most frequent approach is to simultaneously take account of the specific characteristics of a country. For example, in arid and semi-arid areas where extensive irrigation systems and agriculture are the biggest water users, measures to improve and manage irrigation networks are more important than in countries where agriculture consumes less water.

One important control measure adopted involves controlling and detecting leaks, repairing or replacing galvanized iron supply networks with new polyethylene pipes, controlling pressure and introducing new practices for managing network infrastructure. Case studies reveal that leakage control has proven to be one of the main means of significantly reducing water demand. The use and modernization of water metering systems is increasingly associated with leakage control. Metering seems to have a marked influence on users. It has the disadvantage of requiring major bureaucracy and the control and collection of consumption data. The use of automated meter reading is intended to reduce bureaucracy and increase flexibility and efficiency.

Control systems are frequently coupled with a water pricing policy. It has been proven that pricing can be an effective water-demand management tool. Implementation of a water-pricing system presents some difficulties, however; thus the system needs on the one hand to guarantee fair access to water for all sectors of the population irrespective of their financial status and, on the other hand, must cover running costs, maintenance, wear and tear, interest and other costs. There is no doubt that water prices barely cover running costs. Different tariffs are often set depending on the final user and type of water consumed. A distinction can be drawn between systems that provide drinking water and systems that supply water for agriculture or for use in the industrial and energy sectors. Their supply infrastructures are different, as is the quality of water, and therefore the tariff systems should be guided by different criteria. Prices and conditions should vary in accordance with the type of consumer. In the case of drinking water, the system can be relatively straightforward with one single tariff based on consumption. Yet in some cases, the tariff is based on a price per dwelling adjusted to take into account the number of rooms, family size and property value. This differentiated tariff system is often combined with a scheme that subsidizes the use of low-water-consumption devices.

In order to assist countries in their efforts to integrate water resource management and urban management and to advise on how to stabilize water supply for urban dwellers, the Priority Actions Programmes Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC) has prepared draft guidelines for the management of urban water resources.

In the production sectors there are charges for wastewater discharge, and prices for water usage for agriculture or for energy purposes. More sophisticated and complex systems have been tested. For water use in agriculture, systems may charge various prices based on the crops cultivated, using subsidies according to the amount of water they consume. Specific projects related to water use have been conducted in order to apply a package of measures in certain well-defined sectors or economic activities, such as irrigation projects. When successful, these projects have contributed to more rational use of water through a reduction of the time required for irrigation, the number of pumps used and the cost of operating pumps, promoting equity in water distribution as a means of introducing new practices and technologies, increasing water distribution efficiency and, as an upshot, thereby reducing water consumption.

In the industrial sector, tariffs can be set according to the amount of effluent. In this case, the tariff system is combined with the metering of water intake in order to ensure that excess water is not used to dilute the effluent. Another possibility is to charge a tariff based on the effluent load. This approach tends to encourage recycling to improve the quality of the effluent and to reduce overall water use. A further alternative consists of using effluent permits which promote regulation of the effluent load or that are tradable as pollution certificates. In some cases, tariffs can be combined with regulation of supply through quotas for specific industries or types of farming. Subsidies are frequently used as a tool in water-pricing systems.

Some countries have encouraged investment in industry and agriculture aimed at stimulating rational use of water and decreasing consumption through financial assistance schemes. In the case of water for agriculture and industry, subsidies are sometimes granted for the equipment and materials needed to line the ducts. This measure, together with the introduction of water-saving and recycling technology, has already contributed to a drop in water consumption in the industrial sector of several countries despite an increase in industrial production. This has been facilitated in some cases by the adoption of new environmental management practices by individual firms (e.g. the European Eco Management Scheme, or EMAS).

The water requirements of natural ecosystems, although essential for their existence, are rarely taken into account by current legislation and mechanisms. Nonetheless, some countries have established regulations on the minimum flow of rivers and watercourses.

3. Activities implemented

What specific institutions are responsible for the implementation of these activities depends on the structure of each government and the type of measure implemented. Generally speaking, central government plays a crucial role through various ministries (agriculture, environment, industry). In some countries there is a specific ministry for water resources, although more frequently water management is the responsibility of the ministry of agriculture or the ministry for the environment. In a few countries, it is the competence of the ministry of public works. Often, however, basin authorities or committees deal with all aspects of water management at basin level.

The active involvement of all parties concerned in water management is explicitly provided for in the water strategies of some countries. This includes not only central or regional government agencies, municipalities and basin authorities, but also water users

in the public and private sectors, particularly farmers, farmers' associations, water users' associations, irrigation associations, civil society and sectors of industry. The mechanism most frequently adopted for promoting broad participation is the creation of inter-ministerial advisory and technical committees. Almost three-quarters of the NGOs that replied to the Secretariat's questionnaire participate in formulating programmes and strategies related to water demand. Generally speaking, NGOs are quite active in creating water regulation programmes.

The implementation of metering and tariff systems for drinking water is often entrusted to local authorities and municipalities. In some cases, public water management agencies have been created or enhanced.

As already mentioned, 15 countries among the respondents have implemented educational, awareness-raising or information programmes. These activities include the distribution of information to teachers and the promotion of events such as theatre performances, fairs and seminars, which target specific audiences. As far as the general public is concerned, municipality-backed campaigns are organized to distribute information on water-saving practices. The publication and distribution of information has been stimulated by the Aarhus Convention and increased participation by Mediterranean countries in the Euro-Mediterranean Water Information System.

4. Obstacles

Integrated water resource management is an extremely sensitive issue involving several economic sectors, geographical areas and social groups. As a result, it is often the object of conflicting demands. Although water pricing can be an effective tool for influencing demand, it is also true that water tariffs raise politically sensitive issues and may prove socially controversial. For example, a sudden increase in the price of water has frequently led to social and political unrest. Water tariffs and supply policies are always subject to strong social and political pressure. Water-pricing systems face difficulties in obtaining the investment needed to adapt the system to metering requirements. It is difficult to determine adequate but equitable tariffs, and the administration of such a system entails a high level of bureaucracy. Moreover, water markets are often poorly developed in the Mediterranean region.

Water has traditionally been managed from the point of view of supply. Conventional water policies seek to increase supply and correct any shortcomings in water supply through expanding the infrastructure. This approach is deeply rooted in policy makers, administrators and consumers. To change this attitude and implement a strategy based on decreasing demand is a slow and difficult process. As long as the established supply approach is able to maintain an acceptable supply of water and satisfy increasing demand, it is difficult to change attitudes and switch to management based on reducing demand. Efforts to improve water-demand management and save water will not be successful until water supply is restricted, is inadequate or there is a drastic increase in the price of water.

Many decisions concerning water supply involve other sectors of the economy, which may opt for an approach which runs counter to the water-demand approach. For example, the decision to cultivate certain crops depends on markets and tax incentives. Crops selected according to market-based decisions may be water intensive rather than water saving. Crops may be chosen primarily because of the European Union's common

agriculture policy or because of bilateral agricultural trade agreements with countries of the Eastern and Southern Mediterranean. In areas of vastly expanding tourism, a greater volume of water is required not only for direct human consumption but also for recreational activities (e.g. golf courses).

In many countries, water demand management was begun before the creation of the MCSD and before the adoption of any of its relevant recommendations. In some cases, management activities were initiated before the start of the 1990s, creating institutional, legal and administrative structures that do not facilitate the implementation of MCSD recommendations. Additional constraints on the introduction of new management strategies are related to the unequal technical and economic capabilities of countries.

