UNITED NATIONS

EP

UNEP/MED CC.15/5

UNEP

UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

14 May 2019
Original: English

15th Meeting of the Compliance Committee of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols

Athens, Greece, 25-26 June 2019

Agenda item 4: National Implementation Reports for the Biennium 2014-2015: Status of Reporting, Key Findings, Draft Recommendations and Possible Tools to Improve the Assessment Methodology of National Implementation Reports for the Biennium 2016-2017

Status of Reporting, Key Findings and Draft Recommendations Corresponding to the National Implementation Reports for the Biennium 2014-2015 and Possible Tools to Improve the Assessment Methodology of National Implementation Reports for the Biennium 2016-2017

For environmental and cost-saving reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

UNEP/MAP
Athens, 2019

Note by the Secretariat

1. The 14th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (Athens, Greece, 27-29 June 2018) agreed upon "*Guidelines for the Compliance Committee to consider/review the information submitted on the received national implementation reports for 2014-2015 and provide key findings and recommendations for COP 21*" (UNEP/MED CC.15/4, Annex III). Under the agreed Guidelines, intersessional working arrangements were set up for the Compliance Committee:

(1) to prepare key findings on the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols identifying main difficulties and general non-compliance issues;
(2) to draft recommendations to improve the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols to COP 21; and
(3) to extract analysis/stock-taking/possible tools on how to improve the methodology for the elaboration of the key findings and recommendations in the future, i.e. when the 2016-2017 reports based on the new reporting format will be available.

2. To take this work forward, as a first step, the Updated Synthesis Analysis of the Information Provided in the National Implementation Reports Submitted by Contracting Parties for the Biennium 2014-2015 and the Updated General Status of Progress in the Implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, as tabled at the 14th Meeting of the Compliance Committee, were further updated with the 2014-2015 national implementation reports received by the Secretariat following the 14th Meeting of the Compliance Committee. The further updated documents are presented as information documents UNEP/MED CC.15/Inf.3 and Inf.4 to the present meeting.

3. As tasked under the Guidelines, the Compliance Committee went through the further updated documents intersessionally. In addition, as work dictated, the Compliance Committee held informal stock-taking Skype meetings to check on progress and advance in delivery. The result of this collective work undertaken under the agreed Guidelines is presented in this document, which is structured as follows:

- Section I. It presents information on the status of reporting per legal instrument as of 10 May 2019.
- Section II. It presents in table form per legal instrument:
  (1) key findings, identifying general issues of compliance as well as main difficulties in implementation; and
  (2) draft recommendations to COP 21 to improve the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.
- Section III. It presents possible tools on how to improve the methodology for the elaboration of key findings and recommendations regarding the national implementation reports for the biennium 2016-2017.

4. The Compliance Committee is expected to consider:

a) the status of reporting of the national implementation reports for 2014-2015 and advise accordingly;
b) the key findings on general issues of compliance, including the difficulties identified, as well as the associated draft recommendations, and if appropriate, to agree to forward them to COP 21 for their consideration;
c) the possible methodological tools for improving next assessments and if appropriate, to agree to forward them to COP 21 its consideration

KEY FINDINGS, DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS AND POSSIBLE METHODOLOGICAL TOOLS FOR IMPROVING NEXT ASSESSMENTS

Section I: Status of reporting as of 10 May 2019

1. Under Article 26.1 of the Barcelona Convention: "The Contracting Parties shall transmit to the Organization reports on: (a) the legal, administrative or other measures taken by them for the implementation of this Convention, the Protocols and of the recommendations adopted by their meetings; and (b) the effectiveness of the measures referred to in subparagraph (a) and problems encountered in the implementation of the instruments as mentioned above".

2. Article 26.1 establishes an obligation to report. This sets the basis for the work of the Contracting Parties to keep under review the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols (Article 18 of the Barcelona Convention), and to assess the compliance with the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols as well as the measures and recommendations (Article 27 of the Barcelona Convention).

3. As shown in Annex I, Tables I to VIII, as of 10 May 2019 for the biennium 2014-2015:

a) Barcelona Convention: 17 Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (77% of 22 Contracting Parties) had submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, and 5 Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

b) Dumping Protocol: 14 Contracting Parties to the Dumping Protocol (67% of 21 Contracting Parties) had submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, and 7 Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

c) Prevention and Emergency Protocol:17 Contracting Parties to the Prevention and Emergency Protocol (81% of 21 Contracting Parties) had submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, and 5 Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

d) LBS Protocol: 17 Contracting Parties to the LBS Protocol (77% of 22 Contracting Parties) had submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, and 5 Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

e) SPA/BD Protocol: 19 Contracting Parties to the SPA/BD Protocol (90% of 21 Contracting Parties) had submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, and 3 Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

f) Offshore Protocol: 7 Contracting Parties to the Offshore Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium. As of 10 May 2019, 12 countries had submitted their national implementation reports of the Offshore Protocol for the 2014-2015 biennium. Of these twelve countries, 4 (57% of 7 Contracting Parties) were Contracting Parties to the Offshore Protocol and 8 non-Contracting Parties. Three (3) Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

g) Hazardous Wastes Protocol: 7 Contracting Parties to the Hazardous Wastes Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium. As of 10 May 2019, 12 countries had submitted their national implementation reports of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol for the 2014-2015 biennium. Of these twelve countries, 5 (71% of 7 Contracting Parties) were Contracting Parties to the Hazardous Wastes Protocol and 7 non-Contracting Parties. Two (2) Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet;

h) ICZM Protocol: 9 Contracting Parties to the ICZM Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium. As of 10 May 2019, 12 countries had submitted their national implementation reports of the ICZM Protocol for the 2014-2015 biennium. Of these twelve countries, 7 (77% of 9 Contracting Parties) were Contracting Parties to the ICZM Protocol and 5 non-Contracting Parties. Two (2) Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet.

4. Overall reporting rates have steadily increased since the launching of the Barcelona Convention Reporting System (BCRS) in 2008. For the 2008-2009 biennium, 15 reporting Contracting

Parties submitting their national implementation reports. This figure was raised to 19 reporting Contracting Parties for the 2014-2015 biennium.

5. Following-up on the conclusion of the 14th Meeting of the Compliance Committee Meeting, a letter from the Chair of the Compliance Committee was sent to the MAP Focal Points of Egypt, Libya, Syria and Tunisia, asking those Contracting Parties of the nature of the difficulties encountered in submitting their outstanding national implementation reports in order to look into possible solutions. This action has resulted in: (1) the submission of national implementation reports by Tunisia for the reporting period 2012-2013 and by Egypt for the reporting period 2014-2015, and (2) the confirmation from the remaining Contracting Parties of on-going arrangements to submit their pending implementation reports as soon as possible, i.e. Libya and Syria for 2012- 2013 and 2014-2015, and Tunisia for 2014-2015.

Section II: Key Findings and Draft Recommendations

6. In order to implement the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, Contracting Parties need to put the necessary legislative and policy measures in place, and to establish the corresponding institutional structures to implement them. Promoting compliance with these core elements is key for the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols. These core elements have been examined by the Compliance Committee, on the basis of the Updated Synthesis Analysis (UNEP/MED CC. 15/Inf.3) and the Updated General Status of Progress (UNEP/MED CC. 15/Inf. 4) prepared by the Secretariat, as well as on the basis of the national implementation reports, as deemed necessary. The result of this collective exercise is the key findings and associated draft recommendations provided herein.

7. Key findings identify general issues affecting the compliance of a number of reporting Contracting Parties with respect to their obligations under the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, as well as main difficulties in implementation. In drafting the key findings, the focus has been put on those issues reflecting a low level of implementation among reporting Contracting Parties. Draft recommendations aim at improving the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.

8. The key findings and associated draft recommendations presented below should be understood within the limitations which arise from the fact that not all Contracting Parties have submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium; the limited number of Contracting Parties to some Protocols, and additionally, the difference in the amount of information submitted by Contracting Parties in their national implementation reports.

Reporting for the biennium 2014-2015

9. National implementation reports for the biennium 2014-2015 are still pending from some Contracting Parties. Taking into account that the submission of national implementation reports is a legally binding requirement for Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols and enables Contracting Parties to promote compliance and effective implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, the following draft recommendations are presented for consideration of the Compliance Committee, as detailed in the table below.

Reporting under Article 26 of the Barcelona Convention	
Key findings	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols for the Compliance Committee to consider
National implementation reports of the Barcelona Convention and/or its Protocols are still pending from some Contracting Parties for the biennium 2014-2015	The non-submission of national implementation reports under Article 26 of the Barcelona Convention for more than two

	consecutive biennia[1] should lead the Compliance Committee on a case-by-case basis and within its mandate: (a) in a first phase, to take action through a request of information to the concerned Contracting Parties to provide information on the difficulties that have hampered the submission of their outstanding national implementation reports. The request should not amount to an identification of non-compliance and draw the attention of the concerned Contracting Parties on the need to respond within a precise deadline; (b) in a second phase, based on the information provided by the concerned Contracting Parties to the request of information, to either closing the ongoing procedures or triggering the compliance mechanism leading to the consideration of the measures laid down in Section VII of the Procedures and Mechanisms of Compliance.
A limited number of countries have ratified the Offshore, Hazardous Wastes and ICZM Protocols.	Capacity-building activities should be explored by the Secretariat: (a) to further increase the submission rate of national implementation reports to achieve 100% submission. This could include for example the development of e-learning modules on the use of the online Barcelona Convention Reporting System (BCRS) (b) to enable universal ratification of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.

