

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Body of the report

Annexes:

Annex I : List of Participants

Annex II: Agenda of the Meeting

Annex III: Secretariat's Summary Conclusions

I. Introduction

1. At the kind invitation of the Government of Cyprus, the Eleventh Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD) was held in Nicosia (Cyprus) at the Hilton Cyprus Hotel from 24 to 26 May 2006.
2. The Meeting was attended by the following 28 members of the Commission: Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chamber of Commerce of Herzegovina, Coordinamento Agende 21 Locali Italiane, Croatia, Cyprus, Centre for Environment & Development for the Arab Region & Europe (CEDARE), ENDA Maghreb-Environnement Développement et Action au Maghreb, Egypt, European Commission, Greece, Israel, Legambiente-League for the Environment, Italy, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mediterranean Information Office for Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development (MIO-ECSDE), Medcities, Monaco, Morocco, World Bank/Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance (METAP), Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC), Serbia and Montenegro, Slovenia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Union Méditerranéenne des Confédérations d'Entreprises (UMCE).
3. The following 7 alternate members of the Commission also attended: Association Internationale Forêts Méditerranéennes (AIFM), Euro-Arab Management School (EAMS), Hellenic Marine Environment Protection Association (HELMEPA), International Ocean Institute, Research and Conservation of Island & Coastal Ecosystems in the Mediterranean (MEDMARAVIS), Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat, University of the Aegean (UOA).
4. The following components of UNEP/MAP were also represented at the Meeting: MED/POL, REMPEC, BP/RAC, CP/RAC, INFO/RAC, PAP/RAC, SPA/RAC, 100 Historic Sites and the Coordinating Unit.
5. The following United Nations specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations and other partners attended the meeting as observers: United Nations Environment Programme/Global Programme of Action (UNEP/GPA), United Nations Industrial Development Organization–International Centre for Science and High Technology (UNIDO-ICS), European Environment Agency (EEA), League of Arab States (LAS), Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area (SIA/EMFTA), Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED), Palestinian Authority.
6. The full list of participants is attached as **Annex I** to the present report.

Opening of the Meeting

7. Mr Yannis Vournas (Greece) opened the meeting as President of the outgoing Steering Committee of the MCSD. He welcomed the participants and thanked the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus for their hospitality and the excellent organization. He stressed the specificity of the MCSD, which is the only structure in the region to bring together Government representatives, local authorities, socio-economic actors and civil society to reflect on their common future; he expressed the wish that the Meeting will confirm the will of each of its members to fulfil the commitments undertaken when the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development was adopted by the Contracting Parties in Portoroz in November 2005.

Tribute to the Memory of Serge Antoine

8. Mr Vournas expressed the MCSD members' deep sorrow for the passing away of Serge Antoine, who had been the representative of France since the launching of MAP in 1975 and a pioneer in the defence of the Mediterranean environment.

9. Mr Paul Mifsud, Coordinator, on behalf of MAP joined in the tribute to the memory of Serge Antoine. He said that few persons, in France or anywhere in the region, had devoted so much energy, intelligence and imagination to the cause of the Mediterranean environment. He was one of the persons who had been involved in launching MAP, the Barcelona Convention, the Blue Plan and later the MCSD. He was always enlivening and inspiring the discussions in the MCSD meetings and its Steering Committee. In 1993 for his remarkable contribution to the cause of the environment, he received the UNEP Environment Award.

10. Mr Guillaume Benoit, Blue Plan Director, described M. Serge Antoine as "a man who was atypical, generous, and curious of everything, always introducing new ideas, sowing the seeds of the future", who had left his mark promoting environment and sustainable development for more than half a century enriching, throughout the years, the thinking on such matters which then gave rise to concrete action both in France and on the internationally level.

11. Mr Michael Scoullas (MIO-ECSDE) for his part highlighted the role that Serge Antoine played in associating the civil society to all important steps in the development of MAP, as well as his active, open and constructive participation in the many NGO meetings to which he was invited frequently as a member.

12. At the President's invitation, the Meeting observed one minute of silence.

Election of the Steering Committee

13. In accordance with rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure and following the customary consultations, the Commission elected its new Steering Committee, the composition of which is given below:

President:	Mr Nicos Georgiades (Cyprus)
Vice-Presidents:	Mr Emilio D'Alessio (Coordinamento Agende 21 Locali Italiane)
	Mr Abdul Fatah Boargob (Libya)
	Mr Mitja Bricelj (Slovenia)
	Mr Izamettin Eker (Turkey)
	Mr Hicham Abou Jaoude (UMCE)
Rapporteur:	Mr Magdi Ibrahim (ENDA Maghreb)

Adoption of the agenda and organization of the meeting

14. The agenda prepared by the Secretariat, approved by the previous Steering Committee in its meeting of March 2006 in Athens and contained in document UNEP (DEPI)/WG.293/2 was adopted by the meeting. It is reproduced in **Annex II** to this report.

Summary presentation of the Secretariat's report on activities

15. The Coordinator presented the main points of the *Report by the Secretariat on the Activities of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) (June 2005 – May 2006)* (document UNEP(DEPI)/MED.293/3).

16. The year 2005 was marked by the finalization of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD), followed by its adoption by the 14th Meeting of the Contracting Parties. The great challenge was now the implementation of the MSSD and the countries were the main actors to implement it. All MAP components were called upon to play an important role, especially with respect to Priority Action 2.7 "Promoting the sustainable management of the sea and coastal zones".

17. Mr Mifsud pointed out that the Parties had acknowledged the importance of the endorsement of the MSSD at the highest political level. In this connection, a first step was taken at the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Summit in Barcelona in November 2005. The leaders from the 25 EU Member States and 10 Mediterranean Countries made a commitment to implement the MSSD. It should be stressed that this development was made possible also through the very active support of the network of Mediterranean NGOs. It was now imperative, as was requested by the Bureau of the Contracting Parties at its last meeting of April 2006, to ensure the best synergy possible between MAP and the EC especially with respect to "Horizon 2020" initiative making reference in this regard to the Euro-Med Environment Ministers' meeting in Cairo in November, 2006 to discuss this initiative.

18. Concerning the MCSD's Programme of Work, it would focus on the seven priority fields of action identified in the MSSD. In Portoroz, the Contracting Parties had entrusted BP/RAC with the technical implementation, under the supervision of the Secretariat and in collaboration with the other MAP components and to launch the process on the 34 priority indicators. Six themes were to be dealt within the 2006-2008 timeframe: "Water", "Energy", "Marine Pollution from Ships", "Integrated Coastal Area Management", "Rural Development" and "Tourism". The themes would be treated in two-year cycles, one year being devoted to analysis and the other to policy aspects.