B. The Integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas

The MCSD's recommendations on the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas seek to:

- (a) improve institutional mechanisms for the integrated management of coastal areas;
- (b) use legislative and regulatory instruments;
- (c) ensure access to information in order to raise awareness and promote training;
- (d) establish appropriate incentive mechanisms for the integrated management of coastal areas;
- (e) develop practical pilot projects for the integrated management of coastal areas;
- (f) increase opportunities and improve the effectiveness of active participation.

1. Implementation

Institutional, legislative and regulatory instruments and mechanisms for the integrated management of coastal areas (ICAM) have been adopted in two thirds of the countries, whilst two additional countries have established partial measures. Of the measures adopted, slightly less than half are legislative and a small number are related to land use, land planning or policy provisions concerning urban development, tourism or industrial and agricultural development. MAP, through the Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre, has conducted an extensive analysis of national legislation related to the management of coastal areas in MCSD member states in order to identify the current situation and to propose recommendations on the introduction of framework legislation specific to coastal areas. Using the replies to a questionnaire from 16 countries and the European Union, a set of principles in support of an integrated coastal area strategy has been formulated. In addition, MAP has provided guidelines for the design and implementation of regulatory instruments.

New institutions, committees or special programmes have been created in 3 countries. The introduction of new and additional instruments and mechanisms for the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas is being planned by slightly less than two thirds of the countries. In two cases, the new mechanisms will be of a legislative nature. In some cases, there will be further development and improvement of existing legislative mechanisms, and some completely new mechanisms will be created. The other instruments and mechanisms being planned include land planning, land-use master plans, delimitation of marine areas and specific projects.

2. Implementing provisions

The most frequent type of action is the design and implementation of coastal area management projects. About two thirds of the Mediterranean countries use this approach. In some cases, these projects are integrated into or complement regional programmes. Practical pilot projects on integrated coastal management have received assistance from MAP (PAP/RAC coordinates the coastal area management programmes or CAMPs), which has also assisted countries in identifying and defining critical coastal areas.

Regional programmes for the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas have been planned or are being implemented by one third of the countries. Furthermore, several countries declared having implemented incentives that range from the establishment of delimited areas to the provision of financial aid or technical assistance for the creation of protected areas. Two countries stated that they have no incentive programmes, projects or regional programmes for integrated coastal management. In many countries, there are projects dealing with specific issues affecting coastal areas. These projects cannot be considered part of a regional programme for the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas or to be projects for integrated management. They actually focus on the prevention and control of marine pollution, rehabilitation of the coastline, rehabilitation of coastal wetlands, combating marine erosion and beach rehabilitation, combating waste disposal in coastal areas or the protection of habitats of special interest, such as that of the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) or the Mediterranean monk seal (*Monachus monachus*).

An alternative that is increasingly used to provide municipalities with a framework for planning, coordination and consensus is the elaboration and implementation of a local Agenda 21 for coastal municipalities or cities. The municipalities sounded out by the questionnaire indicated that they had received governmental support in the form of technical and economic assistance, training courses and information. However, the success of this alternative depends on the participation of all interested parties, the local community and their associative structures.

The most frequent support and assistance that NGOs receive from governments for the implementation of activities for the integrated management of coastal areas is technical and financial. Information represents the second type of governmental support received by the NGOs, followed by training courses. Governments encourage the use of assessment tools by providing information, subsidies, technical assistance and training.

The main tools used in current national programmes for coastal management in the Mediterranean basin are development plans, coercive or mandatory measures (e.g. regulating construction in coastal areas), the introduction of construction limits and the use of environmental impact assessments (EIAs) for projects to be implemented in coastal areas. These tools are combined with traditional economic tools such as fees, surcharges, fines or subsidies as well as conventional instruments for the economic assessment of projects, such as cost-benefit analysis. In some cases, municipalities have been encouraged by central government to apply these tools through the provision of information, technical assistance and tax incentives.

The MAP/MCSD Secretariat considers assistance to member states in the development of tools and techniques for the integrated management of coastal areas to be of the utmost importance. As a result, the applicability and use of environmental impact

assessments (EIAs) or strategic environmental assessments (SEAs) have been presented and discussed at workshops. After a recent discussion of the status and use of the SEA in the Mediterranean, MAP prepared a document on practical guidelines for its application.

MAP is planning to develop and distribute additional integrated coastal management tools for the assessment of tourist carrying-capacity and rapid coastal assessment. In addition, it is considering improving coastal information systems and land and sea use planning systems. Its assistance to the Contracting Parties for the improvement of legal frameworks and for the preparation of national strategies for integrated coastal management will continue. The Regional Activity Centres for the Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC), the Blue Plan (BP/RAC) and for Environmental Remote Sensing (ERS/RAC) have submitted coastal area management projects to the European Union in the framework of the Short and Medium-term Priority Environment Action Programme (SMAP). MAP has endeavoured in particular to promote the Guidelines for Integrated Coastal Area and River Basin Management, which were tested under a specific project (the Cetina River Basin Project), through the organisation of seminars and workshops.

In addition to the assistance already mentioned (support for pilot projects, guidelines, training sessions, legislative guidelines, etc.), MAP has assisted the Member States on issues related to integrated coastal management. The ICAM has become a major activity in PAP/RAC, which is now heading up the promotion of this instrument in the Mediterranean. Several sets of strategic guidelines and guidelines on good integrated coastal area and river basin management practices have been prepared. These are due to be published and distributed shortly, and regional and national training sessions are to be organized. In addition, a "White Paper" on coastal area management in the Mediterranean has been prepared in an attempt to raise awareness of the need for sustainable management of coastal areas in the Mediterranean basin.

3. Activities implemented

The main institutions involved in the implementation of the recommendations have been governments, local authorities and the MAP/MCSD Secretariat. It, as well as PAP/RAC, has played a prominent role in this implementation through ensuring coordination, providing assistance and organizing training activities, and getting information documents published. NGO participation in implementation has been facilitated by governmental support.

4. Obstacles

The integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas faces several obstacles, of which, according to the information sent in, slightly more than one fifth are institutional and one quarter legal. In most cases, there is no specific legislation for the management of coastal areas. Most legislation or regulations cover spatial and sectoral policies on urban development, sea front conservation, development of tourist infrastructure, regulation of public access to beaches or protection of nature and environmentally sensitive areas. In some cases, specific legislation has been enacted for the coastal areas, or specialised agencies have been set up. This type of legislation is often used to correct specific problems. For example, there are laws, institutions or regulatory mechanisms for the development of infrastructure on the coastline, the protection of a particular landscape or a fragile or threatened ecosystem, for combating land speculation,

conserving the habitats of symbolic or very rare species such as the loggerhead turtle or the Mediterranean monk seal, or for combating the dumping at sea of solid and liquid waste.

Although generally speaking there is neither specific legislation nor an institution for the integrated management of coastal areas, a broad assortment of laws, institutions and regulatory mechanisms are currently used to perform specific tasks in this field. In other cases, even though legislation or institutional mechanisms for the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas exist, it is clear that there are problems. One of the basic problems is that the concept of integrated management and sustainability is poorly understood. There is often a lack of coordination between the institutions involved, namely ministries, local authorities, municipalities, specialised agencies and public services. Overlapping laws, regulations and responsibilities are often the cause of conflict and mismanagement. In many cases, responsibilities are fragmented, and a wide spectrum of actors are involved, ranging from governmental agencies to local authorities, from large industrial firms to tourist operators, from associations and conservation organisations to individuals working in the field. There is sometimes a need to create new coordination mechanisms, but to get them operating smoothly is a formidable task that may mean amending existing regulations and legislation, and affecting established institutions and conflicting social, economic and political interests.