Barcelona Convention

10. In general, as reflected in the Updated Synthesis Analysis and the Updated General Status of Progress, the status of compliance with the Barcelona Convention is high, with the core legal and institutional arrangements needed for the implementation of the Barcelona Convention reported to be in place in the majority of the reporting Contracting Parties.

11. To promote further compliance with and effective implementation of the Barcelona Convention, the following draft recommendations are put forward for consideration of the Compliance Committee, as detailed in the table below. Draft recommendations are associated with key findings, which for the purpose of this exercise touch upon areas where at least three reporting Contracting Parties out of those reporting did not implement the requirements of the Barcelona Convention, as shown in the Updated General Status of Progress, which provides information on the overall status of implementation of the Barcelona Convention in 27 areas:

Barcelona Convention *22 Contracting Parties/17 reporting Contracting Parties/5 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the Barcelona Convention, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the Barcelona Convention for the Compliance Committee to consider
Mechanisms of cooperation in transboundary EIAs: Article 4.3.c and d • 7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not yet adopted a legal framework for notification, exchange of information and	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to establish cooperation mechanisms in cases of transboundary EIAs by adopting the required legal framework and setting the corresponding institutional arrangements.

[1] Note from the Secretariat: At its 87th Meeting (Athens, Greece, 6-7 November 2018), the Bureau recommended that "the Compliance Committee develops a mechanism under which the non-submission of national implementation reports under Article 26 of the Barcelona Convention for more than two consecutive biennia will be construed as a situation of non-compliance, leading to the consideration by the Compliance Committee of the measures laid down in Section VII of the Procedures and Mechanisms of Compliance" (UNEP/MED BUR 87/7 §47.b)

consultation among the parties concerned, when environmental impact assessment (EIA) is undertaken in a transboundary context. • 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not yet set up the institutional structures to conduct EIAs or implement the notification process in case of transboundary EIAs	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to promote coordinated bilateral or multilateral cooperation among the relevant national authorities when EIAs are undertaken in a transboundary context
Public participation in final environmental decision-making: Article 15 7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not implemented a legal framework to allow for public participation in the process of authorization of proposed activities likely to cause damage to the marine environment and its coastal areas	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to establish the required legal framework to ensure public participation in the final decision-making process for authorization of activities likely to cause damage to the coastal and marine environment. To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to promote the sharing of experience and good practices among them in order to reinforce public participation in decision-making
Use of economic instruments: Article 4.3.b • 7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not adopted in their legal and policy frameworks economic instruments such as taxes, fees, funds, charges, with the aim of promoting the protection of the marine environment, its coastal areas and biodiversity conservation. • 3 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not established the institutional structures to implement the polluter pays principle	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to put in place the legal framework and institutional structures needed for the application of economic instruments for the protection of the marine and coastal environment. To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to promote the sharing of information and experience among them to enhance the use of economic instruments in the Mediterranean region.
ICZM: Article 4.3.e • 3 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not yet integrated ICZM principles into their legal and policy frameworks. • 6 reporting Contracting Parties out of 16 have yet to integrate ICZM into their physical plans for the coastal zone. • 4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not yet developed the institutional structures required for applying ICZM work at national, regional or local level.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to integrate ICZM into the physical planning of their coastal zone. To invite the Priority Actions Programme/Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC) to explore how best Contracting Parties could be assisted in this field.
Public access to information: Article 15 • 4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not yet carried out measures for public access to information related to activities carried out to implement the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols. • 3 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 did not publish periodical assessment reports and data on the state of the marine environment and their coastal areas. Also 3 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 did not make available to the public environmental data on the state of the environment and their coastal area.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to adopt measures to ensure public access to information related to activities carried out to implement the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols.
Monitoring: Article 12 4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have not established institutional structures and have not put in place programmes for monitoring marine pollution	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to establish the legal framework and institutional structures for monitoring marine pollution.

	To request the Secretariat to continue to promote and enhance regional approaches to support harmonized implementation of monitoring programmes in the Mediterranean region.
Challenges with implementation Reported key challenges with implementation are: • administrative management (11 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17); • financial resources (10 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17) and • technical capabilities (8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17)	To request the Secretariat to explore capacity building activities to assist Contracting Parties in addressing the challenges reported.

Dumping Protocol

12. In general, as reflected in the Updated Synthesis Analysis and the Updated General Status of Progress, the compliance status of reporting legal measures is at a high level. Nearly all reporting Contracting Parties have provided in their national implementation reports details on their laws, regulations and administrative provisions put in place to implement the Dumping Protocol.

13. To enhance compliance with and effective implementation of the Dumping Protocol, the following draft recommendations are put forward for consideration of the Compliance Committee, as detailed in the table below. Draft recommendations address the key findings identified regarding the implementation of the Dumping Protocol. For the purpose of this exercise, in formulating key findings 50% or less than 50% of reporting Contracting Parties were deemed as a large number of Contracting Parties in terms of identifying general issues of compliance, as shown in the Updated General Status of Progress, which provides information on the overall status of implementation of the Dumping Protocol in 14 areas.

Dumping Protocol *21 Contracting Parties/14 reporting Contracting Parties/7 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the Dumping Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the Dumping Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider
Dumping permits and monitoring data: Articles 6 and 14.2 8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 14 have not submitted data on dumping at sea permits and quantities and 12 reporting Contracting Parties out of 14 have not submitted monitoring data.	To enhance data collection and analysis, building the capacity of Contracting Parties may be required. This could take the form of regional trainings, webinar sessions, or informal in-session events to share experiences and lessons learned in collaboration with other MEAs. The Secretariat is requested to explore this avenue.
Implementation of Guidelines adopted for wastes or other matter listed in Article 4.2: Article 6 10 reporting Contracting Parties out of 14 have not provided information on whether in evaluating applications for dumping of wastes or other matter listed in Article 4.2 the corresponding Guidelines have been given due consideration	To promote the implementation of the technical Guidelines adopted under the Dumping Protocol, the development of regional training activities and workshops in collaboration with relevant MEAs may be required. The Secretariat is requested to explore this avenue.
Enforcement and Effectiveness • 9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 13 (not applicable to the EU) have not provided data on enforcement measures	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to report on enforcement and effectiveness. To Secretariat is requested to explore in collaboration with other MEAs activities to build up enforcement

• 10 reporting Contracting Parties out of 13 (not applicable to the EU) have not provided data on effectiveness indicators.	capacities to ensure the effective implementation of the Dumping Protocol. This could take the form of workshops, seminars or training activities.
Challenges in implementation Reported key challenges with implementation are: • administrative management and regulatory framework (9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 14), and • financial resources (8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 14)	To request the Secretariat to explore capacity building activities to assist Contracting Parties in addressing the challenges reported.

Prevention and Emergency Protocol

14. In general, as reflected in the Updated Synthesis Analysis and the Updated General Status of Progress, the compliance status of reporting legal and administrative measures is in a high level. Fifteen reporting Contracting Parties out of 17 have provided information about the legal and administrative measures taken to implement the Prevention and Emergency Protocol. In particular, rates of adoption of national contingency plans and of availability of spill response equipment can be classified in a high level: 14 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17.

15. In terms of draft recommendations for the Compliance Committee to consider, draft recommendations detailed in the table below address the key findings identified regarding the implementation of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol. For the purpose of this exercise, in formulating key findings 50% or less than 50% of reporting Contracting Parties were deemed as a large number of Contracting Parties in terms of identifying general issues of compliance, as shown in the Updated General Status of Progress, which provides information on the overall status of implementation of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol in 36 areas.

Prevention and Emergency Protocol *21 Contracting Parties/17 reporting Contracting Parties/5 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider
Communication of information and reports concerning pollution incidents: Article 8 Only 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 16 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having taken action to overcome the encountered barriers to ensure the reception, transmission and dissemination of reports and urgent information concerning pollution incidents	To ensure that Parties have an effective system of mechanisms and procedures to manage communication between countries and with REMPEC in case of pollution incidents, action in that regard within the REMPEC Regional Strategy for Prevention of and Response to Marine Pollution from Ships (2016-2021) (COP19 Decision IG. 22/4) could be of assistance. To foster the collection of data on pollution incidents, a user friendly and simple online system for reporting should be in place[2]. To encourage Contracting Parties to report pollution incidents under the online Barcelona Convention Reporting System (BCRS)
Reporting Procedure • **Article 9.1:** Only 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 16 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having taken action to address the encountered difficulties hampering its ships and aircrafts to report on actual or potential oil and HNS incidents to the designated	

[2] Note from the Secretariat: The revised reporting format adopted in 2018 by COP20 Decision IG. 23/1 provides a simplified format for the reporting of pollution incidents under the Prevention and Emergency Protocol. This format is online and currently in use for the reporting corresponding to the 2016-2017 reporting period.

national authority or authorities and the nearest Coastal State; Only 4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 16 (not applicable to the EU) have provided information on accidents and spill incidents • **Article 9.6:** Only 4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 16 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having taken action to overcome the barriers faced to transmit the required information to REMPEC in case of pollution incidents • **Article 9.7:** Only 6 reporting Contracting Parties out of 16 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having taken action to address the challenges faced to transmit the required information to those Parties likely to be affected by a pollution incident	
Challenges in implementation Reported key challenges with implementation are: • technical capabilities (8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17); • administrative management (7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17), and • financial resources (6 reporting Contracting Parties out of 17)	To request the Secretariat to explore capacity building activities to assist Contracting Parties in addressing the challenges reported.