19. The Coordinator concluded by summarizing the strategic implications of the Portoroz decisions and recommendations: it was up to the countries to implement the objectives, orientations and actions proposed in the MSSD through specific projects, to mobilize to this effect the necessary human and financial resources, to promote awareness for sustainable development and to secure the active support of the various stakeholders, especially NGOs. On the other hand, it was the responsibility of the Secretariat to put in place the process to monitor the implementation of the MSSD, to mobilize funding institutions, to encourage the Parties and Partners through information and communication campaigns and to launch and coordinate the Commission's Programme of Work. .

20. Mr Michael Scoullas stressed the importance of the forthcoming meeting in Cairo in November 2006 of the EuroMed ministerial conference, mentioned by Mr Mifsud in his introductory presentation. It was important to ensure fruitful operational links between the MCSD and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP). MIO-ECSDE was planning to organize a meeting of NGOs before the ministerial meeting and needed support to this effect. Generally speaking and in order that the stakeholders be in a position to participate in various aspects of the programme, as for instance the preparation of the ICAM Protocol, they should have a minimum of support, which might entail an allocation of financial resources.

21. Mr George Strongylis (European Commission), indicated that the Euro-Med Ministerial meeting in Cairo was scheduled for 20 November 2006 and was being organized with the very active participation of Egypt. A preparatory two-day meeting (18-19 September) would be held in Brussels jointly with the SMAP meeting. Obviously one of the items to be discussed would be the

"Horizon 2020" initiative, where MAP was called upon to play a key role. The meeting would discuss the matter in detail, since it was included in its agenda.

Session 1: NSSD process

Updated status of NSSDs

22. Mr Philippe Alirol, MAP's Senior Sustainable Development Officer, pointed out that the implementation of the MSSD, which is a flexible framework without legally binding obligations presented the countries with four major challenges: i.e. to review and possibly revise current policies; to find new forms of governance in order to involve various actors not always associated in the past with the process of elaborating the strategy, through the channelling and sharing of information which is vast at the level of the Mediterranean and finally to mobilize the necessary financial resources.

23. MAP Secretariat had prepared in 2005 a Regional Review and Assessment Report on sustainable development initiatives in the Mediterranean, on the basis of information received from the countries. That report had recently been updated making it possible for MAP to draw up a list of what existed, in order to focus its actions accordingly. Four countries had already benefited from MAP's assistance, with financial support from Italy and Monaco, in the preparation of their NSSDs: Egypt, Morocco, Serbia and Montenegro and the Syrian Arab Republic. The same process was followed in the preparation: road map, consultation mechanism, setting up of expert groups, formulation of a vision and framework orientation, organization of national workshops to review progress and the draft NSSD. However, the common approach respected each country's specific characteristics and took advantage of already existing institutional structures.

24. On the basis of the same criteria, four more countries were identified to follow the same process, with the financial support of the Spanish Cooperation Agency (AZAHAR programme): Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Lebanon and Tunisia. While these countries did not all move at the same pace, they were all using the MSSD as framework and making efforts to secure additional resources to widen the scope of the process. As would clearly appear from the presentations to follow, the NSSD elaboration process was in itself more important than its output because it fostered a sense of ownership among the various actors involved.

NSSD presentations: Montenegro, Syria, Italy and Malta

25. Following the general presentation by Mr Alirol, the representatives of the four countries, gave an account of the process of elaboration of their respective NSSDs. Ms Jelena Knezevic, representative of Serbia and Montenegro, declared that, following the referendum organized in her country three days before and in view of the imminent recognition of the referendum results by the European Union, Montenegro was going to be a new independent coastal Mediterranean State and MAP member.

26. Ms Jelena Knezevic for Montenegro and Ms Mokhlesa Al-Zaeim for the Syrian Arab Republic described the elaboration process of their respective NSSDs and gave details on the common procedure previously referred to by Mr Alirol. Montenegro had obtained, in addition to MAP and Italy's support, a contribution from UNDP, while Syria obtained a contribution from GEF/Small Grants Programme. In Montenegro a national NGO coordinates the consultation process so that expert work and consensus building are successfully combined. Syria entrusted a national NGO with the coordination of the process under the supervision of the General Commission for Environmental Affairs. A stakeholders' web survey on their perception of the draft strategy was conducted to identify priority issues. The delegates of the two countries indicated some of the challenges encountered: limited capacity to conduct multi-stakeholder processes, lack of sustainable development awareness at all levels, limited integration of sustainability in development policies and the status of the NSSD as against other national plans or strategies.

27. Mr Paolo Soprano, Head of Division at the Italian Environment Ministry, presented his country's NSSD, based on lessons learned from the shortcomings of a first Sustainable Development plan prepared in 1993 after the Rio Summit. In 1999 a wide participatory approach was launched for the formulation of the new strategy with the involvement of the main stakeholders, especially the major groups of civil society. In the first semester of 2002, 14 meetings had been organized in which more than 140 bodies and organizations participated. Priorities had been defined on the basis of EU's 6th Environmental Action Plan and the EU Strategy for Sustainable Development and a set of indicators had been selected to measure the results of implementation. The institutional arrangement, comprising the inter-ministerial Committee of economic planning (CIPE) and the State and Regions' Conference, was inspired by the NSSD for the formulation of the specific strategies for Italy's 20 regions and two provinces.

28. Ms Marguerite Camilleri, representing the Malta Environmental and Planning Authority, began by presenting the national context and the conditions in which the NSSD was established on the basis of a legal provision of the Environmental Protection Act of 2001. The National Commission on Sustainable Development presided by the Prime Minister was given the task to draft the document after wide consultation process in 2004 and 2005 involving the major groups. The document was currently being finalized. The thematic priorities corresponded to those of the MSSD. The challenge for Malta was that, since its accession to the EU, this task added to the transposition into national law of the "acquis communautaire" in the field of environment; that in itself would require a tremendous administrative, legal, institutional and financial effort with its obligations for follow-up, monitoring and reporting. Moreover, the priorities of the "acquis" did not always correspond to those of an insular Mediterranean country like Malta, e.g. the crucial problem of water supply. However, the speaker pointed out that the intensive environmental awareness campaigns and capacity building efforts carried out in Malta for several years (through *inter alia* CAMP and MEDSTAT projects) had prepared the political leaders and the main stakeholders to deal with the horizontal questions included in the MSSD.