A further obstacle which compounds the difficulties encountered in promoting the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas is the lack of financial resources. In many areas there is also a general lack of the qualified personnel essential to ICAM. It is also pointed out that political questions and the lack of awareness-raising are some of the obstacles to prudent coastal management.

Amongst the other problems encountered with ICAM implementation is that of poor cooperation from the private sector and a lack of expertise amongst the local public organisations and associations. However, despite all these obstacles, governments are becoming increasingly aware of the need for the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas, and are actively subscribing to it. This awareness is increasingly reflected in the actions planned or already implemented.

C. Tourism and sustainable development

The Contracting Parties adopted the MCSD recommendations and proposals for action on "tourism and sustainable development" at their eleventh ordinary meeting (October 1999). There are 27 specific proposals for action in three main areas: management of the impact of tourism on the environment, promotion of tourism in harmony with sustainable development and development of Mediterranean cooperation.

1. Implementation

The MCSD proposals most actively implemented are those on the promotion of tourism in harmony with sustainable development, although greater emphasis is placed on promotion than on harmonization. The measures are intended to reduce the seasonal nature of tourism by attempting to spread the tourist season over a larger part of the year.

A second priority is to improve the quality of destinations and mitigate their impact on the environment, thus meeting the wishes of the tourists themselves, and adjusting tourist

products to emerging trends. This implies, however, subordination of other objectives to those of tourism. There have been attempts to identify outstanding coastal sites and to develop appropriate tools for their protection as biosphere reserves or nature areas. The resources for promoting the development of cultural, ecological and rural tourism are, however, scarce. Furthermore, resources earmarked for the implementation of specific action programmes for the sustainable development of vulnerable areas such as islands and wetlands, are also very scarce.

The proposal to encourage the diversification and improvement of tourist destinations is frequently interpreted in overly narrow terms, resulting in measures for introducing tourist information offices, museums, or activities such as golf or sailing and festival-type events. The drawback with this approach is that the “environmental” and “sustainable” dimensions of tourism are often ignored. Some countries attempt to steer demand towards centres that are often environmentally insensitive. In these cases, tourism is considered to be a catalyst for urban renewal and the involvement of local communities. Under this approach, the conservation of scenic landscapes, coasts and parks seeks to promote the quality of life of local inhabitants, relegating the satisfaction of tourist demand to a back seat, and discouraging large-scale and purely recreational tourism. The concept of “carrying capacity” is not applied in almost half of the countries consulted. The need to control urbanisation and the building of infrastructure too close to the coast is a matter of increasing concern, but one which is rarely reflected in concrete action. Similarly, efforts to develop synergy between coastal and inland tourism and between the tourist industry and other economic activities are rarely pursued. The rehabilitation of “mature” destinations has been undertaken by more than half of the countries consulted.

2. Implementing provisions

Measures aimed at reconciling tourism with sustainable development usually focus on improving the infrastructure at tourist destinations, facilitating access, creating new infrastructure such as parking lots, roads and highways, information signs, refurbishing façades and old neighbourhoods, creating green areas and improving beaches in order to reduce the negative impact of urbanisation and tourism on coasts. Reducing the negative impact of tourism implies a corrective rather than a preventive approach and is the focus of proposals to control the spread of urbanisation for the purpose of tourism.

Pilot studies reveal that most of the indicators for sustainable development relate to the economic implications of tourism. There are no indicators based on maximum carrying-capacity for tourism. As a matter of fact, conventional regional planning is most frequently viewed as a practical and operational tool to mitigate the impact of tourism. Current management practises are oriented to respond to the expansion of tourism, to resort to environmental impact assessments, to attempt to internalise the cost of waste disposal and maintenance of water supply networks, and to protect historical and natural sites of outstanding value.

The environmental and ecological dimensions of the carrying capacity concept are often ignored. All too often, this concept is limited to the notion of the capacity of tourism accommodation, for example the number of beds available. The concept of carrying-capacity has only recently gained a place in tourism although it has been used for some time as a criterion for assessing the sustainability of tourism. Scarce economic resources, institutional obstacles and the opposition of interest groups are additional

obstacles, representing a small share of the difficulties encountered in the use of carrying-capacity as an evaluation tool.

The legislative instruments most frequently used do not specifically focus on promoting the sustainability of tourist activities, which tend to be regulated by national or local legislation, regulations or development plans in force for specific tourist areas. Nonetheless, the impact and needs of tourism are frequently taken into account by laws and national or regional coastal development plans. In some cases, there are specific plans for developing tourism, but frequently these cannot be squared with the idea of sustainable tourism, and overlap with coastal rehabilitation and other sectoral plans. Regulations often prohibit construction within a certain distance from the coastline or require facilitation of access to coasts and beaches in cases where coasts are public property. Regulation of urbanisation is sometimes included in planning for infrastructure, for example constructing roads perpendicular to the coastline instead of parallel to it.

As for techniques and instruments for the evaluation of the impact of tourism, environmental impact assessments (EIAs) are normally required for new projects. Three quarters of the countries consulted regularly use this instrument. Few NGOs have developed techniques to evaluate the impact of tourism, mainly because of a lack of technical means and professional expertise or simply because it is too costly.

Although the replies to the questionnaire indicate that the concept of carrying capacity for the evaluation of tourism activities is used in slightly less than half of the countries, the concept seems to be interpreted very loosely. It is mainly used when a tourist area coincides with a protected area, a national park or a nature reserve. However, even in these cases the concept is often used in a rather simplistic manner, subject to caution. For example, carrying capacity can be measured in relation to the number of daily visitors only for routes and rest areas. Unless a clear relationship has previously been established between routes, rest areas and the ecological carrying capacity of a protected area, the result may be misleading. In other cases, carrying-capacity is determined by the relationship between the number of daily visitors and the size of the protected area without taking into consideration the peculiarities of that ecosystem, its biodiversity, fragility or any pressure from other sources (e.g. pollution in the surrounding area). In other cases, carrying-capacity is determined by the relationship between the level and diversity of tourist services, the water supply and its quality or even by the number of available rooms and beds.

The MAP/MCSD Secretariat and PAP/RAC have produced and tested the "Guidelines for Carrying-Capacity Assessment for Tourism in Mediterranean Coastal Areas". This method is easily adapted to local conditions and offers a realistic framework for planning sustainable tourism in given areas. Furthermore, the results of a carrying capacity assessment provide important input for the preparation of programmes and plans for the integrated management of coastal areas. However, the concept of carrying capacity is not used in almost half of the countries consulted. This is partly due to a lack of methodology and technical expertise, which account for one case in every five for each of these two reasons.

The lack of accurate data is the third obstacle, representing one of the five main reasons for this shortcoming. Information provided by the municipalities that replied to the questionnaire confirms that efforts to promote this approach are few and far between because of a lack of a clear methodology and financial resources. Nonetheless, several

municipalities reported having the means to evaluate the impact of tourism, even for large-scale projects, thanks to technical expertise and methodologies based on the use of indicators. In 1997, one municipality conducted an assessment of the carrying capacity of tourist sites and implemented measures to ensure that the accommodation offered was limited to a given carrying-capacity.