LBS Protocol

16. The present assessment of the status of implementation of the LBS Protocol is based on the analysis of the Updated Synthesis Analysis and General Status of Progress documents prepared by the Secretariat and the 2014-2015 national implementation reports of the LBS Protocol submitted by Contracting Parties. It is structured into four parts:

- Part I: It provides a detailed analysis of the status of implementation of the LBS Protocol. In so doing, the information submitted by Contracting Parties in the six sections of the reporting format[3] has been clustered in four areas: (1) legal measures, (2) monitoring, (3) implementation of National Actions Plans (NAPs) and (4) data;
- Part II: It presents key findings on the implementation of the LBS Protocol, identifying main difficulties and general non-compliance issues. In drafting the key findings, additional sources of information[4] other than the national implementation reports have been taken into consideration; and

[3] The reporting format used for the reporting corresponding to the 2014-2015 biennium was adopted by COP15 in 2008 by Decision IG. 17/3 and is divided into six sections: (1) Legal measures, (2) Allocation of resources, (3) Administrative measures, (4) Implementation of NAPs and their effectiveness, (5) Implementation of monitoring programmes and (6) Effectiveness.

[4] See: (1) the revised reporting format for the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols (COP20, IG. Decision IG/23), (2) the Mid-term evaluation of SAP/NAP implementation (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.41/Inf.21), (3) the Strategic Action Programme to Address Pollution from Land Based Activities (SAP-MED) and related National Action Plans (NAP): Implementation Status 2000-2015, (4) the Guidelines for updating National Action Plans (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.404/7, Annex 4), (5) the State of the Mediterranean Marine and Coastal Environment Report (2012), (6) the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) Ministerial declaration on Environment and Climate Change (2014), and (7) the Horizon 2020 initiative (https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en)

- Part III: it provides draft recommendations to COP21 to improve the implementation of the LBS Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider.

Part I: Detailed analysis of the status of implementation of the LBS Protocol

17. Legal Measures. This section covers the first eight questions of the 2008 reporting format for the LBS Protocol, which seek to determine whether legislation is in place to regulate LBS and activities as per the LBS Protocol and whether the institutional arrangements for environmental permitting and compliance monitoring have been set. In particular, information is sought to test whether: (a) legal measures are in place to eliminate LBS pollution, in particular to phase-out POPs taking into account BAT and BET (Article 5.2); (b) legal measures have been adopted to reduce accidental pollution (Article 5.5); (3) discharges and pollutant releases are subject to the required authorization/regulation issued by the competent national authority (Article 6.1); (4) a system of enforcement, including sanctions, is in place (Article 6.2 /3) and (5) measures adopted by the Conferences of the Parties are implemented (Article 7).

18. Questions posed require a “yes”, “no” or “under development” answer. The reporting rate for these eight questions is high, with 84% of the reporting Contracting Parties having answered “yes”. However, an examination of the answers highlights some uncertainties. For instance, when asked whether Contracting Parties have taken legal measures to eliminate LBS pollution, in particular by phasing-out POPs using BAT, BEP and cleaner production, some answered “yes”, though it is indicated that measures in place do not apply to the whole territory or the entire list of POPs. Another example is when asked whether they have taken legal measures to reduce the risk of accidental pollution. Some reporting Contracting Parties have answered “yes”, though the narrative text referring to or describing the adopted measures shows that measures are not of a preventive nature but sanctions after pollution incidents. Finally, when asked whether Contracting Parties have taken measures to implement the LBS Regional Actions Plans (RAPs), several answered “yes” on the basis of having in place bathing criteria, though LBS RAPs have a wider scope.

19. Of particular concern in this context are the frequently reported difficulties/challenges in implementation, in particular regarding the issuance of permits and inspection mechanisms. Difficulties reported in these areas refer to “financial, staff or regulatory problems”, and seem to suggest that legal measures are under development rather than fully in place and that should new legal measures be put in place, insufficient enforcement is an issue.

20. Against this background, the percentage of 84% of the reporting Contracting Parties having answered “yes” to the questions whether the relevant legislation is in place to regulate LBS and activities as per the LBS Protocol and whether the institutional arrangements for environmental permitting and compliance monitoring have been set should be interpreted in light of the limitations above-mentioned.

21. To sum up, the overall level of implementation of the LBS Protocol is high. However, there is room for improvement to fully meet the objectives of the LBS Protocol. Steps in that direction have been taken under the revised reporting format adopted by COP20, whereby Contracting Parties are invited to report on the implementation of more than 40 targets under the LBS RACs for the 2016-2017 biennia.

22. Monitoring. This section covers the six questions of the 2008 reporting format for the LBS Protocol seeking to gather information on whether institutional arrangements are in place for environmental monitoring and the testing of NAPs and SAP effectiveness, as well as on whether compliance and field monitoring (state and trend, biomonitoring and eutrophication) are carried out. Questions posed require a “yes”, “no” or “under development” answer and the reporting rate for these

six questions is high, with 67% of the reporting Contracting Parties having answered "yes" and 23% of them having answered "under development".

23. However, from the analysis of the answers provided it appears that there is a misunderstanding in most of the reporting Contracting Parties when asked whether they have in place institutional arrangements for monitoring coastal pollution levels and for testing the effectiveness of NAPs. It seems that monitoring of coastal pollution levels is confused with monitoring the effectiveness of NAPs. In addition, implementation difficulties of financial or technical nature are quite often reported when it comes to monitoring, suggesting that monitoring is under development rather than fully in place. In this context, the Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Programme of the Mediterranean Sea and Coast (IMAP) takes special importance in promoting and enhancing regional approaches to support harmonized implementation of monitoring in the Mediterranean region.

24. Implementation of NAPs. This section covers those questions of the 2008 reporting format for the LBS Protocol seeking to collect information on the implementation of NAPs to address LBS pollution. Contracting Parties are asked to define their NAP priorities. Most reporting Contracting Parties have done so, with the exception of seven. This information should be put in the context of the new NAPs in place[5]. From the data reported, no clear conclusions could be drawn as regards the implementation of NAPs.

25. Data and statistics. This section covers those questions of the 2008 reporting format for the LBS Protocol aimed at collecting of quantitative information on authorizations for discharge granted, pollutant releases and enforcement measures. Data under these categories comes from half or less than half reporting Contracting Parties and is difficult to interpret. This adds to the fact that leaving tables in blank creates uncertainty over whether this should be interpreted as "unknown value" or "zero value". In short, when it comes to the reporting of data, the quality of the reporting is very low.

Part II: Key findings on the implementation of the LBS Protocol

26. Reporting process and compliance. Reporting rates for the LBS Protocol are good. Seventeen (17) Contracting Parties to the LBS Protocol (77% of 22 Contracting Parties) had submitted their national implementation reports for the 2014-2015 biennium, and 5 Contracting Parties had not submitted them yet (Egypt, Libya, Monaco, Syria and Tunisia). To reach the target of 100% reporting, it could be of help to provide assistance to those Contracting Parties with still outstanding reports.

27. The Compliance Committee has to come to draft recommendations covering two key aspects: implementation of LBS Protocol measures and the effectiveness of these measures. For the Compliance Committee to do so, neither the synthesis analysis nor the general status of progress would suffice. The analysis of the national implementation reports themselves is necessary, as well as of additional information such as environmental assessments, MEDPOL data streams[6], initiatives of regional stakeholders complementary to UNEP-MAP etc. The analysis of additional information is particularly important, as the quantitative data submitted in the national implementation reports is limited. This comprehensive analysis would allow to assess the effectiveness of the LBS protocol, i.e. whether good environmental status (GES) has been achieved for the Mediterranean Sea.

28. In addition, the period from the time of the synthesis analysis of the national implementation reports is tabled at the Compliance Committee until the Compliance Committee draft its recommendations to COP should be shortened. Long periods, as it is case now with the 2014-2015

[5] To further elaborate the present assessment, it would be advisable the Compliance Committee to have access from MEDPOL to the NAPs, in order to understand the methodological differences behind the NAPs from EU and non-EU countries.

[6] MEDPOL "*National Baseline Budget*" (NBB) or the "*European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register*" (E-PRTR). Data and reporting timing under NBB and E-PRTR are not the same as under the BCRS.

national implementation reports[7], limit somehow the corrective actions that the Compliance Committee may recommend.

29. Quality of the reports. The 2008 reporting format for the LBS Protocol is made of two types of questions in order to gather both non-quantitative and quantitative information. The first type is about the implementation of measures as required by the LBS Protocol. Questions so posed require a "yes", "no" or "under development" answer. The second type is about quantification of impacts and this requires data to be provided by filling out detailed tables.

30. The quality of the national implementation reports of the LBS Protocol should be significantly improved in the following two areas:

a) Questions gathering non-quantitative information: questions testing whether legislative measures have been put in place as required by the LBS Protocol should be formulated clearly and precisely to avoid uncertainty. The rule should be to introduce one content in one question. As pointed out, the question whether Contracting Parties have taken legal measures to eliminate LBS pollution, in particular by phasing-out POPs using BAT, BEP and cleaner production cannot be answered by "yes", "no" or "under development" given its comprehensive nature. Some countries having taken measures addressing some POPs may answer "yes" while others may answer "no" on the basis of having draft measures to address the remaining POPs in the future. In addition, some questions would benefit for further elaboration of their minimal content. For instance, when asked Contracting Parties whether they have implemented programmes of "state and trend monitoring", some countries may answer "yes" even though their monitoring programme is very limited in scope (e.g. a sample every two years with analysis of a few parameters), while other may answer "no" on the thinking that this implies monthly samplings per pollution hot spots with analysis of all substances. To add, the difficulties or challenges that reporting Contracting Parties report are of a very general nature ("financial", "administrative", etc.) and do not help to actually understand the situation;

b) Questions gathering quantitative information (data): As already noted, the weakest point of LBS reporting is the submission of data (i.e. authorizations for discharge granted, pollutant releases and enforcement measures). This set of data allows to verify that the regulatory system in place is effective at meeting the LBS Protocol objectives. In other words, to assess effectiveness at reducing LBS pollution and of the national implementing legislation, information on national legislation should go hand in hand with data on authorization permits and monitoring. Otherwise, the picture would be incomplete. It is worth noting that the Secretariat through the Regional Activities Centers and the European Environment Agency through the SEIS project are setting in place methodologies, IT tools and capacity building activities to enhance the collection of data [8].