Discussion

29. It was pointed out that the four presentations highlighted the common concerns about the institutional arrangements and financing of the implementation of the strategy. Often the low level of integration of the economic and social aspects was the result of the non-involvement of the relevant ministries, other than those of environment and land use planning. One participant related the example of a national process where all the ministries were instructed to provide their input, with the Ministry of Finance and the financial institutions playing a key role. Another participant pleaded for the introduction in the Arab countries of a model similar to the process described by Syria with the very close involvement of civil society; he proposed to systematize the exchange of experiences at the regional level to learn from actions implemented in each country. It was also pointed out that added value could be brought to the NSSDs by learning from the EU strategy for SD and its linkage with the Lisbon process. One delegate referred to the problem of the NSSD formulation overlapping with the preparation of a quite exhaustive national environmental plan which had engaged the main stakeholders for 5 years and integrated the principles of sustainable development. Another delegate pointed out that obviously the solution consisted not in setting one document against the other, but simply in revisiting the national environmental plans in the light of the new elements of the MSSD. However, the crucial point for the future was implementation since the MSSD and then the NSSDs were necessarily the result of compromise. One delegate wondered about the real part played by the business sector in formulating the MSSD and the NSSDs and warned against its absence during the implementation phase. Finally, it was indicated that among other constraints, the implementation of the NSSDs suffered from the absence of an adequate legal framework: environmental legislation and regulations were for the most part sector specific and the remit was scattered among several ministries.

30. In summing up the discussion, the Coordinator stated that the presentations and the ensuing comments were very encouraging, in that it was not just countries like Italy and Malta that had EU commitments, but also countries like Syria and Montenegro that had been able to complete the process of formulating the NSSD and could look forward realistically to the strategy's implementation. All interventions highlighted the importance of involving all relevant ministries (e.g. Finance Ministries) and thus an effective inter-ministerial committee presented a good solution. MAP and its components would continue bringing their assistance to other countries, with the support of Spain in the near future as with that of Italy and Monaco in the recent past. But given its limited financial resources, MAP would like to receive from other countries additional funding for this purpose..

Adriatic Initiative

31. Mr Mitja Bricelj, representative of Slovenia, explained that the big challenge of reaching the MSSD's objectives should also be addressed at the subregional level, as in the Adriatic, where six countries shared the same marine and coastal ecosystem but under diverse economic and political circumstances, especially with regard to their status vis-à-vis the EU. He reviewed the main actions carried out in the last few years in the sub-region, like the Adriatic-Ionian Initiative, the setting up of the trilateral Commission on the Adriatic (Croatia – Italy – Slovenia), the activities carried out by MAP within the framework of the Albanian and Slovenian CAMPs with strong ICAM components, the management plan of the river basins, the training sessions, the sub-regional contingency plan and the plan for the management of ballast water prepared with REMPEC's assistance, the SPA projects carried out by the Tunis Centre, the project for the designation by IMO of the Adriatic as "especially sensitive marine area". The meeting to formulate an Adriatic strategy for sustainable development, scheduled for June 2006 in Slovenia, would be the final step of the sub-regional efforts to make rational use of marine resources, with abatement of pressures and impacts and improvement of the quality of life on the coast. The synergies among the various bodies and the active involvement of the public were essential in the sustainable development of the sea and coast of a closed basin such as the Adriatic.

32. The Adriatic Initiative was received very favourably by two participants who considered it a unique opportunity to pass from theory to action in a sensitive area, with a level of effectiveness only possible at the sub-regional level for countries at different stages of development but confronted with common issues. It was also indicated that several international organizations like the EU, the EMP, the GEF, the REC, the World Bank and UNDP were ready to assist national efforts at this level.

33. The Coordinator stated that Mr Mitja Bricelj, widely known for his strong advocacy of the sub-regional approach, brought to this cause a strong conviction that would mobilize others and a will for concrete action. He was thus an example of what this level of intervention could bring to the concerted efforts of several countries for the implementation of the MSSD and its objectives. MAP and the RACs would do their utmost to contribute to the success of the June meeting in Slovenia.

Session 2 : Current MAP processes relevant to the implementation of the MSSD (Priority Field of Action 2.7)

Prospective and scenarios concerning coastal zones (BP/RAC)

34. Ms Elizabeth Coudert (BP/RAC) presented the prospective studies and the scenarios concerning the Mediterranean coastal areas, which were a unique heritage, including marine biodiversity, at world level. Coastal areas were under strong pressure – coastal urbanization - with explosive urbanization, land artificialization, and for the marine areas, traffic which constituted 30% of the world maritime total, pollution of coastal waters and half of the cities with a population of more than 100,000 without wastewater treatment plants. Biodiversity and habitats were heavily affected with critical decrease of the areas covered with Posidonia meadows, invasion of

allogeneous species, over 100 species threatened with extinction, depletion of fishing stocks. Supporting her presentation with projections and figures, Ms Coudert outlined the main points of the 2025 trend scenario: an additional 20 million living in cities, an extra 135 million tourists (international and national), a doubling of land area covered by transport infrastructures and of urban waste volume, a four-fold increase of maritime cargo traffic, etc. Despite the EuroMed partnership and breakthroughs at political level, the North-South economic gap was widening.

35. In view of these perspectives, it was vital for the future of the region to turn to an alternative scenario of sustainable management of the coast based on knowledge, strengthened cooperation and coastal policies, decoupling of economic development and pressures on the environment, revitalization of the hinterland and tourism regulation. The Blue Plan had developed the "Imagine" approach which consisted of a set of methods and tools to mobilize the stakeholders in a participatory framework, assess the level of sustainability and make it easier to select the objectives to be reached.

ICAM Protocole (PAP/RAC)

36. Mr Ivica Trumbic, PAP/RAC Director, outlined the development of the process to formulate a draft ICAM Protocol, launched at the 13th Catania Meeting in 2003, then entrusted in 2005 by the Portoroz meeting to a group of legal and technical experts to draft a definitive text for review and possible adoption by the Meeting of the Parties in 2007. There was convergence with the MSSD, since the latter included in its objectives the adoption by 2007 of such a Protocol and the ICAM strategy that would accompany it. The first meeting of the Working Group was held in Split in April 2006 and had begun the review and revision of the first version. The interest of the Parties was very clear, but the participation should be widened in the future to include other stakeholders, not least the private sector. Mr Trumbic was of the opinion that on the whole there was agreement to opt for a text that would be legally binding. PAP/RAC had also promoted the implementation of other ICAM-related MSSD orientations. Among other benefits, the adoption of the protocol would provide a concise legal definition of "coastal zone" which for the time being was not available to the countries; it would also facilitate the dissemination among Mediterranean countries and stakeholders of the main principles of integrated management. In this connection, if the Protocol were adopted, its effectiveness could be assessed through pilot studies to be carried out in some countries.