The NGOs feel that the concept of carrying-capacity is still inadequately defined, that its methodology is vague, the available data is insufficient, and that technical expertise is lacking. In their eyes, the last two of these shortcomings account for the majority of problems related to the use of carrying-capacity, whilst in a handful of responses it is the inadequate definition which is flagged up. Nonetheless, almost half the NGOs have in fact conducted an assessment of the carrying capacity of tourist sites, although in practice only one has actually applied the results.

Only two of the countries consulted reported having adopted environmental management practices for the tourist sector, whilst about one in three admit that this type of management is only partially practised in that country. One municipality has implemented environmental management practices at tourist sites through the introduction of clean, energy-and-water-saving technologies and the adoption of voluntary certification schemes. The same municipality has participated in international initiatives and networks for sustainable tourism, such as the "Tour Operators Sustainable Initiative", "ECoNETT", "Green Globe 21" and ICLEI.

Mechanisms to enable the tourist sector to participate in financing the protection of natural and cultural sites have been implemented in slightly over a third of the countries, and several countries consider their mechanisms to be too limited or inadequate. Although there is growing awareness of the notion of sustainability, translation of this awareness into concrete action is inadequate and encounters several obstacles. This is reflected in the recommendations and proposals intended to reconcile tourism, the environment and sustainable development in relation to the promotion of tourism and balanced regional development. Very little has been done to define and share out responsibilities despite the fact that negotiations concerning tourist activities have been conducted by governments and local authorities in two thirds of the Mediterranean countries that answered the questionnaire.

As for Mediterranean cooperation, half of the countries participate in Mediterranean programmes, but little has been done to promote the sharing of experience, the setting up of Mediterranean networks of experts, and mechanisms for regional cooperation. The MAP Secretariat has assisted countries on this issue through the production and distribution of documents and by providing methodological tools for the assessment of the environmental impact of tourism.

3. Activities implemented

Although the local authorities, governments and MAP have played an important role in implementing this set of recommendations, the tourist sector for its part has played only a marginal role, and for technical and financial reasons NGO participation has been quite limited.

4. Obstacles

Case studies reveal that the major institutions are unaware of the MCSD recommendations and activities and that many measures adopted to promote environmentally sound and sustainable tourism do not necessarily take them into account. Moreover, many ongoing activities and programmes in the tourism sector were initiated before the adoption of the MCSD recommendations and proposals.

A frequent obstacle to the management of sustainable tourism comes in the form of interest groupings, which seek to promote tourism at all costs in order to maximise immediate economic gain. These interests are in direct conflict with those attempting to ensure the sustainability of tourism. One of the pilot studies conducted points out that an important prerequisite for success is sustainable growth. Information provided by the municipalities that replied to the questionnaire reveals that efforts to promote this approach suffer from unclear methodology and a lack of financial resources.

The concept of carrying capacity is not used in slightly less than half the countries consulted. This should first and foremost be attributed in equal share to the lack of methodology, and a shortage of technical expertise. The lack of data is the third most frequent obstacle, which impedes the use of the carrying-capacity approach to evaluate tourist activities. Scarce funding, institutional difficulties and opposition within the tourist sector are other obstacles, accounting for a goodly number of the problems encountered in the use of carrying-capacity for evaluating sustainability. Information provided by the municipalities that replied to the questionnaire reveals that efforts to promote this approach lack a clear methodology and financial resources. As for the difficulties encountered in practising environmental management, these mainly concern the high cost of implementation, the lack of appropriate methodology for managing environmental systems, and a lack of expertise. These three types of difficulty account for a considerable share of those mentioned.

The main obstacle preventing countries from using an environmental impact assessment is the lack of technical expertise. This obstacle accounts for a significant number of those mentioned, although to a slightly lesser extent financial constraints are flagged up as being the main one. Other impediments include a lack of regulations or a lack of a methodology.

D. Information, public awareness-raising, environmental education and participation

Most of the countries which replied to the MAP/MCSD Secretariat's questionnaire have a strategy or programme on information, public awareness-raising, environmental education and participation. NGOs are involved in two thirds of these strategies or programmes. Future NGO participation is not envisaged in four countries. Pilot participatory and mobilization projects have been implemented in two thirds of the countries which answered the questionnaire. Exhibitions or events intended to take stock of available know-how were organized in slightly more than half of the responding countries.

As far as environmental education is concerned, almost half the replies indicate participation in Mediterranean educators' networks, but only a small number indicate that an assessment of the resources needed for training half of all primary school teachers

had been conducted. In one country a project has been launched to extend the notion of a local Agenda 21 from a municipality to the island where it is located.

The MAP Secretariat has frequently assisted the Contracting Parties in implementing this set of recommendations. It has organised a regional workshop for the Arabic-speaking countries on information, awareness-raising and participation in the field of the environment and sustainable development. The workshop was attended by regional institutions and NGOs and produced a strategy that is being adapted and extended to the entire Mediterranean region. Together with MIO-ECSDE, the MAP Secretariat has produced a manual on the participatory approach and assisted countries in preparing and disseminating brochures on the environment and sustainable development in national languages as well as English and French.

Moreover, the NGOs are generally very active in this field, and notably the main networks such as MIO-ECSDE, MEDFORUM, RAED, WWF, Friends of the Earth, etc. Their many publications and campaigns have a major impact on public awareness and environmental education.

The MAP Secretariat intends to involve the major Mediterranean NGO networks in the preparation and finalisation of a Mediterranean Strategy on Information, Awareness-raising and Participation. Furthermore, it has prepared and published a report on success stories on the environment and sustainable development in the Mediterranean.

E. Indicators for sustainable development

The MCSD recommendations and proposals for action on the "Indicators for sustainable development" theme invite the Contracting Parties to implement a system of indicators for sustainable development for Mediterranean countries on a voluntary basis. Five of the recommendations are addressed to the Contracting Parties and two to the MAP Secretariat. Those concerning the Contracting Parties refer to the adoption of a common set of indicators, and the testing of status and response indicators, which will contribute to the preparation of a report on indicators and to the submission of national reports on this subject. The Contracting Parties are also invited to build up their capacity to promote, harmonize and coordinate work on producing, monitoring and enhancing indicators. The proposals concerning the MAP Secretariat focus on the harmonization and dissemination of indicators in order to facilitate work at the national level and to ensure its follow-up, supported by the regional activity centres.

1. Implementation

Of the countries which replied, many of them have produced a common set of indicators, or are in the process of so doing, with an equivalent number of them not yet having implemented the corresponding recommendations. A preliminary set of indicators has, however, been prepared in most countries, in most cases for indicators of pressure, status and response. The others have prepared status indicators, and one country has prepared pressure and status indicators. The system of indicators adopted in the various countries reflects the differences in the acuity of problems between them. Thus, countries which are relatively well endowed with water resources have not prepared water shortage indicators. Similarly, countries not affected by soil erosion and desertification do not lay great store by indicators for assessing and monitoring these two problems.

The most frequently proposed indicators concern urbanization, water and air pollution, industrial waste, marine pollution and tourism. Indicators related to biodiversity (in particular the introduction of exotic species or genetically modified organisms) were the least common. Only two countries that answered the questionnaire have not brought in any capacity building measures. This capacity building covers a wide range of activities, such as developing a system of environmental statistics, developing indicators for sustainable development, new forms of monitoring, data collection and training of personnel. Some activities have been conducted within the framework of regional initiatives such as MEDSTAT or Euromed.

Only some of the countries that replied to the questionnaire have supplied MAP with national reports prepared for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD).