[7] Note from the Secretariat: The synthesis analysis of the 2014-2015 national implementation reports was presented at the 13th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (UNEP(DEPI)/MED CC. 13/7) (Athens, Greece, 26-27 September 2017) together with the 2014-2015 general status of progress in implementation (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG. 443/Inf.11). Tight time constraints prevented the meeting from analyzing the two documents. The meeting agreed the Secretariat to update both documents for consideration and action to take by the 14th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (UNEP(DEPI)/MED CC.13/12). As requested the documents were updated and tabled at that meeting (Athens, 27-29 June 2018), where the meeting agreed on the "*Guidelines for the Compliance Committee to consider/review the information submitted on the received national implementation reports for 2014-2015 and provide key findings and recommendations for COP 21*" (UNEP/MED CC.15/4, Annex III). For the 2016-2017 national implementation reports, the deadline for submission as agreed by COP 20 was December 2018. However, as of today countries are still submitting their national implementation reports through the new Barcelona Convention Reporting System.

[8] In particular, work is ongoing in MED POL to streamline the "*National Baseline Budget*" (NBB) and the "*European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register*" (E-PRTR). In addition, the new revised reporting format

31. Quality of LBS Protocol implementation: As already pointed out, from the analysis of the national implementation reports and additional information, it emerges that national legislation is in place to regulate LBS and activities as per the LBS Protocol as well as the institutional arrangements for environmental permitting and compliance monitoring[9]. This is an achievement in the Mediterranean Sea Area. However, there is room for improvement. In particular: (a) the adoption of sustainable development goals and indicators worldwide should lead to more precise targets and monitoring in the Mediterranean region; and (b) all pollution hot spots need to be addressed.

32. In the present assessment, attention should be brought to the 1997 the Strategic Action Plan to reduce pollution in the Mediterranean by 2025 (SAP MED)[10]. It is worth noting that some SAP Med priorities and targets have been translated into LBS Regional Action Plans (RAPs) and a number of NAPs for the period 2000-2015. However as regards NAPs, the assessment carried out in 2015 of the status of implementation of SAP MED and related NAPs[11] showed that some of the SAP MED intermediate targets were not met through NAPs. This should lead to the amendment of the SAP MED, given the fact that SAP MED would be the basis for the 2015-2025 NAPs.

Part III: Recommendations to COP21 to improve the implementation of the LBS Protocol

33. Recommendation 1: Strengthening the assessment process of the national implementation reports of the LBS Protocol in MEDPOL. Once national implementation reports of the LBS Protocol are submitted, MEDPOL should strengthen the process of analyzing the information provided by Contracting Parties. On that basis, the meeting should discuss with the concerned Contracting Parties the difficulties hampering the submission of national implementation reports, seek from them further information or clarification in case of incomplete or ambiguous reports, and identify concrete actions to overcome difficulties in submission and/or implementation. The meeting would be also an opportunity to harmonize reporting under the LBS Protocol with reporting under the rest of the Protocols.

34. Recommendation 2: To provide support to the countries to improve the content of the national implementation reports corresponding to the 2016-2017 period, within available resources, using the adopted new reporting format.

a) To enhance the submission of data as well as to avoid any uncertainty when interpreting quantitative information the following actions can be taken: (i) to encourage Contracting Parties to provide “NIL reports” i.e. to fill out the tables with “zero”, “not concerned” or “not available” instead of leaving fields blank; (ii) to disseminate “data identity cards” developed under the SEIS Project, and (iii) to explore whether and how data from the European Environment Agency information system can be extracted;

b) As noted about the 2014-2015 national implementation reports, a closer look to the responses submitted by reporting Contracting Parties left the impression that Parties understood certain questions in different ways. To avoid any misunderstanding leading to ambiguous and inconsistent responses, the Secretariat should provide clarification of the relevant questions of the new reporting format. For example, the question whether Contracting Parties have taken legal measures to eliminate LBS pollution, in particular by phasing-out POPs using BAT, BEP

gives to those Contracting Parties which have submitted their data via NBB or E-PRTR the opportunity to indicate so in the report, avoiding then the duplication of reporting.

[9] In this context, a helping factor has been the work developed under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD)

[10] The SAP Med provides a comprehensive framework for countries to act, by setting regional targets and objectives. Priorities and intermediate targets are set for the period 2000 – 2015, such as depollution investments in cities of more than 100.000 habitants before 2010, and pollution hot spots to tackle.

[11] See the Strategic Action Programme to Address Pollution from Land Based Activities (SAP-MED) and related National Action Plans (NAP): Implementation Status 2000-2015

and cleaner production should be clarified, so that Parties should be invited to specify those substances listed in Annex I (19 categories) for which legal measures have been taken and not and also the BEP or BAT used from Annex IV. Another example is the question on whether resources have been allocated for environmental monitoring and the testing of NAPs effectiveness. Clear distinction should be made between the monitoring of pollution levels (environmental objectives) and the monitoring of NAPs effectiveness (actions objectives). In addition, to achieve 100% implementation, it would also help invite Parties to further elaborate on their difficulties in implementation. Broad categories such as "financial difficulties" are open to interpretation and do not allow for targeted support.

35. Recommendation 3: To continue to support the implementation of updated NAPs. MEDPOL should invite Parties to provide their existing list of depollution investment projects[12], as well as to define their pollution hot spots and sensitive areas following a common methodology, as much as possible, so that there is harmonization between EU and non-EU countries. The Secretariat should provide a map for priority projects and pollution hot spots for the Mediterranean region. This is a key prerequisite for the mid-term NAP evaluation scheduled in 2020.

LBS Protocol *22 Contracting Parties/17 reporting Contracting Parties/5 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the LBS Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the LBS Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider
Reporting process and compliance • 5 Contracting Parties have not yet submitted their national implementation reports. • The Compliance Committee has to come to draft recommendations covering two key aspects: implementation of LBS Protocol measures and the effectiveness of these measures. • The longer the period between the synthesis analysis of the national implementation reports and the drafting of the Compliance Committee recommendations, the more outdated the corrective actions recommended by the Compliance Committee	Recommendation 1: To strengthen the assessment process of the national implementation reports of the LBS Protocol in MEDPOL MEDPOL meetings should strengthen the process of discussing with Parties the difficulties in the submission of national implementation reports, seeking from them further information or clarification in case of incomplete or ambiguous reports, and identifying concrete actions to overcome difficulties in submission and/or implementation In addition: • To reach the target of 100% reporting, to provide assistance to those Contracting Parties with still outstanding reports • For the Compliance Committee to provide a complete assessment of the status of implementation of the LBS Protocol, the analysis of the national implementation reports themselves is necessary, as well as of additional information, including environmental assessments • The period from the time of the synthesis analysis of the national implementation reports is tabled at the Compliance Committee until the Compliance Committee draft its recommendations to COP should be shortened.

[12] See also the H2020 investment projects' subgroup, or Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) 2013 study on investment projects and its corresponding database

Quality of the reports • The reporting rate for those questions gathering non-quantitative information (e.g. legal measures, monitoring) is high. However, from the analysis of the answers provided by reporting Contracting Parties it seems that there are some uncertainties arising from the formulation of the questions • The reporting rate for those questions gathering quantitative information (e.g. authorizations for discharge granted, pollutant releases and enforcement measures) is low, coming from half or less than haft reporting Contracting Parties.	Recommendation 2: To provide support to the countries to improve the content of the national implementation reports corresponding to the 2016-2017 period, within available resources, using the adopted new reporting format. Questions gathering non-quantitative information in the reporting format should be formulated clearly and precisely to avoid any misunderstanding leading to ambiguous or inconsistent responses. The Secretariat should provide the clarification needed of the relevant questions of the new reporting format and invite Contracting Parties to further elaborate on their difficulties in implementation. To enhance the submission of data and avoid any uncertainty when interpreting data submitted the following actions can be taken: (1) to encourage Contracting Parties to provide "NIL reports", (2) to disseminate "data identity cards" developed under the SEIS Project, and (3) to explore whether and how relevant data from the European Environment Agency information system can be extracted
Quality of LBS Protocol implementation There is room for improvement in this area by adopting more precise targets and monitoring in the Mediterranean region; and tackling all pollution hot spots	Recommendation 3: To continue to support the implementation of updated NAPs. MEDPOL should invite Parties to provide their existing list of depollution investment projects as well as to define their pollution hot spots. The Secretariat should provide a map for priority projects and pollution hot spots for the Mediterranean region.

SPA/BD Protocol

36. In general, as reflected in the Updated Synthesis Analysis and the Updated General Status of Progress, all reporting Contracting Parties have reported having put in the place the legal framework for the protection of areas of particular natural or cultural value, notably by the establishment of Specially Protected Areas (SPAs) and the protection of endangered or threatened species of flora and fauna, as required in Article 3 of the SPA/BD Protocol.

37. A closer look at the responses submitted by reporting Contracting Parties shows that there is however room from improvement in a number of areas in order to enhance compliance with and implementation of the SPA/BD Protocol. To this end, the draft recommendations below are put forward for the consideration of the Compliance Committee. They address key findings identified regarding the implementation of the SPA/BP Protocol, which for the purpose of this assessment exercise address areas where at least 50% or less than 50% of reporting Contracting Parties did not implement the requirements of the SPA/BD Protocol, as shown in the Updated General Status of Progress, which provides information on the overall status of implementation of the SPA/BD Protocol in 86 areas.