Prevention and abatement of land-based pollution – Implementation of SAP and the NAPs (MEDPOL)

37. Mr Francesco Saverio Civili, MEDPOL Coordinator, explained that while the programme in the beginning was focused on the assessment of marine pollution, international developments, especially after the Rio Summit, had led to putting the accent on the socio-economic dimension and turn progressively to pollution control, in other words go back to the causes of pollution and find alternatives to production and development methods. This was the background to the launching in 1997 of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) which was supported by the first GEF Project; the SAP was given concrete form in the MAP countries through National Diagnostic Analyses (NDAs), National Baseline Budgets (NBBs) of emissions and discharges of pollutants and finally through the National Action Plans (NAPs) which contained antipollution measures to be taken by the 2010 and 2015 horizons and the relevant costs. Thus there was clear convergence of the whole process MEDPOL/SAP/NAP with the MSSD objectives and the recent EC Initiative "Horizon 2020". Synergies and linkages must therefore be established. Moreover, the new GEF Strategic Partnership project offered the opportunity to eligible countries to meet their needs and priorities through sustainable funding and to MAP to be optimistic in the launching of the implementation phase, while maintaining the dynamic character of the process and integrating recently developed concepts like the differentiated approach to pollution reduction.

38. Several participants noted the high level of the presentations and made general comments. "Convergence" was a key word in their interventions: convergence between the ICAM Protocol and the MSSD objectives, between the "acquis" of MEDPOL and the "Horizon 2020" Initiative, among CAMPS, between the PAP ICAM activities and the SMAP III projects *inter alia*. Progress was evident in theory, but practice was slow to follow and each MCSD meeting was an opportunity to measure this persisting gap. A problem that was mentioned repeatedly was that of NGOs being confronted with even more complex problems, even more numerous commitments and meetings in which, because of lack of funds, they could not exercise their right to participate, a right that had been recognized in principle in acknowledgement of the expertise they can bring. Some participants expressed their concern over the extremely strict character of the provisions of the ICAM Protocol in the current phase of the negotiation, which could jeopardize its ratification later. Others indicated that it would be useful to make governments aware of the cost of not taking anti-pollution measures, the need to manage pollution according to demand and use of resources, rather than at the end of the production cycle. It was also proposed to focus the Commission's meetings on two or three important subjects, with a good preparation, rather than making several interventions on various topics as was the case currently.

39. The Coordinator pointed out that for many years, MAP had decided to involve NGOs and the major civil society groups in its technical and political meetings where they could express their views and be part of the Commission on an equal footing. He added however that there were budgetary constraints. With regard to the Commission meetings' agenda, this time the floor was given to the various MAP components because the MSSD had just been approved and they should explain their role in the implementation of the specific objectives falling within their remit, and their role would be a major one.

Implementation of the Regional Strategy for the prevention of pollution from ships (REMPEC)

40. Mr Frédéric Hébert, REMPEC Director, noted that the MSSD explicitly and directly made reference the Regional Strategy for the Prevention and Combating of Marine Pollution from Ships adopted in 2005. This strategy aimed at: combating all aspects of this type of pollution over a given period (2006-2016), especially through the effective application of various IMO Conventions (MARPOL, antifouling, ballast waters); the building and operating of port reception facilities; taking strong action against offenders and those responsible for illegal dumping; and publishing and disseminating relevant guidelines and results of research studies on dumping in the sea. REMPEC had for years been preparing contingency plans at national and sub-regional levels and organized national and regional exercises of preparation and combat against accidental marine pollution. The Centre had also been entrusted with drawing up draft guidelines on the prevention of pollution from pleasure craft, a highly acute problem in the Mediterranean. REMPEC through the SAFEMED project funded by the European Commission under the supervision of the IMO was addressing many of the goals defined in its regional strategy.

Protection of marine and coastal biodiversity (SPA/RAC)

41. Mr Abderrahmen Gannoun, SPA/RAC Director made reference to the objectives of priority field 2.7 of the MSSD concerning protected areas and biodiversity. He insisted that in addition to the traditional activities of the Centre linked with the application of the relevant Protocol, the pace of implementation of the SAP BIO at the level of countries should be increased; it was to this effect that the consultative committee and the national correspondents' network had been re-established. He further stressed the need to encourage fishing and aquaculture activities through strengthened cooperation with GFCM/FAO. The other important objectives were the setting up by 2012 of at least 30 Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Interest (SPAMIs), a third of which in the Eastern Mediterranean; a better geographic balance of protected areas which should globally double in size. The Centre should develop coordination and synergies with international organizations and networks (such as IUCN, the Bonn, Bern and Ramsar Conventions,

ACCOBAMS, the Natura 2000 network and the EU's marine strategy) in order to reinforce and widen sustainable management in marine and coastal biodiversity. Finally, in the longer term, the Centre should introduce the ecosystems approach in all its activities.

Discussion

42. One delegate referred to the problem of the funding of RACs which he deemed inadequate, especially for transboundary projects which had not been mentioned. This opinion was countered by another delegate who referred to the many additional external sources of funding which benefited the Centres, e.g. the countries and organizations such as the European Commission and GEF, for targeted activities. Two representatives questioned again the pertinence for the RAC to make separate presentations which could at most be summed up into one. The presentations made one think one was in a MAP Focal Points' meeting, whereas the MCSD was primarily a body for reflection, discussion and consultation on the major issues of sustainable development. The Coordinator replied that the rest of the meeting would be devoted to thematic questions and indicators; he agreed that at the next MCSD meeting there would be one presentation highlighting the support of the MAP components to the MCSD. Mr Yannis Vournas, in his capacity as outgoing President of the Commission, stated that he took on the entire responsibility for the agenda of the present meeting, adopted by the Steering Committee in Athens and that indeed there had been a misguided division of time between presentations and discussions. The experience should benefit the planning of future meetings.