MAP- the Blue Plan to be specific- has proposed a methodological framework for the use of indicators for sustainable development, which are compatible with those used in other international initiatives on this matter, such as the European Environmental Agency, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD). MAP has established a common set of 130 indicators for sustainable development tailored to the specific conditions of the Mediterranean region. Following adoption of this set of indicators by the MCSD and the Contracting Parties, a programme involving all Mediterranean countries has been launched, with the intention of preparing a detailed glossary, initial calculations using the first indicators, an exchange of information during a regional workshop and monitoring the up-dating of the indicators. The main difficulties encountered by the Blue Plan have been primarily of a methodological and conceptual nature.

The concept of sustainable development is very broad and covers a large number of very different issues. Covering such a broad area requires the involvement of a large number of experts. The difficulties created by the great diversity of issues are further compounded by the diversity of situations and priorities in the Mediterranean countries, which makes it difficult to reach agreement. This proved a particularly important obstacle in the pursuit of homogeneous definitions and methods. The broad and diverse nature of the issues acted as an institutional hindrance because it was necessary to involve and gain the cooperation of many different institutions in each country. The solution was to work in networks and exploit synergies with other Mediterranean programmes (e.g. METAP, the IPE, MEDSTAT).

2. Implementing provisions

The approach adopted for the implementation of the recommendations has involved organising a series of meetings and training activities at national and regional level. Communication between the MAP Secretariat and the Contracting Parties has been essential to the implementation of these recommendations.

3. Activities implemented

The main institution for the implementation of the recommendations has been MAP, using the methodological framework proposed by the Blue Plan. MAP was involved in the selection of 130 indicators, and coordinated the participation of the countries of the Mediterranean basin. The governments, through their statistical institutes or ministries of

the environment, have been the main participants at national level in the countries which have adopted the common or partial set of indicators.

4. Obstacles

The two main difficulties encountered by the countries in setting up system of indicators of sustainable development were, to an equal extent, the lack of a conceptual or methodological approach, and the inadequacy of data collection, in other words almost half of all the difficulties reported. These are followed in decreasing order by the lack of resources, institutional barriers, lack of flexibility, and the shortage of technical expertise.

The main difficulty in establishing a methodology stems from the fact that sustainable development is a concept embracing numerous dimensions in many different areas of activity, some of them very complex. This diversity of dimensions produces a mass of data and information which must be processed at considerable operational cost.

II. SHORTCOMINGS AND ADVANTAGES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS

The main shortcomings encountered by governments in implementing the MCSD recommendations and proposals are related to poor dissemination of the recommendations, a lack of defined follow-up and poor communication between the MAP Secretariat, the Contracting Parties and other partners. Slightly less than half the replies report poor dissemination of the recommendations as being a serious or very serious obstacle, yet a similar number do not see this as a particular problem. In their replies two thirds of the NGOs consider this to be a serious shortcoming, and less than a quarter flag it up as a very serious obstacle.

Along with poor dissemination, the lack of defined follow-up is one of the most frequently mentioned obstacles. About four in five Mediterranean governments deem it to be serious or very serious (slightly more than half the cases). As for the NGOs, they rated the seriousness of this failure slightly higher. Other problems frequently mentioned are the fact that the recommendations take no account of the diversity of the Mediterranean countries, their technical capacity, the need for large amounts of data and information for implementation, the level of financial resources required for this end, or simply that the recommendations and proposals are somewhat unrealistic. These five types of problems account for a large share of the obstacles reported, although to varying extents. In slightly over a third of cases the fact that no account is taken of the diversity of Mediterranean countries is considered to be a serious or very serious drawback. For the NGOs, this shortcoming does not have the same relevance, not only because it is mentioned on fewer occasions, but also because it is deemed less serious.

The vast majority of governments felt that ignoring the inadequacy of data is a major shortcoming, with a less marked majority seeing this as a serious or very serious drawback. A similar view was expressed by the NGOs, most of them viewing this deficiency as important and serious. Slightly less than half the governments also felt that ignoring the inability to muster the financial resources needed was a serious or very serious shortcoming, whilst a handful of them felt it was only a minor omission. The vast majority of NGOs consider this to be a serious or very serious shortcoming.

Governments feel that a lack of due consideration for the limited technical capabilities of countries is one of the obstacles which most frequently crop up in the implementation of the recommendations, with a small number of them seeing it as a serious or very serious shortcoming, whilst less than half consider it to be a major flaw in the recommendations. One third of the NGOs' responses shared this view.

According to the governments, unclear formulation of the objective of the recommendations is deemed to be an important albeit not serious shortcoming in slightly more than half the cases that mention this aspect. This was the shortcoming least mentioned by NGOs, which considered it unimportant. The lack of clarity in terms of the results expected, and the lack of any definition of follow-up are some of the most-cited obstacles to the implementation of recommendations. Slightly under half the responses mentioned the former as being important, whilst a small number of governments deemed it serious or very serious. Half of the governments reported the absence of any definition of follow-up to be a serious oversight, whilst the vast majority of NGOs believed this to be the case.

The absence of guidelines or inadequate indications as to how to implement the recommendations are the obstacles most frequently mentioned by governments: in a clear majority of replies this is perceived as an important and serious shortcoming, very serious in a few cases. For the NGOs, the percentages are higher. The omission of considerations on the institutional aspects of implementation is mentioned in two thirds of the replies from governments, most of them considering it to be an important and serious shortcoming, a small minority as very serious. For a clear majority of NGOs it is a serious or even very serious shortcoming.

It should be noted that the type of obstacles most frequently mentioned represent no more than one third of the replies and that when there is convergence or tacit consensus it is always on shortcomings considered serious or very serious. It is also worth noting that two countries did not answer this part of the questionnaire and that one country considered almost all the obstacles to be unimportant. As far as MAP is concerned, the main obstacle it faces in implementing the recommendations is a lack of human resources.

Overall, according to the municipalities that replied to the questionnaire the difficulties encountered in implementing the MCSD recommendations and proposals stem from the fact that they ignore the diversity of the Mediterranean countries, lack any clear objective, are too vague, fail to address how to implement them, and are poorly disseminated. Of lesser importance is the fact that they take no account of the necessary data and the funds required for their implementation, and are unrealistic. A third category of difficulties is related to the inadequate consideration given to institutional aspects, the poor system of communication between partners, and the vagueness of the results expected.

It is difficult to estimate the value added by implementation of the recommendations and proposals for each theme dealt with, for several reasons. Practically all themes covered by the recommendations are activities that were initiated before the creation of the MCSD rather than in response to its recommendations. It is extremely difficult to distinguish between the results of previous activities and what could stem from activities organised to take account of the recommendations.

Moreover, it is highly plausible that what appears to be a response to an MCSD recommendation is but the logical evolution of a previously initiated activity. It should be borne in mind that the implementation of a given MCSD recommendation is only made possible by activities carried out earlier, which have created structures and conditions (institutional, administrative, legal or human) favourable to later implementation (as in the case of water demand management). In addition, it seems that this situation was not foreseen by the MCSD, so there are no criteria, no systems and no methodology for this type of evaluation.

The MCSD proposals were prepared and approved quite recently. As a result, very little information is available on their implementation. Nonetheless, there are some concrete facts that reflect their positive contribution to sustainable development. Some of them are general, while others are inherent to the implementation of specific recommendations or to the implementation of a component. The effective involvement of civil society is certainly an added value, as is the evident increase in the generation and flow of information among the Mediterranean countries.