SPA/BD Protocol *21 Contracting Parties/19 reporting Contracting Parties/3 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the SPA/BD Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the SPA/BD Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider

Planning and management: Article 7 • **Article 7.2.a:** Only 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 18 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having developed management plans for all their SPAs. Challenges in this area are identified, ranging from public participation to technical difficulties. • **Article 7.2.b:** 12 reporting Contracting Parties out of 18 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having developed programmes in their SPAs for the observation and scientific monitoring of changes in ecosystems and on the impact of human activities. • **Article 7.2.c:** 9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 18 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having adopting measures to assist local inhabitants who may be affected by the establishment of SPAs.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to continue with the identification and establishment of SPAs and candidate SPAMIs, as well as: (1) to develop management plans for all their SPAs, (2) to establish scientific monitoring programmes to track changes in their SPAs, and (3) to adopt measures to compensate local inhabitants affected by the establishment of SPAs. The support of RAC/SPA is key in addressing the reported challenges faced by reporting Contracting Parties when developing management actions plans for their SPAs.
Establishment of the List of SPAMIs: Article 8 8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 18 (not applicable to the EU) have reported having established SPAMIs.	
National measures for the protection and conservation of species: Article 11 • **Article 11.6:** 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having developed ex-situ reproduction programmes addressing the conservation of protected species. • **Article 11.4:** 10 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having established multilateral cooperation arrangements for the protection of migrant species.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to develop ex-situ reproduction programmes addressing the conservation of protected species and establish multilateral cooperation for the protection of migrant species in the Mediterranean area.
Conservation of the components of marine and coastal diversity: Article 3.3 9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having inventoried the components of marine and coastal biodiversity.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to proceed with the inventory of the components of marine and coastal biodiversity.
Enforcement measures Very low level of reporting on enforcement measures (i.e. inspections conducted, non-compliance cases detected, fines issued) to implement Articles 6 and 11.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to report on enforcement measures.
Regional Action Plans • **RAP on Cartilaginous Fishes** Only a reporting Contracting Party out of 19 has reported having developed training programmes on cartilaginous fishes. 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having developed specific programmes for the protection and conservation of cartilaginous fishes in the context of FAO.	To enhance the implementation of the RAPs adopted under the SPA/BD Protocol, the Contracting Parties concerned are urged: RAP on Cartilaginous Fishes: to develop specific conservation programmes in the context of the FAO International Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks, and training programmes on cartilaginous fishes.
• **RAP on the Introduction of Non-Indigenous Species**	RAP on the Introduction of Non-Indigenous Species: (1) to develop actions plans to control the introduction of non-native marine species, (2) to monitor and

Only a reporting Contracting Party out of 19 has reported having set up an action plan to control the introduction of non-native marine species 6 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having in place mechanisms to monitor and control ballast water discharges into their territorial waters. 7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reporting having developed awareness raising programmes.	control ballast water discharges into their territorial waters, and (3) to develop awareness raising programmes to control the introduction of non-native marine species.
• **RAP for the Conservation of Bird Species** 9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having put in place actions plans for the protection of the bird species listed in Annex II to the SPA/BD Protocol.	RAP for the Conservation of Bird Species: to develop action plans for the protection of the bird species listed in Annex II to the SPA/BD Protocol.
• **RAP for the Conservation of Cetaceans** 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having developed action plans for the conservation of cetaceans. 9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having established either MPAs or SPAMIs for the protection of cetaceans.	RAP for the Conservation of Cetaceans: to develop action plans for the conservation of cetaceans and designate MPAs or SPAMIs for their protection.
• **RAP for the Conservation of Marine Vegetation** Only a reporting Contracting Party out of 19 has reported having developed an action plan for the conservation of marine vegetation. 11 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having established MPAs for protection of marine vegetation. 10 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having conducted studies and scientific research to inventory and map marine vegetation.	RAP for the Conservation of Marine Vegetation: (1) to develop action plans for the conservation of marine vegetation, (2) to establish MPAs for the protection of marine vegetation significant to the marine environment, and (3) to conduct studies and scientific research to inventory and map marine vegetation formations that are natural monuments.
• **RAP for the Conservation of the Monk Seal** 6 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reporting having established protected areas for the conservation of monk seal populations.	RAP for the Conservation of the Monk Seal: to establish protected areas for the conservation of monk seal populations, if deemed appropriate.
• **RAP for the Conservation of Marine Turtles** 8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having taken measures to reduce the incidental by-catch of marine turtles 8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 19 have reported having adopted action plans for the conservation of marine turtles and inventoried turtle nesting beaches.	RAP for the Conservation of Marine Turtles: (1) to establish measures to reduce the incidental by-catch of marine turtles, (2) to adopt action plans for the conservation of marine turtles, and (3) to carry out inventories of turtle nesting beaches.
Challenges in implementation Policy framework, regulatory framework, financial resources, administrative management, technical	To request the Secretariat to explore capacity building activities to assist Contracting Parties in addressing the challenges reported.

capabilities and public participation are the challenges in implementation reported.	

Hazardous Wastes Protocol

38. In assessing the degree of implementation of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol, the following elements have been assessed as presented in the Updated Synthesis Analysis and General Status of Progress documents prepared by the Secretariat. On that basis, key findings and associated draft recommendations have been formulated in those areas where at least four reporting Contracting Parties out of those reporting did not implement the requirements of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol, as shown in the Updated General Status of Progress, which provides information on the overall status of implementation of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol in 17 areas.

Hazardous Wastes Protocol *7 Contracting Parties/12 reporting Contracting Parties/2 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider
Number of Contracting Parties to the Protocol: 7 out of the 22 Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention **Number of Contracting Parties to the Protocol which have submitted their national implementation reports**: 5	To increase both the number of Contracting Parties to the Hazardous Wastes Protocol and the rates of national reporting, it is recommended: (a) MEDPOL National Focal Points to hold discussion on reporting requirements under the Hazardous Waste Protocol (Skype, Conference calls); (b) The Secretariat to organize informative side-events or side-session on the Hazardous Wastes Protocol enabling Parties to exchange experiences and good practices and replicate the success (c) To develop a set of indicators measuring progress in implementation
Transboundary movement and notification procedures: Article 6 8 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have reported having put in place the notification procedure for the transboundary movement of wastes	In collaboration with other MEAs, the Secretariat to explore how to promote coordination and cooperation among Contracting Parties concerning the notification procedure for the transboundary movement of wastes
Transboundary Movement and Notification Procedures: Article 6 **Information and Participation of the Public: Article 12** 5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have reported having established the institutional arrangements needed to implement Articles 6 and 12 of the Protocol.	In collaboration with other MEAs, the Secretariat to explore how to strengthen institutional arrangements among Contracting Parties in the fields of notification procedures, enforcement and public participation
Enforcement: Articles 5.5 and 9 6 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have reported having established the institutional arrangements needed to implement Articles 5.5 and 9 of the Protocol.	
Provision of data: Articles 5, 6 and 8.2 Limited data submitted on the generation of hazardous wastes and other wastes, the	To enhance data collection, building the capacity of Contracting Parties in collaboration with other MEAs

transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and disposals that did not proceed as intended	could be of help. The Secretariat is requested to explore this avenue
Enforcement and effectiveness Limited data submitted as regards enforcement and effectiveness	In collaboration with other MEAs, the Secretariat is requested to explore activities to build up enforcement capacities
Challenges in implementation Reported key challenges with implementation are: • administrative management (4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12), and • technical capabilities and financial resources (3 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12)	To request the Secretariat to explore capacity building activities to assist Contracting Parties in addressing the challenges reported

Offshore Protocol

39. In formulating the key findings and associated draft recommendations corresponding to the Offshore Protocol, the Updated Synthesis Analysis and the Updated General Status of Progress have been considered as well as the national implementation reports submitted by Contracting Parties. The following four elements have been assessed as below to determine whether Contracting Parties have put the required legislative measures in place, established institutional arrangements to implement them, provided technical data which allows verification of compliance with the Offshore Protocol and set up enforcement mechanisms for the effective implementation of the Offshore Protocol.

a) Part I: Establishing an appropriate legal framework: Most reporting Contracting Parties have reported having put in place the required national legal framework to regulate offshore activities, as follows:
   (i) Articles 4 and 8: All reporting Contracting Parties have enacted legal frameworks for prior authorization of offshore activities and the use of Best Available Technology (BAT)/Best Environmental Practices (BEP);
   (ii) Article 9: Most reporting Contracting Parties have enacted legal frameworks for the prohibition of HNS discharges listed in Annex I to the Protocol (10 out of 12)
   (iii) Articles 9, 12 and 21: majority of reporting Contracting Parties have enacted legal frameworks for the prohibition of discharges of plastics (9 out of 12), issuance of special permits for HNS discharges listed in Annex II to the Protocol (7 out of 12), issuance of general permits for HNS discharges not listed in Annexes I and II to the Protocol (7 out of 12), and disposal of food wastes (7 out of 12) and measures to prevent, abate, combat and control pollution from offshore activities in SPA (7 out of 12);

b) Part II: Putting in place appropriate institutional arrangements: Only about a half of the reporting Contracting Parties have put in place the institutional structures required for:
   (i) the authorization/permitting system under Articles 4 and 6 (6 out of 11) (not applicable to the EU)
   (ii) the safety measures under Article 15 (6 out of 11) (not applicable to the EU)
   (iii) environmental and compliance monitoring under Article 19 (6 out of 11) (not applicable to the EU)
   (iv) removal of abandoned or disused installations under Article 20 (5 out of 11) (not applicable to the EU)

c) Part III: Data on authorizations/permits issued: Only 2 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have provided data on authorizations and permits granted during the 2014-2015 biennium. None of the reporting Contracting Parties have provided data on disposal of offshore installations during the 2014-2015 biennium, without indicating whether the lack of information was due to the fact that no disposal of offshore installations was authorized during the 2014-2015 biennium.

d) Part IV: Enforcement measures (i.e. inspections, non-compliance cases, fines issued, suspensions of permits, etc.): Only 2 reporting Contracting Parties out of 11 (not applicable to the EU) have provided information on inspections.

e) Challenges in implementation: The following key challenges are reported when it comes to implementation of the Offshore Protocol: regulatory framework and administrative management and technical capabilities together with policy framework. Capacity building activities should be explored to assist in addressing these challenges.