Session 3: MAP's support to the MSSD

43. The Coordinator recalled that BP/RAC had been entrusted with monitoring the MSSD implementation under the supervision of the Secretariat with the support of the other MAP components. The whole exercise would be based on the 34 priority indicators already selected and additional indicators to be explored and tested; the MCSD's work programme would revolve around the themes of water and energy/climate in 2006 and tourism and rural development in 2007; *ad hoc* working groups would be set up to this effect. MAP and BP/RAC would also carry out missions to assist countries in the monitoring at the national level. All these questions would be discussed after the Blue Plan presentation so that the meeting could formulate proposals and recommendations.

Follow-up: indicators and thematic activities (water, energy, tourism and rural development) (BP/RAC)

44. Mr Guillaume Benoit, Blue Plan Director, indicated that the BP, like all other MAP components, was committed to fulfilling the tasks assigned to it by the meeting of Parties every 2 years. At Portoroz, in November 2005, the Parties had requested the Centre to produce and disseminate a set of indicators for the follow-up of the MSSD, to strengthen technical partnerships with other MAP components and other institutions and to focus the thematic activities on those areas where MAP could bring added value.

45. Concerning indicators, the BP had prepared a document of methodology "sheets" for each of them which were available to the meeting's participants. Given the need for the countries to make a concrete commitment, the Secretariat has sent a letter to the countries asking them to appoint a qualified person to work on indicators. According to the strategy, additional indicators could be proposed; activities on the themes of water and energy should allow progress on the relevant indicators.

46. Work on two thematic activities "water" and "energy/climate" had already begun. In respect of the latter, the two great challenges highlighted in the strategy were energy efficiency and renewable sources of energy. Expert meetings had already been convened in order to launch the relevant activities shortly; the Commission had the relevant document with the results of the

discussions in its hands. The principal regional partners - OME, MEDENER, Italian Programme MEDREP, UMET, CP/RAC Barcelona and FEMISE – were almost certain to associate themselves with these activities. BP also wanted to associate all the countries in this effort, the first step being a questionnaire to be sent to them; further, more in depth work will be carried out with some volunteer countries. All these activities would lead to a regional workshop to be organized in 2007 under the aegis of the MCSD.

47. On water, the big challenges were demand management and the Millennium Goal "Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger". Two workshops, organized by the MCSD in 1997 and 2002 respectively, had shown how crucial this theme is for the Mediterranean. The partners were the Global Water Partnership, IME, MedWet, CIHEAM and CEDARE. At national level, the countries had to be invited to prepare reports on the current situation and on water management. At regional level, presentations were invited for the workshop scheduled for March 2007.

48. Mr Benoit provided information on the preparation and perspectives of the next two thematic questions "rural development" and "tourism". He indicated that BP had been requested by the Parties to carry out support missions to countries. Finally, he expressed the wish that the discussion to follow would address four key issues: (i) work on indicators; (ii) the content of support missions to countries; (iii) the ways to make the most of national expertise; (iv) how to foster countries' and stakeholders' ownership of the results of this work.

Discussion

49. The Coordinator agreed with BP's proposal to focus on some key questions. The delegates that took the floor congratulated the Director of the BP for his presentation and the Centre for its work to develop and finalize the MSSD and then on indicators and the two thematic activities for 2005-2006. A majority felt that the BP should play more the role of "facilitator" rather than that of "doer"; this would make it easier for the themes selected to forge strategic alliances with organizations, expert networks, initiatives and projects already existing and provided with resources, that had achieved considerable results and level of experience, while the Blue Plan would continue its work on indicators. Several other proposals were made: (1) to give a content to the BP support missions to countries; (2) to concentrate exclusively at first on the 34 priority indicators of the MSSD without adding to the list; (3) that each Centre gives a specific account of external funding received for the various tasks, so that there be complete transparency; (4) BP is justifiably ambitious, but perhaps overly so on indicators since this can prove counterproductive; rather it should take advantage of the many systematic in-depth studies carried out by other bodies and adapting them to the Mediterranean context; (5) to limit itself to its very detailed programme already agreed by the Commission and the Contracting Parties in 2005 for 2005-2006 and not try to go around it, modify it or anticipate other themes; (6) to make a greater effort to develop expertise in the Mediterranean countries, often lagging behind in areas such as climate change or environmental economics; (7) to activate the role of the members of the working groups; (8) to work on indicators together with AEE which is very experienced in this area and had collaborated very successfully with MAP for many years on the preparation of a status report on the Mediterranean and on data collection; (9) to make the most of the valuable contribution of universities and the use of pilot studies on specific themes.

50. Mr Luc Dassonville, BP/RAC's Deputy Director, summarized the discussion which made clear that what was important was for the Centre not to overextend itself but make the most of what already existed and intervene where it could bring added value. On indicators, it was explicitly recommended to limit the work on the 34 priority ones; one should specify however that "additional indicators" referred to those that might emerge from carrying out thematic activities; there was also great demand for coastal indicators as against those valid for the whole territory of a country.

51. Mr Guillaume Benoit thought the discussion very useful. By insisting on the "facilitator" role, the Commission members had provided the Centre with a concrete framework. The MCSD in its 10

years of existence had managed to mobilize on most themes experts and organizations of the region with the highest qualifications. One should build on this solid basis and continue along the same lines.

Session 4: Cross cutting issues

Information and communication

Promotion of the Report on Environment and Development (BP/RAC)

52. Mr Guillaume Benoit outlined briefly the various activities carried out to promote the *Report on Environment and Development* since its publication. It had attracted great interest and requests for its presentation had been made, an encouraging sign for potential allies for sustainable development. Its translation into Arabic would be accelerated and a 30-page summary would be published in several other Mediterranean languages. Four-page leaflets were prepared on the main themes of the *Report*. Relevant articles were scheduled to appear in well known prospective magazines, such as *Futuribles*.

Strategic information and communication vision for the MCSD (INFO/RAC)

53. Mr Sergio Illuminato, Director of INFO/RAC, presented the MSSD promotion activities undertaken by the Centre within the framework of an Information and Communication Strategy focusing on making the document better understood, disseminating it more widely and raising the awareness of both political leaders and the public for its effective implementation through a participatory process involving the main actors. This strategy based on the "MSSD IC vision" would be submitted to the 15th Contracting Parties Meeting in 2007 for review and approval. There would be a large media component, broadcasts and stories on priority themes and success stories of SD in the Mediterranean, the support of the most recent Internet tools like a forum and an on-line magazine (Campus Ecomedia), the organization of colloquia and the launching of a MSSD Day or Week in the region. All countries were invited to participate actively in the process.