The process of design, adoption and implementation has had an important educational effect on decision-makers, planners, political leaders, managers, local authorities, members of civil society, the private sector and the media. The same process has had important political effects. One principle underlying the implementation of the recommendations is that of encouraging participation by more players. This involvement has apparently been more successful in some cases than in others, but it is important that a process of increasingly effective participation has been triggered. The implementation process helps make the problems inherent to the ecological, economic, social and political dimensions of sustainable development more visible.

ANNEX : PROPOSED GENERAL GUIDELINES

The general guidelines proposed below provide a framework which includes a series of questions to be borne in mind by the players concerned when preparing for implementation of the recommendations. Five sets of thematic guidelines were prepared by theme, but as no comments were received from the Task Managers and Support Centres concerned, (with the exception of one Task Manager), it was decided not to include them in this report. In any case, the Task Managers and Support Centres are expected to propose guidelines by theme for the implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations. These guidelines are intended to induce the actors concerned to identify adequate means to this end.

A. Justification and objectives

The main purpose of the guidelines is to mobilise and focus efforts on achieving agreed objectives. To this broad end, the guidelines are expected to:

- (a) Provide an opportunity and perspective for debate on the implementation and follow-up of MCSD recommendations and proposals;
- (b) Provide a framework for focusing on a common set of priority issues;
- (c) Provide support for planning and carrying out measures and actions to enhance knowledge and to strengthen institutions with respect to priority issues;
- (d) Develop institutional capacities;
- (e) Provide a statutory framework against which to assess achievements;
- (f) Contribute to the improvement, preparation, adoption and implementation of additional clear and practical proposals.

The key themes have already been defined by the MCSD: (a) water demand management, (b) the integrated and sustainable management of coastal areas, (c) tourism and sustainable development, (d) information, public awareness-raising, environmental education and participation, (e) indicators for sustainable development, (f) free-trade and the environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context, (g) industry and sustainable development, and (h) the sustainable management of urban development. Other issues could be considered by the MCSD in the next few years in the following fields: agriculture and rural development, urban waste management, consumption patterns, international cooperation, mobilisation of resources and partnerships.

B. Identification and assessment of capabilities and options

- Legal, economic and environmental instruments
- Institutional development
- Technological options
- Capacity-building

C. Anticipating potential obstacles and conflicts

- Lack of agreement on the severity or the existence of a problem, how to approach it and responsibility for that task
- Lack of technical capability and financial and managerial resources
- Political opposition

D. Identification, promotion and support of measures leading to successful implementation

Each measure should be defined in terms of purpose, inputs and outputs, roles and responsibilities of the implementing body, budgetary and financial implications and monitoring and evaluation processes.

- Institutional development including coordination mechanisms
- Capacity-building
- Improved decision-making through better information and analytical techniques
- Identification of practices for the rational use of new resources and improved use of existing resources
- Development of methodological tools for assessment and evaluation
- Specific programmes, pilot projects and case studies
- Training programmes
- Dissemination of information and networking
- Development of legislative and regulatory mechanisms
- Development of decision-making instruments, such as environmental assessment, cost-benefit analysis, environmental impact assessment (EIA), technological assessment, risk analysis and carrying-capacity assessment
- Economic measures, subsidies, taxes and incentives
- Transfer of technology and know-how
- International cooperation
- Dissemination of information and effective communication
- Public awareness-raising campaigns

E. Defining priorities for action

- Setting criteria for defining priorities (cost-benefit, cost-efficiency, cost-effectiveness)
- Social, economic, environmental and political priorities
- Identifying and carrying out trade-offs

F. Definition of a time frame and deadlines

A guideline must allow for two time frames: a functional time frame within each strategic activity which is implemented and monitored in order to meet the objectives, and a long-term time frame for reaching the overall goals as a result of synergetic interaction by all the strategic activities. The use of two time frames makes it possible to use indicators for assessing performance in each phase of implementation. The time frame covers the period required for a strategic activity to produce the desired results. This is the period during which a starting point is set for each activity, the time lag between initiation and full-scale development of an activity and the time for implementation of each task.

G. Definition of follow-up for each key issue

Strategic activities are not isolated actions. Each strategic activity produces changes during its implementation and affects other activities. The guidelines must take into account the effects of new situations in order to ensure that all positive effects are sustainable. These guidelines must also take into account the activities required to continue the dynamic process triggered by the original strategic activity. Allowance

must be made for new financial, technical and human resources, as well as resulting needs for changes in institutions and regulations. The strategic activity will have a social, economic and environmental impact, and monitoring and corrective planning should be provided for.

H. Design of the “information and communication” component

Information and communication are essential components of any strategy and are essential for visibility and for achieving effective cooperation at all levels. An effective information and communication system will allow the MCSD's intentions to be conveyed, and helps to insure coherence across activities and the use of resources. Providing information about these guidelines is the first step towards coordination with partners on the task, the ends and general objectives, policy objectives and implementation. A dynamic information and communications strategy is essential to implementation and follow-up. This strategy should identify target groups, means and tools for using the information and communication component and establishing the necessary infrastructure and institutional mechanisms. Among target groups are actors responsible for the implementation of recommendations and proposals, the media, decision makers, donors, influential groups, NGOs and local authorities. Tools include newsletters, educational publications, audiovisual presentations, field trips, public debates, workshops, public hearings and forums. Actors also include the MCSD Secretariat, the MAP regional activity centres and the Contracting Parties.

I. Planning for action

- Determining resources needed for implementation of key actions
- Budgeting and financing
- Allocation of financial, technical and human resources to key issues and corresponding actions
- Defining an organisational structure and coordination mechanisms

J. Follow-up and assessment

- Determination of types of indicators
- Indicators of status, pressure (processes) and response
- Indicators of input, output and performance
- Normative and descriptive indicators
- Reporting on implementation
- Review, revision and adaptation process

ANNEX III

Conclusions of the Fifth Meeting of the Steering Committee of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, Monaco, 18-19 May 2001

1. Follow-up of the “Strategic Review”

- a) The Steering Committee approved the new presentation and the change of the document's title to “Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region”.
- b) In order to ensure its timely distribution to all the actors and organisations concerned, the Committee decided to keep the final deadline of end June 2001 for the new version and asked the Secretariat to use this time interval for an updating of the document with the new information which would be available until then, at the Blue Plan in particular, with special emphasis on socio-economic indicators and, if possible, on environmental indicators; the insularity theme will be highlighted by means of a box and the aspect of natural risks added, also in the form of a box;
- c) Subject to the above additions, the report's substance and structure will not be modified, in accordance with the decision of the 6th MCSD Meeting.
- d) The preparation and distribution of the Review's summary will be an opportunity to underscore the importance of both the thematic and sub-regional integration within the context of sustainable development.

2. “Strategic Orientations”

- a) The Steering Committee approved the preparatory process of the “Strategic Orientations” which should continue, through further consideration and a participative approach, without focusing on the need to go to the Johannesburg Summit with a finalized document.

- b) Therefore, only a short framework document, together with draft terms of reference, will therefore be presented to the next meetings of the MCSD and the Contracting Parties.
- c) Thanks to the support given by Spain to this activity, a meeting of experts representing the MCSD members and the other partners involved will be held in this country during the first half of 2002, in order to contribute to the formulation of the “orientations”.
- d) The results of the Johannesburg Summit, as well as the rapid evolution of the Mediterranean regional context, will be taken into account for the preparation of the draft “orientations” which will be presented at the 8th MCSD Meeting in 2002, while a final draft will be submitted for adoption at the 13th Meeting of the Contracting Parties in 2003.
- e) The “Strategic Orientations” will be prepared on the basis of the following three thematic documents which will provide their essential contents: “Environment and natural resources”, “Economic development and social equity”, “Sustainable development policies, integration and participation”.