40. There are signs of deficient levels of compliance with regard to Parts II, III, and IV of the national reports presented. The weakest level of compliance, as reflected in the national reports, affects the provision of data on 1) authorizations and permits for offshore activities, 2) the removal of disused installations, and 3) inspections and enforcement measures eventually adopted. This should be considered as a possible case of non-compliance.

41. The Compliance Committee should recommend to the Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols to give a strong warning to the concerned Contracting Parties to the Offshore Protocol:

a) On the need to comply with the obligation to send their national implementation reports;
b) On the need to provide data on authorizations and permits for offshore activities, the removal of disused installations and inspections and enforcement measures eventually adopted;
c) On the need to comply with other important obligations such as those concerning the disposal of waste food as far as possible from land, the prohibition of disposal of plastics and to prevent pollution in specially protected areas.

42. Several Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention which conduct offshore activities in the Mediterranean are not Parties to the Offshore Protocol and therefore do not report on such activities. It would be advisable that the Secretariat identifies whose are such Contracting Parties and produces an informative document for consideration by the Compliance Committee.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Offshore Protocol
7 Contracting Parties/12 reporting Contracting Parties/3 non-reporting Contracting Parties</th></tr>
<tr><th>Key findings
on the implementation of the Offshore Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues</th><th>Draft Recommendations to COP21
to improve the implementation of the Offshore Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider</th></tr>
<tr><td>Grating of authorizations: Article 6
Only 2 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have provided data on offshore authorizations and permits</td><td rowspan="3">To give a strong warning to the Contracting Parties concerned on the need to provide data on authorizations and permits for offshore activities, the removal of disused installations and inspections and enforcement measures eventually adopted
To enhance data collection and analysis, building the capacity of Contracting Parties could be of assistance within the framework of the Mediterranean Offshore Action Plan (COP19 Decision IG.22/3). The Secretariat is requested to explore this avenue.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Removal of installations: Article 20
None of the reporting Contracting Parties have provided data on the removal of abandoned or disused offshore installations</td></tr>
<tr><td>Enforcement measures
Only 2 reporting Contracting Parties out of 11 (not applicable to the EU) have provided information on inspections.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Garbage: Article 12
• 7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have enacted legal frameworks for the disposal of food wastes as far as possible from land</td><td>To give a strong warning to the Contracting Parties concerned on the need to comply with the obligations concerning the disposal of waste food as far as</td></tr>
</table>

• 9 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have enacted legal frameworks for the prohibition of discharges of plastics	possible from land, the prohibition of disposal of plastics and to prevent pollution in specially protected areas.
Specially Protected Areas: Article 21 7 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12 have reported having put in place measures to prevent, abate, combat and control pollution from offshore activities in SPA	
Challenges in implementation Reported key challenges with implementation are: • regulatory framework (5 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12); • administrative management (4 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12), and • technical capabilities and policy framework (3 reporting Contracting Parties out of 12)	To request the Secretariat to explore capacity building activities to assist Contracting Parties in addressing the challenges reported.

ICZM Protocol

43. The key findings and associated draft recommendations presented below for the consideration of the Compliance Committee have been prepared on the basis of the analysis of the Updated Synthesis Analysis and General Status of Progress documents prepared by the Secretariat and the 2014-2015 national implementation reports of the ICZM Protocol submitted by reporting Contracting Parties. In so doing, the operational measures reported to be in place by reporting Contracting Parties have been analysed.

44. Key findings identify general issues affecting compliance with the ICZM Protocol. These range from the enforcement of setback zones as non-building zones, to the development of measures for the protection and accessibility of underwater sites of the cultural heritage to the adoption of economic and financial instruments to support ICZM implementation. Associated draft recommendations refer to specific actions to be taken by the Contracting Parties concerned to address key findings identified, with the overall aim to enhancing the implementation of the ICZM Protocol.

ICZM Protocol *9 Contracting Parties/12 reporting Contracting Parties/2 non-reporting Contracting Parties*	
Key findings on the implementation of the ICZM Protocol, including identification of main difficulties and general non- compliance issues	**Draft Recommendations to COP21** to improve the implementation of the ICZM Protocol for the Compliance Committee to consider
Protection and sustainable use of the coastal zone and setback zone: Article 8 Setback zones enforcement remains a challenge.	To recommend to the Contracting Parties concerned to enforce the provision on the setback zones as non-building zones may exceeding the Protocol's 100 metres, in particular as regard as factors such as natural risk and climate change, and the need to protect natural and landscape heritage.
Economic activities: Article 9 The use of indicators to evaluate economic impacts on the coastal zone is limited with very little comprehensive activity in this field.	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to define in national legislation specific economic indicators relating to the sustainable use of the coastal zone.
Specific Coastal Ecosystems: Article 10 Few reporting Contracting Parties have yet taken positive measures to restore and reactivate the	To urge the Contracting Parties concerned to take measures to protect the characteristics of certain specific coastal ecosystems, in particular to restore and

positive role of coastal wetlands (there is room for progress regarding compensation measures) and islands.	reactivate the positive role in coastal environmental processes of coastal wetlands, estuaries, and islands.
Coastal landscapes: Article 11 Specific measures for coastal landscape are still scarce, and landscape protection is generally built on broader landscape protection measures.	To recommend to the Contracting Parties concerned to adopt specific measures for coastal landscape protection.
Cultural Heritage: Article 13 The protection and accessibility of underwater sites is still underdeveloped.	To recommend to the Contracting Parties concerned to adopt measures for the protection and accessibility of underwater sites of the cultural heritage.
Participation: Article 14 There is considerable scope for improvement in this field.	None
Awareness Raising, Training, Education and Research: Article 15 There is a lack of actions, but as well of visibility of the actions, at the regional and local levels. There are relatively few dedicated ICZM centres, but many operating in related fields dealing with the subject. There is a continued need for networking research activity.	To recommend to the Contracting Parties concerned to implement the participatory processes in the ICZM field, as well as actions and their visibility on awareness raising, training, education and research initiatives and programmes, increasing and improving dedicated ICZM centres and networking research activity, and establishing a unique national coastal inventory on resources and activities, as well as on institutions, legislation and planning that may influence coastal zones.
Monitoring and Review: Article 16 There appears to be little focus on the coastal zones, and there is a lack of unique coastal inventory, both at national and local level.	
National Coastal Strategies, Plans and Programmes, Transboundary Cooperation: Article 18 It seems that a common methodology for interpreting the nature or undertaking the assessments of the use and management of the coast is missing. This may be an area for further development.	None
Environmental Assessment: Article 19 There is a potential for improved guidance on this subject, particularly on its applicability to the coastal zone.	To recommend to the Contracting Parties concerned to improve Environmental Assessment, in particular EIA and SEA in the coastal zone, as well as in the transboundary context.
Transboundary Environmental Assessment: Article 29 Most of the reporting Contracting Parties point out a lack of joint approach to protection and management of continuous coastal zones. 4 reporting Contracting Parties are reporting partial transboundary cooperation, 1 answered “yes” and 1 “no”.	
Economic, Financial and Fiscal Instruments: Article 21 Only a small minority of reporting Contracting Parties indicate the use of economic or financial instruments to support ICZM.	To recommend to the Contracting Parties concerned to take appropriate measures to adopt relevant economic, financial and/or fiscal instruments intended to support local, regional and national initiatives for the integrated management of coastal zones.
Exchange of Information and Activities of Common Interest: Article 27	None

There is a lack of evaluation the effectivity of the ICZM principles implementation, and their effectiveness.	