Education for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region (MIO-ECSDE)

54. Mr Michael Scoullios, MIO-ECSDE President, indicated that his presentation was not just on MAP and MSSD, but concerned education as a broader concept in each country, in view of reorienting it towards sustainable development with all the challenges that this entailed. The concept was first developed in 1977 in Tbilisi as "environmental education", but after Rio in 1992 and especially Thessaloniki in 1997 it had evolved as education for sustainable development (ESD), integrating the environment – society – economy – governance with three different domains of action: institutions, culture, sciences and technologies. The launching in 2002 of the "UN Decade on Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014)" had given rise to several regional activities, including a conference held in Athens in November 2005 which culminated in a Declaration for a Mediterranean Strategy on ESD; this would be submitted to the Contracting Parties Meeting. The Government of Greece would facilitate the setting up of a small working group to formulate this strategy.

Associating the business world – Current knowledge on sustainable development and cleaner technologies (CP/RAC)

55. Ms Virginia Alzina, CP/RAC Director, first recalled the mandate entrusted by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Centre and its principal activities focused on sustainable production patterns; she then pointed out that the Centre had engaged in consultations with ASCAME and defined five areas where work should be concentrated: (1) to associate the business sector in the formulation of standards and policies on environmental pollution; (2) transfer cleaner technologies and sound practices in the Mediterranean countries, especially to SMEs; (3) train and

educate the business world to prevent pollution; (4) promote and support projects, especially in tourism; (5) launch a common framework of policies and projects to support specifically the countries in the South and East of the Mediterranean. Ms Alzina made clear that the contribution of CP/RAC to MSSD implementation went beyond the industrial sector to include rural development, water and agriculture; moreover the Centre was currently working with the Blue Plan on the theme of Energy and Climate change.

Discussion

56. The attention of CP/RAC was drawn to the action carried out at world level by the DTIE/UNEP in Paris and the interest, within the framework of SD promotion, to introduce the ISO 26000 standard on corporate responsibility. Concerning the IC strategy on SD, one participant thought that a greater coherence and integration of all the projects carried out in this field at all levels was desirable, since there was no great advantage in multiplying specific projects. Another participant stated that for years at MAP meetings wide-ranging strategies, figures, indicators were bandied about without any tangible results for the day-to-day life of people; however, he continued, he was somewhat heartened by the last three presentations which finally fell within the MCSD's mandate, because they touched upon three topics that put human beings at the centre of Sustainable Development, in the Rio spirit. The same speaker agreed with a previous speaker that persons from the Mediterranean participating in international fora should behave as a Champion for their region which was not officially recognized as such in the UN system and added that there should be a common approach for the presentation of MAP activities by Mediterranean Countries at external meetings. Two more participants indicated that INFO/RAC should play its role to make the Mediterranean more visible at the global level.

Session 5: MSSD and other regional initiatives and processes

Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade Zone

57. Mr G. Benoit, who acted as moderator during the discussion on this topic of the agenda, stated that the Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade Zone was deemed very important by the MCSD since its inception; concerns had been voiced as to the impact of a total trade liberalization by the years 2010 without carrying out a full-scale study on the subject. The study on the SIA-EMFTRA had finally been launched by the European Commission, and two of the three phases had been completed under the direction of Manchester University.

58. Mr Clive George, Manchester University, indicated that during the third phase of SIA-EMFTA, which would comprise case studies, contributions by countries or organizations would be welcomed and he should be contacted by interested parties. In his presentation, he first put the study in its historic context, described the first two phases as well as developments, current negotiations, scenarios envisaged; he then turned to the results of phase two, i.e. data collected on potential impact of the free-trade zone envisaged, if abatement/accompanying measures were not taken. Mr George gave details of the impacts analysed in the Executive Summary in Annex VII to the working document of the meeting (UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.293/3). For this purpose, he showed several tables of the impact by country, degree of importance, in the short, medium and long terms.

59. On the whole, in the EU, economic impact looked positive but limited with a tendency to grow in the longer term in the area of liberalization of services and industrial products. From a social perspective, considerable negative impact would be felt in the EU given the liberalization in agriculture, especially for the rural areas of Southern Europe. In the Mediterranean partner countries, economic impact would on the whole be positive in terms of consumer welfare, largely due to industrial products and for agriculture and services, the additional gain for each of the sectors would be 0.5%. Greater gains were possible in the longer run, but would hinge on internal reforms and decisions on investment. The social impact would be mixed: certain aspects would be

affected negatively, especially a considerable increase of unemployment which would lead to a lowering of salaries, a decrease of public funds allocated to education, health and social services, and a heavy impact on the status and standard of living for women. At the environmental level, considerable negative impact would affect water resources, soil fertility and biodiversity with intensified pressures in the cities and increased production of wastes. In terms of Millennium Development Goals, all this would increase poverty and negatively affect public health and education. A lot of these impacts would be felt in the short and medium term and could persist even through the long term if effective measures were not taken early on. Finally, Mr George stressed the linkages between the results of the SIA study with the proposals and recommendations of the MSSD and advocated the need for the MCSD to involve itself more closely with the EuroMed process.

Discussion

60. Mr Michael Scoullas (MIO-ESCDE) related the position of NGOs in the follow-up committee, while pointing out that the NGOs had, from the first phase of this study, stressed that the environmental and social studies were not covered by the EuroMed Association Agreements and that the strengthening of capacity building had not been envisaged for the partner countries. At the end of phase II, the presentation by Mr George confirmed that there were few economic benefits to expect – and those were depending upon uncertain pre-conditions – but on the other hand serious negative impacts such as social troubles and environmental degradation were expected. Moreover, from the North American Free-Trade Zone Agreement, one knew what the poorer segments could expect, especially concerning migratory flows. It was important to know how the recommendations of phase III would be taken into consideration in the trade negotiations, how national policies would be restructured and what form of EU assistance would maximize benefits and minimize costs; finally how liberalization would be combined with the MDGs, the NAPs and the MSSD. For as long as an assessment and serious study of the final conclusions of the SIA study had not been carried out, the negotiations on present and future agreements on agriculture and trade should stop. Otherwise, a serious error would be committed which would be difficult to fix. The deadline of 2010 should also be revised. For the MCSD, the only possibility was for the time being to follow the process closely on the basis of all available information and draw its conclusions which it would then submit to the Contracting Parties Meeting.