3. Implementation and follow-up of the MCSD’s proposals

- a) The Steering Committee took note with satisfaction of the Secretariat’s work with the sending of the questionnaires and approved its suggestion to develop “guidelines” rather than a strategy for the follow-up.
- b) To ensure wider participation, it recommended that task managers, former and new MCSD members, should be consulted during the formulation for both thematic and general “guidelines”.
- c) In a similar spirit, it invited the Secretariat to call upon the representatives of concerned groups to contribute to the preparation of pilot studies.

- d) The Secretariat will submit to the meeting in Antalya preliminary draft terms of reference for programmes on the follow-up and implementation of thematic recommendations, including the old recommendations adopted by the Parties.

4. Preparatory process for the Johannesburg Summit, funding problems.

- a) The Steering Committee took note of the main activities and meetings of the preparatory process and relevant timetables; it encouraged the Secretariat and MCSD members to be part of this process in order to promote the achievements of the Mediterranean region through it, as well as through national reports.
- b) The importance of funding for development was emphasized; in this respect, it was agreed that the Secretariat should be invited to follow the preparation process of the UN Conference on Financing for Development and adapt it, as appropriate, to the regional level.

5. Ongoing work of thematic groups

- a) The Steering Committee took note of the progress of the three groups “Industry”, “Free-trade” and “Urban Management”.
- b) Efforts to disseminate information and increase public awareness will continue, in particular by promoting publications in the countries which reflect their individual situation.
- c) The Steering Committee expressed the wish that, in a general way, the aspect of “funding” should be included in the thematic proposals.

6. Participation and involvement of the major groups of Society.

- a) To initiate the process of renewing the members of the three MCSD categories, the Secretariat was invited to write to the MAP national focal points asking them to name candidates for the representatives of socio-economic actors and local authorities. A candidates “profile” will be

proposed to them, emphasizing the importance of networks, the candidates' motivation, the need for a broad vision and a Mediterranean focus.

- b) In order to diversify the Commission's composition, the Steering Committee invites the Secretariat to ask MCSD members to propose potential candidates and also contact, for that purpose, other partners and networks.
- c) The workshops planned for the "Industry" and "Urban Management" groups could be used to identify potential partners.
- d) The candidature proposals should be submitted by 15 October 2001 at the latest.

7. Seventh Meeting of the MCSD.

In reviewing the provisional agenda for the meeting of Antalya, the Steering Committee has discussed the point concerning the new issues and has proposed:

- a) To retain "International cooperation, financing and partnership", among the new issues that are under preparation.
- b) To reflect on the eventual follow up of the themes already dealt with, in order to make recommendations more operational and complete them, if necessary, to best meet the region's requirements (in particular, financial requirements, deadlines, partners).

8. Evolution prospects of the MCSD.

- a) The Steering Committee invited the Secretariat to prepare for the Antalya meeting on informal document summarizing the main points of its discussions in Monaco on the MCSD's evolution prospect and ways of improving its effectiveness; this document will serve as an

introduction to the further discussion of this question at the Commission's plenary session.

- b) Since the examined themes extend well beyond the environmental basis on which MAP was established, the MCSD's Steering Committee proposed that for future work it would be advisable to promote a participatory approach by any means, develop partnership and cooperation, diversify skills, work with all ministries and organizations concerned, depending on the themes and examine, in a systematic way, possibilities of financing concrete actions for the follow-up of recommendations.
- d) The MCSD could present to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties a proposal for revising the Commission's terms of reference as regards the follow-up and implementation of recommendations and any other matter which could make future work more effective.
- e) The Secretariat is invited to convene, just before the Antalya meeting, a meeting of the members of the Commission's three categories on which a report will be submitted to the Commission; the object of this meeting will be to improve cooperation between the three groups, as well as their participation in the work of the Commission and to examine ways of obtaining representative and motivated candidatures for renewing the members of these groups.

ANNEX IV

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE MCSD

1. Election of the new Steering Committee

After the usual consultations among the members of the Commission, the Meeting elected a new Steering Committee, including the President of the Bureau of the Contracting Parties (Malta) as an ex officio member. The new Steering Committee is composed as follows:

President:	H.E. Mr. Bernard Fautrier	(Monaco)
Vice-Presidents:	H.E. Mrs. Fa'za Kefi	(Tunisia)
	H.E. Mr. Francis Zammit Dimech	(Malta)
	Mr. Alex Lascaratos	(Greece)
	Mr. Georges Giourgas	(EOAN)
	Mr. Magdi Ibrahim	(ENDA)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Armando Mauro	(City of Naples)

2. Consideration of the Strategic Review

- (a) The members of the Commission expressed their satisfaction with the contents of the Strategic Review stressing the relevance of its analyses, the wealth of information it contained and the significant improvements made to the first version distributed;
- (b) The Secretariat is invited to enhance the present version, without changing its substance, on the basis of the comments to be sent in writing by the countries and other members of the Commission not later than 31 December 2000;
- (c) In preparing this final version, the following points will, as far as possible, be taken into account:
 - the environmental dimension of sustainable development should not be overly emphasized to the detriment of the economic dimension which, for many countries, was still a vital stake;
 - the concept of shared but differentiated responsibilities;
 - more reference to the importance of indicators and to the work carried out in the region by organizations other than those already mentioned in the Review;
 - the question of climate change and its possible repercussions in the Mediterranean; and
 - updated data communicated by members to complete the tables in the annexes.
- (d) All the participants agreed on the need to make optimum use of the important work carried out during the preparation of the Review; every opportunity should be taken to give it the widest possible circulation in order to reach all sectors in civil society;

To that end:

- The Secretariat will prepare a synthesis of the Review and will publish it in the form of a pamphlet;
- The Review and its synthesis will serve as a basis for the contribution of MAP and of the MCSD to the forthcoming important events: the Governing Council of UNEP; the meetings of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development; Earth Summit II and other international conferences;
- The Meeting welcomed the proposal that the Strategic Review should serve to prepare a strategy for sustainable development in the Mediterranean; a draft strategic framework document would be submitted to the forthcoming meetings of the MCSD and of the Contracting Parties in 2001, and the text would be finalized and submitted for approval at a meeting of experts from the Contracting Parties to be held in 2002 and presented for approval to the Bureau, before Rio + 10. Spain had generously proposed to host this meeting;
- The Secretariat of the MCSD will draw up a detailed work programme with a view to contributing to the preparations for Earth Summit II (2002). This programme will be circulated for comments to all members before its finalization and implementation;
- Moreover, in view of the quality and wealth of information contained in the regional reports and of many national reports, better use should be made of them, particularly through the preparation of country profiles and a series of success stories to promote exchanges of information and experience;
- The dynamism created through the preparation of this Review by the excellent cooperation and interaction between the consultants, experts, members of the MCSD and Secretariat should also use the valuable information gathered to strengthen the MAP strategy.

3. Recommendations and proposals for action

After a thorough discussion in the ad hoc and plenary meetings, the Meeting adopted, as amended, the set of recommendations taken from the Strategic Review for submission to the next meeting of the Contracting Parties in Monaco.

4. The Tunis Declaration

After a fruitful discussion in the ad hoc and plenary meetings, the MCSD, at its high-level segment, adopted the Tunis Declaration for consideration by the Contracting Parties.