Section III: Possible methodological tools for improving next assessments

45. The paragraphs below suggest possible tools and ways to improve the methodology for the elaboration of key findings and recommendations regarding the national implementation reports for the biennium 2016-2017.

a) Synthesis Analysis and General Status of Progress:
   (i) These two documents have proved very useful in conducting the current exercise of identifying key finding and associated recommendations. The way of summarizing information in the General Status of Progress has been of particular help, by providing the general picture question by question of the reporting format and drawing overall conclusions. To further enrich the picture, the General Status of Progress should name Parties. For instance, if reported that some reporting Contracting Parties have developed protected areas for the conservation of monk seas populations, those Parties should be identified as well as those that have not done so, specifying in which ones the status of implementation is "no", "under development" or "not applicable", as well as which Parties have left the question in blank. The formula would read as follows: "XX [name the Parties] reporting Contracting Parties have reported having (…). XX [name the Parties] have reported "no", XX [name the Parties] have reported "under development" and XX [name the Parties] have reported "not applicable'. XX [name the Parties] have left this question in blank". By having this information, the Compliance Committee will be provided with a reinforced basis for elaborating key findings and recommendations in future and for recommending remedial and supporting action;
   (ii) For the sake of simplification, it is advisable for the Secretariat to merge the two currently produced documents, the Synthesis Analysis and the General Status of Progress into a single document encompassing both aspects of the review;
   (iii) Both the Synthesis Analysis and the General Status of Progress would benefit from clarification on the methodology, including the criteria used in summarising the information.

b) Elements of assessment in future exercises: Attention in future assessment exercises should focus on identifying: (1) general potential non-compliance issues, (2) difficulties reported and (3) non-reporting issues. This should be introduced by brief description of achievements in reporting and implementation by Parties;

c) National Implementation Reports:
   (i) The Compliance Committee has to come to draft recommendations covering two key aspects: implementation of LBS Protocol measures and the effectiveness of these measures. For the Compliance Committee to do so, neither the Synthesis Analysis nor the General Status of Progress would suffice. The analysis of the national implementation reports themselves is necessary, as well as of additional information, including environmental assessments;
   (ii) It is necessary to consider also the national implementation reports themselves, in particular when going into the detail by brining individual countries into the picture. This is of key importance should the Synthesis Analysis or the General Status of Progress indicates lacunae; being necessary the Compliance Committee to consider the national implementation reports in order to have a more enriched picture of the status of compliance;

(iii) In the examination of the national implementation reports on the various Protocols, there is a need to put them in context with the relevant provisions of the Barcelona Convention, so that a broad picture on implementation is provided;

(iv) The assessment of the national reports is a complex and time-consuming exercise. The Compliance Committee is ill-prepared to conduct its own analysis of the information provided in the national reports, as a third revision additional to the two revisions already completed by the Secretariat in the Synthesis Analysis and the General Status of Progress.

d) Mode of working in conducting next assessments:

(i) Intersessional work of the Compliance Committee has proved challenging and should be avoided. Teleconferences are difficult, in terms of quorum, working documents and translation services;

(ii) To facilitate the work of the Compliance Committee, on the basis of the General Status of Progress enriched as indicated above, the Secretariat, together with the relevant Regional Activity Centres, should identify key findings (i.e., possible general issues of compliance and difficulties reported) and draft recommendations for the consideration of the Compliance Committee.

e) Continue streamlining the reporting process towards a shared information platform:

(i) For countries in difficult situations of conflict and instability, Secretariat may join efforts with the relevant UN agencies;

(ii) To improve the quality of the reports, the Secretariat should further refine the reporting format in line with the recommendations formulated concerning the LBS Protocol. In addition, to facilitate reporting, tools such as tutorials, good practices, guidance, training sessions should be available for Contracting Parties;

(iii) The shared information platform should enable Parties to provide updates on information and data as it happens. It should also enable Parties to upload any additional document clarifying or extending their answers in the reporting format in their own language[13];

(iv) The Secretariat should assess on an annual basis the information submitted through the platform and on that basis to interact with Parties to ask for more information, clarification or share achievements. This should be a continued process of assessing compliance and effectiveness involving both the Secretariat and Parties. In this framework, the role of the Compliance Committee would be to check that a common approach is taken, thus ensuring the objectivity, quality, independence and impartiality of the process.

f) Points recommended to be raised at the relevant MAP body:

(i) Update of reginal depollution action plans: SAP Med targets should be updated up to 2030, by extending its scope to new geographical areas (river basins are not yet included) and measures (on new priority hazardous substances and on the use of financial instruments) in line with environmental and sustainable development goals. An assessment should be also carried out to identify potential gaps between updated SAP Med targets and current NAPs, and on that basis to support countries through capacity building activities to fill the gaps so identified. This should be done in line with the H2020 initiative;

(ii) Develop financial instruments and enforcement capacity in addition to environmental laws: This should be done in coordination with the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development and in line with capacity building activities with the H2020 initiative.

[13] Note from the Secretariat: Both the former online Barcelona Convention Reporting System (BCRS) and the new online BCRS enable Parties to upload additional information or data to the one requested in the reporting format. Reports can be filled out in English or French.

Annex I

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention)

Table I. State of signature and ratification of the Barcelona Convention

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1976 Barcelona Convention	12 February 1978
1995 Barcelona Convention	9 July 2004

Contracting Parties	1976 Barcelona Convention			
	Signature	Ratification	Acceptance of 1995 Amendments	Entered into force
Albania	-	30.05.90/AC	26.07.01	09.07.04
Algeria	-	16.02.81/AC	09.06-04	09.07.04
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	22.10.94/SUC	-	-
Croatia		12.06.92/SUC	03.05.99	09.07.04
Cyprus	16.02.76	19.11.79	18.07.03	09.07.04
European Union	13.09.76	16.03.78/AP	12.11.99	09.07.04
Egypt	16.02.76	24.08.78/AP	11.02.00	09.07.04
France	16.02.76	11.03.78/AP	29.03.01	09.07.04
Greece	16.02.76	03.01.79	10.03.03	09.07.04
Israel	16.02.76	03.03.78	29.09.05	29.10.05
Italy	16.02.76	03.02.79	07.09.99	09.07.04
Lebanon	-	08.11.77/AC	22.04.09	22.05.09
Libya	31.01.77	31.01.79	12.01.09	11.02.09
Malta	16.02.76	30.12.77	28.10.99	09.07.04
Monaco	16.02.76	20.09.77	11.04.97	09.07.04
Montenegro	-	19.11.07	19.11.07	19.12.07
Morocco	16.02.76	15.01.80	07.12.04	06.01.05
Slovenia	-	16.09.93/AC	08.01.03	09.07.04
Spain	16.02.76	17.12.76	17.02.99	09.07.04
Syria	-	26.12.78/AC	10.10.03	09.07.04
Tunisia	25.05.76	30.07.77	01.06.98	09.07.04
Turkey	16.02.76	06.04.81	18.09.02	09.07.04

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1976 Barcelona Convention on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 22
- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1995 Barcelona Convention on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 21
- **Number of reporting Contracting Parties on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 17 (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, European Union, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 5 (Egypt, Libya, Monaco, Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol for the Prevention and Elimination of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft or Incineration at Sea (Dumping Protocol)

Table II. State of signature and ratification of the Dumping Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1976 Dumping Protocol	12 February 1978
1995 Dumping Protocol	Not yet in force

Contracting Parties	1976 Dumping Protocol		
	Signature	Ratification	Acceptance of 1995 Amendments
Albania	-	30.05.90/AC	26.07.01
Algeria	-	16.03.81/AC	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	22.10.94/SUC	-
Croatia	-	12.06.92/SUC	03.05.99
Cyprus	16.02.76	19.11.79	18.07.03
European Union	13.09.76	16.03.78/AP	12.11.99
Egypt	16.02.76	24.08.78/AP	11.02.00
France	16.02.76	11.03.78/AP	29.03.01
Greece	11.02.77	03.01.79	-
Israel	16.02.76	01.03.84	-
Italy	16.02.76	03.02.79	07.09.99
Lebanon	-	08.11.77/AC	-
Libya	31.01.77	31.01.79	-
Malta	16.02.76	30.12.77	28.10.99
Monaco	16.02.76	20.09.77	11.04.97
Montenegro	-	-	-
Morocco	16.02.76	15.01.80	05.12.97
Slovenia	-	16.09.93/AC	08.01.03
Spain	16.02.76	17.12.76	17.02.99
Syria	-	26.12.78/AC	11.04.08
Tunisia	25.05.76	30.07.77	01.06.98
Turkey	16.02.76	06.04.81	18.09.02

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1976 Dumping Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 21
- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1995 Dumping Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 15
- **Number of reporting Contracting Parties on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 14 (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, European Union, France, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 7 (Egypt, Greece, Libya, Monaco, Slovenia, Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol Concerning Cooperation in Preventing Pollution from Ships and in Cases of Emergency, Combating Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea (Prevention and Emergency Protocol)

Table III. State of signature and ratification of the Prevention and Emergency Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1976 Emergency Protocol	12 February 1978
2002 Prevention and Emergency Protocol	17 March 2004

Contracting Parties	**1976 Emergency Protocol**			**2002 Prevention and Emergency Protocol**		
	Signature	**Ratification**	**Entered into force**	**Signature**	**Ratification**	**Entered into force**
Albania	-	30.05.90/AC	29.06.90	-	-	-
Algeria	-	16.03.81/AC	15.04.81	25.01.02	14.11.16	14.12.16
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	22.10.94/SUC	01.03.92	-	-	-
Croatia	-	12.06.92/SUC	08.10.91	25.01.02	01.10.03	17.03.04
Cyprus	16.02.76	19.11.79	19.12.79	25.01.02	19.12.07	18.01.08
European Union	13.09.76	12.08.81/AP	11.09.81	25.01.02	26.05.04	25.06.04
Egypt	16.02.76	24.08.78/AC	23.09.78	-	-	-
France	16.02.76	11.03.78/AP	10.04.78	25.01.02	02.07.03	17.03.04
Greece	16.02.76	03.01.79	02.02.79	25.01.02	27.11.06	27.12.06
Israel	16.02.76	03.03.78	02.04.78	22.01.03	10.09.14	10.10.14
Italy	16.02.76	03.02.79	05.03.79	25.01.02	30.06.16	30.07.16
Lebanon	-	08.11.77/AC	12.02.78	-	3.11.17/AC	03.12.17
Libya	31.01.77	31.01.79	02.03.79	25.01.02	-	-
Malta	16.02.76	30.12.77	12.02.78	25.01.02	18.02.03	17.03.04
Monaco	16.02.76	20.09.77	12.02.78	25.01.02	03.04.02	17.03.04
Montenegro	-	-	-	-	19.11.07	19.12.07
Morocco	16.02.76	15.01.80	15.02.80	25.01.02	26.04.11	26.05.11
Slovenia	-	16.09.93/AC	15.03.94	25.01.02	16.02.04	17.03.04
Spain	16.02.76	17.12.76	12.02.78	25.01.02	10.07.07	09.08.07
Syria	-	26.12.78/AC	25.01.79	25.01.02	11.04.08	11.05.08
Tunisia	25.05.76	30.07.77	12.02.78	25.01.02	-	-
Turkey	16.02.76	06.04.81	06.05.81	-	03.06.03	17.03.04