61. For Mr George Strongylis (EC), the matter in question was sensitive and it was good to have this study in order to bring the process launched to its best possible conclusion with all necessary corrections. Personally, he was in a difficult position, because he shared with the other MCSD members the vision and the language of the SD while he was not a sustainable development specialist; however, he was fully convinced that the benefits of liberalization of trade would in time be greater than the negative consequences; this process should be seen within the larger context of the EuroMed Partnership in which it was inscribed and which brought more general benefits in terms of peace, security, better governance which could not be measured in simple GDP terms. In any case, the SIA was not completed, the follow-up was continuing and one should trust the European Commission to integrate the results in the negotiations with its partners. In the meantime, it would be a good idea to put the views of the NGOs, just referred to by Mr Scoullas, in a letter or other document to be transmitted to all relevant DGs in Brussels.

62. Mr Hicham Abou Jaoude (UMCE) highlighted the economic aspect of the Barcelona process and the SIA study to express the viewpoint of the enterprises that his organization represented. The business sector strongly supported the Barcelona process and the liberalization of trade by 2010, because it would represent a historic occasion to relaunch in the Mediterranean Basin a prosperity which had been made evident by the successive and brilliant civilizations which had flourished along its coasts. For sure, after ten years, the EuroMed process had not produced all the results expected in terms of economic growth and job creation in the Southern countries. The EU should envisage ways to reinforce the effectiveness of its Euro-Mediterranean policies, but on the other hand, the partner countries should accelerate the pace of legal, political and economic

reforms based on private initiative, market economy, venture capital and structural reforms which would bring about a better liberalization and South-South integration, a prerequisite for foreign direct investments in the Southern countries and North-South integration.

63. Ms Noura Laroussi (Tunisia) stated that her country had just celebrated the tenth anniversary of its restructuring programme, having signed in 1995 the first association and partnership agreement with the EU which entailed tariff abolishment over a twelve-year period for industrial products. The results could be summarized in some spectacular figures for export increases, direct foreign investments, a rate of return on investments approved in the context of modernization/upgrading higher than 72% and a ten-fold increase in immaterial investments. The success of liberalization of trade in the EuroMed framework was the result of efforts taken by the Tunisian authorities in consultation with the economic actors. The next phase would focus primarily on improving the indicator of human development (life expectancy, per capita GDP, level of education); this would be based on the development of the tourist sector, the modernization of the agricultural sector and the development of the oil sector, along with the liberalization of services and agriculture. This would be a critical phase for the preservation of natural resources and rural areas. The SIA study should be followed closely at each MCSD meeting to make sure it stays on course and its results are integrated in the negotiations.

64. In opening the discussion, Mr Benoit had invited participants to provide recommendations that the MCSD could formulate on this question crucial for the future of the region. Two participants raised the question of other free trade and commercial agreements concluded between Mediterranean countries and other partners, such as the USA and Asian countries. This complicated the problems because it superimposed a different dynamic without yet being clear on which way things were moving. For many speakers, the role of the MCSD was not clear: its members were not specialists in the matters in question and could only express their "feelings". It was possible to organize a meeting on this question alone, or even submit a document incorporating the views of the Parties and NGOs to the European Parliament. One participant thought the views of the NGOs "shocking" because they were too radical and tarnished the image of the EU in the Southern Mediterranean countries. Other participants estimated that one should put things in perspective: the international financial institutions predicted for certain Southern countries a growth rate of between 4 to 7% in the following eight years and in this light the projected benefits of the Partnership in % of the GDP appeared very slight. A characteristic of the Mediterranean was that the short term counted a lot, and it was there that the study predicted an increase of unemployment, urbanization, etc. A good partnership implied the presence of two strong partners: to give an example, Spain and Portugal had fully succeeded in becoming integrated in Europe thanks to preparation over a number of years with the assistance of the Structural Funds; something similar was not forthcoming in the case of the Euro-Mediterranean area. Finally, it was pointed out that some questions were not treated in the study such as water, climate change and their impact.

65. Responding to some interventions, Mr George stated that the study did not predict such high socio-economic costs as had been noted and that the abatement measures were not necessarily onerous. The case of Tunisia could be cited as a model, but in all fairness it should be added that the success in that country was not due solely to the association agreement, but to a development strategy which predated the agreement and complemented liberalization with suitable accompanying measures and a strong sustainability and environment component.

MSSD and Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Initiative "Horizon 2020"

66. Mr Strongylis described the "Horizon 2020" initiative launched during the Euro-Mediterranean Barcelona Summit in November 2005 within the framework of a five year Partnership Action Programme. Through this initiative the partners committed themselves to agreeing on a realistic timetable for the depollution of the Mediterranean Sea by the year 2020, with the appropriate financial resources and technical support they would provide for its

implementation. In December 2005, a technical meeting was organized to launch the Initiative and a draft road map was formulated. The idea was to associate the regional mechanisms already existing, such as MEDPOL/MAP, SAP/NAP and the GEF Strategic Partnership Project. The initiative would comprise a strong capacity building component and a research component. Moreover, the cooperation MAP-EC had already begun with a joint working programme. The commitment of the Heads of State and Government of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership to this initiative gave it a strong political weight.

67. Mr Civili, MEDPOL Coordinator, gave an account of the process of pollution reduction in the Mediterranean on the basis of SAP through a participation process of NAP preparation in which governments, local authorities and the industry were involved. There was now a solid basis for the concrete implementation phase of the process. MEDPOL, upon learning of the "Horizon 2020" Initiative was at first surprised since it had been for twenty years a Mediterranean structure capable of carrying out this exercise directly. However, given the fact that the objectives of the Initiative and the SAP/MED were similar and also taking into account the methodology used and the timetable adopted, it appeared that a fruitful synergy could be established between MAP and EMP, especially on the basis of the NAP preparation documents like the TDAs and the NBBs, established by the countries themselves.

Discussion

68. For two participants, the dialogue between the EC representative and the MEDPOL Coordinator made clear that the EuroMed process would assimilate the pollution reduction programme established by MEDPOL/SAP and reintroduce them in the bilateral agreements of the Partnerships with the countries with a more substantial funding. One was of course glad for the Mediterranean, but wondered about the situation in each country, where there would be overlapping at best and competition at worst between a MEDPOL Programme carried out for two decades and new actions launched by EMP under the supervision of various ministries. Moreover, "Horizon 2020" was a classic environmental initiative which lacked the sustainability component proposed by the MSSD. For other representatives on the contrary, the Initiative presented very positive aspects: first a political aspect, since one would go beyond the ministry of the environment and involve other ministries as well; then a financial aspect with the perspective of large investments. MEDPOL/MAP did not lose anything; in fact it gained in visibility, since clear reference was made to its experience, diagnostic "acquis" and competence in the field of pollution monitoring. The ministerial Euro-Mediterranean Meeting in Cairo in November 2006 would have the opportunity to confirm the need for synergy between "Horizon 2020" and all the projects, actions and initiatives currently running in the Mediterranean with SAP/MEDPOL holding pride of place.