The Meeting further requested that that, following its adoption by the Contracting Parties, the Tunis Declaration would be submitted, together with the Strategic Review, to all the major international forums, and particularly to Earth Summit II.

5. Role and Mode of Operation of the MCSD

Considerable time was devoted to an open, frank and critical discussion of the role and mode of operation of the MCSD. It was agreed that this discussion would be fully reflected in the detailed final report of the Meeting.

The MCSD requested the Secretariat to include an item on the Agenda of the next Meeting on tangible ways to harness synergies and cooperation within other groups in the region.

6. Participation of the groups

The Meeting urged NGOs, local authorities and socio-economic actors to participate actively and effectively in the work of the MCSD and to establish networks with former members in order to benefit from their experience.

The proposal to organize a forum of civil society partners within the framework of the MCSD was endorsed.

7. Consideration of ongoing activities

Industry and sustainable development

The Meeting took note with interest of the progress report of the thematic group "Industry and sustainable development" and of the announcement by the group that a large workshop would be organized by CP/RAC in March/April 2002 to introduce and discuss the tools prepared and the studies carried out by MED POL, ICS/UNIDO and CP/RAC in cooperation with the other members prior to their formal presentation to the meeting of the MCSD. It was decided that other institutions such as CITET should be associated with the exercise.

Free trade and environment in the Euro-Mediterranean context

The Meeting took note with interest of the report on the activities and outcome of the workshop held in September 2000. It emphasized that the work on this theme should be continued, not only in relation to the past experience of other free-trade areas but also with due regard for a specific Mediterranean character which was evolving rapidly in view of the fact that four riparian countries were already involved in association agreements. While focusing on the impact of free trade on the environment, it was necessary to take into account the overall context of sustainable development and the impact of environmental measures on free trade. Moreover, it would be useful to consider policy measures capable of mitigating potential negative effects. The ongoing work in that area by other organizations including METAP should be taken into account for the sake of complementarity and synergy. The assistance of the socio-economic actors should be actively sought.

Urban management and sustainable development

Having taken note with interest of the report on the group's work, the Meeting invited it to continue the regional studies and analysis that had been initiated on the basis of the replies to questionnaires, whose addressees would have to be approached again, but also with the more active assistance of the MAP Focal Points and the MCSD. Other available work and sources of information must also be taken into account. The participants noted that a workshop was to be held in April 2001 and expressed the view that, in dealing with the theme, the importance should be borne in mind of urban development established in consultation with the local population whose quality of life must remain the basic objective.

8. Consideration of possible new issues:

The Commission went through an exchange of views on the questions that have been the subject of feasibility case studies, bearing in mind the further preparation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development as well as the need for practical action, an integrated approach and the mobilization of concerned partners.

At the present stage, particular attention was focused on the following issues:

- agriculture and rural development,
- urban waste management and consumption patterns, and
- international cooperation: mobilization of resources and partnerships.

on which the Secretariat would prepare an additional report covering in particular the work programme and an assessment of expected value added in the context of the MCSD for consideration and approval at the Seventh Meeting (Antalya), taking due account of other ongoing work.

However, work on other issues will progress through the impetus given by the Secretariat, backed by available expertise.

ANNEX V

MEMBERS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE MCSD

1ST MCSD meeting (1996)	4th MCSD meeting (1998)	5TH MCSD meeting (1999)	6th MCSD meeting (2000)
President: MOROCCO Vice President: ASCAME Vice President : CREE Vice President : CROATIA Vice President : EGYPT Vice President : EC Vice President : TUNISIA Rapporteur : ECOMEDITERRANEA	President : TUNISIA Vice President : EOAEN Vice President : CYPRUS Vice President : MIO-ECSDE Vice President : SILIFKE MUNIC. Vice President : SPAIN Rapporteur : MONACO	President : TUNISIA Vice President : EOAEN Vice President : CITY OF ROME Vice President : MALTA Vice President : MONACO Vice President : TURKEY Rapporteur : WWF	President : MONACO Vice President : TUNISIA Vice President : MALTA Vice President : GREECE Vice President : EOAEN Vice President : ENDA Rapporteur: MUNIC.OF NAPLES

ANNEX VI

PREVIOUS MEMBERS OF THE MCSD (December 1996-October 2000, MCSD I to MCSD V)	PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE MCSD (November 2000-March 2002, MCSD VI and MCSD VII)	NEW MEMBERS OF THE MCSD (March 2002-2004,MCSD VIII and MCSD IX)
<u>LOCAL AUTHORITIES</u> ➤ CREE (network) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF ROME (ITALY) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF DUBROVNIK (CROATIA) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF SILIFKE (TURKEY) ➤ MEDCITIES (network)	<u>LOCAL AUTHORITIES</u> ➤ MEDICITIES (network) ➤ IFOCC/ULAI-UNION OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES OF ISRAEL(network) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF CALVIA (SPAIN) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF NAPOLI (ITALY) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF TRIPOLI (LIBYA)	<u>LOCAL AUTHORITIES</u> ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF NAPLES (ITALY) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF OMISALJ (CROATIA) ➤ AL FAYHAA URBAN COMMUNITY(LEBANON) ➤ MUNICIPALITY OF TETOUAN (MOROCCO) ➤ MEDCITIES (network)
<u>SOCIO-ECONOMIC ACTORS</u> ➤ ASCAME-ASSOCIATION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ➤ CEFIC/EUROCHLOR ➤ EOAEN (CHAMBERS GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK ISLANDS) ➤ FID-FEDERATION DES INDUSTRIES DIVERSES(MOROCCO) ➤ RME - RESEAU MEDITERRANNEN DE L'EAU	<u>SOCIO-ECONOMIC ACTORS</u> ➤ AIFM (ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES FORETS MEDITERRANEENNES) ➤ IME (INSTITUT MEDITERRANEEN DE L'EAU) ➤ MEDENER (MEDITERRANEAN ASSOCIATION OF THE NATIONAL AGENCIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION) ➤ EOAEN (CHAMBERS GROUP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK ISLANDS) ➤ FEI-FEDERATION OF EGYPTIAN INDUSTRIES	<u>SOCIO-ECONOMIC ACTORS</u> ➤ ASCAME- ASSOCIATION OF MEDITERRANEAN CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ➤ EDCM/ICC- ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAMBERS OF MONACO ➤ EBA-EGYPTIAN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION ➤ INSULEUR-NETWORK OF THE INSULAR CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION ➤ FEMISE-EURO-MEDITERRANEAN FORUM OF ECONOMIC INSTITUTES
<u>NGOs</u> ➤ MIO-ECSDE -MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION OFFICE FOR ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (network) ➤ ECOMEDITERRANEAN (SPAIN) ➤ WWF ➤ APNEK (TUNISIA) ➤ FIS-FOUNDATION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (MALTA)	<u>NGOs</u> ➤ ENDA MAGHREB (ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT) ➤ MEDWET (MEDITERRANEAN WETLANDS) ➤ WWF ➤ MEDFORUM (MEDITERRANEAN NGO NETWORK FOR ECOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT) ➤ MEDCOAST (TURKEY)	<u>NGOs</u> ➤ FOE/MEDNET (FRIENDS OF THE EARTH/MEDITERRANEAN NETWORK) ➤ MED FORUM (MEDITERRANEAN NGO NETWORK FOR ECOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT) ➤ ENDA MAGHREB (ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT) ➤ MIO/ECSDE-MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION OFFICE FOR ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT-(network) ➤ RAED-ARAB NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT(network)