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1976 Emergency Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 21
- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 2002 Prevention and Emergency Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 14
- **Number of reporting Contracting Parties on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 17 (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, European Union, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 5 (Egypt, Libya, Monaco, Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities (LBS Protocol)

Table IV. State of signature and ratification of the LBS Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1980 LBS Protocol	17 June 1983
1996 Amendments	11 May 2008

Contracting Parties	1980 Land-Based Sources Protocol			
	Signature	Ratification	Acceptance of 1996 Amendments	Entered into force
Albania	-	30.05.90/AC	26.07.01	11.05.08
Algeria	-	02.05.83/AC	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	22.10.94/SUC	-	-
Croatia	-	12.06.92/SUC	11.10.06	11.05.08
Cyprus	17.05.80	28.06.88	18.07.03	11.05.08
European Union	17.05.80	07.10.83/AP	12.11.99	11.05.08
Egypt	-	18.05.83/AC	-	-
France	17.05.80	13.07.82/AP	29.03.01/AP	11.05.08
Greece	17.05.80	26.01.87	10.03.03	11.05.08
Israel	17.05.80	21.02.91	19.06.09	19.07.09
Italy	17.05.80	04.07.85	07.09.99	11.05.08
Lebanon	17.05.80	27.12.94	-	-
Libya	17.05.80	06.06.89/AP	-	-
Malta	17.05.80	02.03.89	28.10.99	11.05.08
Monaco	17.05.80	12.01.83	26.11.96	11.05.08
Montenegro	-	19.11.07/AC	19.11.07	11.05.08
Morocco	17.05.80	09.02.87	02.10.96	11.05.08
Slovenia	-	16.09.93/AC	08.01.03	11.05.08
Spain	17.05.80	06.06.84	17.02.99	11.05.08
Syria	-	01.12.93/AC	11.04.08	11.05.08
Tunisia	17.05.80	29.10.81	01.06.98	11.05.08
Turkey	-	21.02.83/AC	18.09.02	11.05.08

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1980 LBS Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 22
- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1996 LBS Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 17
- **Number of reporting Contracting Parties on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 17 (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, European Union, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Spain, Slovenia and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 5 (Egypt, Libya, Monaco, Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (SPA/BD Protocol)

Table V. State of signature and ratification of the SPA/BD Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1982 SPA Protocol	Not applicable
1995 SPA/BD Protocol	12 December 1999

Contracting Parties	1982 Specially Protected Areas Protocol			1995 SPA/DB Protocol		
	Signature	Ratification	Entered into force	Signature	Ratification	Entered into force
Albania	-	30.05.90/AC	29.06.90	10.06.95	26.07.01	25.08.01
Algeria	-	16.05.85/AC	23.03.86	10.06.95	14.03.07	13.04.07
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	22.10.94/SUC	01.03.92	-	-	-
Croatia	-	12.06.92/SUC	08.10.91	10.06.95	12.04.02	12.05.02
Cyprus	-	28.06.88/AC	28.07.88	10.06.95	18.07.03	17.08.03
European Union	30.03.83	30.06.84/AP	23.03.86	10.06.95	12.11.99	12.12.99
Egypt	16.02.83	08.07.83	23.03.86	10.06.95	11.02.00	12.03.00
France	03.04.82	02.09.86/AP	02.10.86	10.06.95	16.04.01	16.05.01
Greece	03.04.82	26.01.87	25.02.87	10.06.95	-	-
Israel	03.04.82	28.10.87	27.11.87	10.06.95	-	-
Italy	03.04.82	04.07.85	23.03.86	10.06.95	07.09.99	12.12.99
Lebanon	-	27.12.94/AC	26.01.95	-	-	-
Libya	-	06.06.89/AC	06.07.89	-	-	-
Malta	03.04.82	11.01.88	10.02.88	10.06.95	28.10.99	12.12.99
Monaco	03.04.82	29.05.89	28.06.89	10.06.95	03.06.97	12.12.99
Montenegro	-	-	-	-	19.11.07	19.12.07
Morocco	02.04.83	22.06.90	22.07.90	10.06.95	24.04.09	25.05.09
Slovenia	-	16.09.93/AC	15.03.94	-	08.01.03	07.02.03
Spain	03.04.82	22.12.87	21.01.88	10.06.95	23.12.98	12.12.99
Syria	-	11.09.92/AC	11.10.92	-	10.10.03	09.11.03
Tunisia	03.04.82	26.05.83	23.03.86	10.06.95	01.06.98	12.12.99
Turkey	-	06.11.86/AC	06.12.86	-	18.09.02	18.10.02

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1982 SPA Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 21
- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1995 SPA/BD Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 17
- **Number of reporting Contracting Parties on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 19 (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, European Union, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 3 (Libya, Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution Resulting from Exploration and Exploitation of the Continental Shelf and the Seabed and its Subsoil (Offshore Protocol)

Table VI. State of signature and ratification of the Offshore Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1994 Offshore Protocol	24 March 2011

Contracting Parties	1994 Offshore Protocol		
	Signature	Ratification	Entered into force
Albania	-	26.07.01	24.03.11
Algeria	-	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	-	-
Croatia	14.10.94	08.02.18	10.03.18
Cyprus	14.10.94	16.05.06	24.03.11
European Union	17.12.12/AC.	29.03.13-	29.03.13
Egypt	-	-	-
France	-	-	-
Greece	14.10.94	-	-
Israel	14.10.94	-	-
Italy	14.10.94	-	-
Lebanon	-	-	-
Libya	-	16.06.05	24.03.11
Malta	14.10.94	-	-
Monaco	14.10.94	-	-
Montenegro	-	-	-
Morocco	-	01.07.99	24.03.11
Slovenia	10.10.95	-	-
Spain	14.10.94	-	-
Syria	20.09.95	22.02.11	24.03.11
Tunisia	14.10.94	01.06.98	24.03.11
Turkey	-	-	-

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1994 Offshore Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 7
- **Number of countries that have signed the 1994 Offshore Protocol but not yet ratified on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 1
- **Number of reporting countries on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 12 (Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, European Union, Greece, Israel, Italy, Morocco, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 3 (Libya, Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Hazardous Wastes Protocol)

Table VII. State of signature and ratification of the Hazardous Wastes Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
1996 Hazardous Wastes Protocol	18 January 2008

Contracting Parties	1996 Hazardous Wastes Protocol		
	Signature	Ratification	Entered into force
Albania	-	26.07.01	18.01.08
Algeria	01.10.96	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	-	-
Croatia	-	-	-
Cyprus	-	-	-
European Union	-	-	-
Egypt	01.10.96	-	-
France	-	-	-
Greece	01.10.96	-	-
Israel	-	-	-
Italy	01.10.96	-	-
Lebanon	-	-	-
Libya	01.10.96	-	-
Malta	01.10.96	28.10.99	18.01.08
Monaco	01.10.96	-	-
Montenegro	-	19.11.07	18.01.08
Morocco	20.03.97	01.07.99	18.01.08
Slovenia	-	-	-
Spain	01.10.96	-	-
Syria	-	22.02.11	24.03.11
Tunisia	01.10.96	01.06.98	18.01.08
Turkey	01.10.96	03.04.04	18.01.08

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the 1996 Hazardous Wastes Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 7
- **Number of countries that have signed the 1996 Hazardous Wastes Protocol but not yet ratified on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 7
- **Number of reporting countries on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 12 (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, European Union, Greece, Italy, Lebanon, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted yet their reports for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 2 (Syria and Tunisia)

Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean (ICZM Protocol)

Table VIII. State of signature and ratification of the ICZM Protocol

(Source: http://web.unep.org/unepmap/)

Entry into force	
2008 ICZM Protocol	24 March 2011

Contracting Parties	2008 Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Protocol		
	Signature	Ratification	Entered into force
Albania		04.05.2010/AD	24.03.11
Algeria	21.01.08	-	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	-	-	-
Croatia	21.01.08	29.01.13/R	28.02.13
Cyprus	-	-	-
European Union	16.01.09	29.09.10/AP	24.03.11
Egypt	-	-	-
France	21.01.08	29.10.09/AP	24.03.11
Greece	21.01.08	-	-
Israel	21.01.08	01.02.16/R	02.03.2016
Italy	21.01.08	-	-
Lebanon	-	01.08.2017/AC	31.08.2017
Libya	-	-	-
Malta	21.01.08	-	-
Monaco	21.01.08	-	-
Montenegro	21.01.08	09.01.12/R	08.02.12
Morocco	21.01.08	21.09.12/R	21.10.12
Slovenia	21.01.08	01.12.09/R	24.03.11
Spain	21.01.08	22.06.10/R	24.03.11
Syria	21.01.08	22.02.2011	24.03.11
Tunisia	21.01.08	-	-
Turkey	-	-	-

AC= Accession AD=Adhesion AP=Approval R=Ratification SUC=Succession

- **Number of Contracting Parties to the ICZM Protocol on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 9
- **Number of countries that have signed the ICZM Protocol but not yet ratified on the 2014/2015 biennium:** 7
- **Number of reporting countries on the 2014-2015 biennium:** 12 (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, European Union, France, Greece, Lebanon, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey)
- **Number of Contracting Parties that have not submitted their reports yet for the 2014-2015 biennium:** 2 (Albania and Syria)