Session 6: Other matters

69. The Coordinator indicated that the following GPA/UNEP presentation would provide information on the 2nd Intergovernmental Review Meeting of the Global Programme of Action (GPA) which was scheduled to be held in Beijing in October, 2006 and to which all Regional Seas Programmes of UNEP, such as MAP, were invited to participate.

70. Ms Annie Muchai, Associate Liaison Officer at Global Programme of Action/UNEP, made reference to the fact that the GPA for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities had been adopted in Washington in 1995 by 108 Governments and the EC to respond to the fact that 80% of total marine pollution was due to land-based activities. Governments were committed to implement the GPA through formulation and implementation of national action plans. Sixty countries had already prepared such a plan. In the Mediterranean, the launching of the SAP/MED had largely been inspired by a GPA provision on the establishment of regional action programmes. Ms Muchai announced that the second intergovernmental conference to review the GPA programme was scheduled for 16-20 October in Beijing (Peoples Republic of China).

71. A participant then expressed the view that the time had come, now that the meeting was drawing to a close, to think about its content and form. Various opinions were expressed. It was agreed that with the implementation of the MSSD, a difficult phase was beginning. Sustainable development was a very complex process and thinking should be developed as to what the next MCSD meeting would entail: more time for discussion, in other words focus on certain specific questions, especially horizontal issues, without too many items crowding the agenda as was the case in the current one. One participant stated that it would have been more efficient to launch the working groups as stated in the working plan approved in Portoroz, and urged the Secretariat to take appropriate actions towards that end. The MCSD had gone at first, after its setting up, through a reflexion phase, then a phase of MSSD formulation and was now in the implementation phase which presented a great challenge. There was of course the MCSD work programme, adopted at Portoroz, but one was not yet in the after-Portoroz phase. The RACs had presented their activities by giving them a sustainable development "tint" but this would have been the object of a Focal Points meeting and not of the MCSD. In 2004, there were plans to integrate in the MCSD an "interorganizational platform", an interesting idea which apparently had been abandoned. Meetings had in the past been signalled so that participants could enter – or refuse to enter – certain paths of reflexion but they knew from the beginning where they were being led. The current meeting gave rise to conclusions which however brought nothing new and were not recommendations since the meeting had decided practically nothing. This current discussion was doubtless the most important moment of the meeting, since in the corridors there was talk of the usefulness or not of the Commission; too many meetings without concrete results had brought about a certain malaise. Even the country representatives came to the meetings without having much to say. Despite this criticism, one should get out of this situation and figure out how the important regional initiatives could be linked together: Barcelona Convention, NAPs, GEF Partnerships, EMP, etc. in order to obtain through wide-ranging reflexion, the best possible synergies.

72. It was noted that the MCSD had from the first debated, at times quite emotionally, about its identity, role and vocation; task forces and other assessment structures had been set up to find solutions, but consensus was never reached. This phenomenon was repeated year after year. The cultural dimension, which this time did not come to the fore, should not be forgotten. One problem was that most country representatives and even those from the NGOs were environmentalists and had a difficult time grasping the complexity of the issues and the wide-ranging problems which sustainable development brought with it. Two major groups were absent from the Commission, local authorities and socio-economic actors, doubtless because they were not sure as to what was expected of them. Progress was not made, because the mayors, municipal councillors, heads of business, social actors, all confronted with the practical problems, were not there to tell the meeting why policy X was ineffective and proposal Y unrealistic. One participant suggested that the meetings would be more fruitful if they were convened not annually, but every two years. This suggestion was strongly opposed by many other participants. Finally, the Secretariat was invited, at the extraordinary meeting of Focal Points in November 2006 which was to review the role of all MAP components, to re-examine fully and in-depth the mandate, composition and operation of the Commission. After all, it was perhaps not correct that those that had conceived and formulated the MSSD were also those entrusted with the monitoring and assessment of its implementation.

Session 7: Adoption of conclusions and closure of the meeting

73. The Coordinator stated that the unscheduled discussion, which had just taken place, had been very useful and was an opportunity to speak frankly about the problems and not simply to be raised "in the corridors". Almost all members that took the floor had been critical, mostly in a constructive spirit so that progress could be made. The discussion touched on issues that were now more realistically considered. As the President of the Steering Committee and other members had recalled, the external evaluation of MAP, presented in September 2005 to the Focal Points Meeting, had already explicitly recommended that: "the MCSD must clarify its role" and "the MCSD must adopt criteria for the appointment of its members". One should take advantage of the November 2006 extraordinary meeting of the Focal Points to reflect in-depth about the MCSD; one

would hope that this time the countries would adopt strong measures and depart from the *status quo* of pessimistic accounts of fact and disillusionment at every meeting. Some representatives were right in pointing out that this meeting had come too early, only 6 months after the MSSD adoption. However, the commitment was there and the annual meeting had to be organized. In conclusion, the point had been made and one would expect that the MCSD would be put on a new more solid basis.

74. The President asked what would, under the circumstances, be the fate of the draft conclusions prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the meeting's deliberations. The Coordinator gave the opinion that it was the Commission alone that should decide.

75. After a lengthy exchange of views it was decided that the document would be considered as a summary conclusions elaborated by the Secretariat which would be circulated to the Members of the Commission for review and amendments as appropriate, provided also that members could eventually send in further amendments by electronic means within a two-week period. The summary of conclusions, as finalized by the Secretariat based on the comments received from the participants, is in **Annex III** to this report.

76. Answering a query by participants, the President and the Secretariat confirmed that, according to long-standing tradition, a detailed report of the meeting was also going to be sent to the Rapporteur and President of the Steering Committee of the MCSD, for eventual comments which would then be integrated in the text. The amended report would then be sent to the members and partners.

77. The Coordinator announced the departure of Mr Guillaume Benoit, who was appointed by the French Government to a new post in Morocco. In the name of the Secretariat he thanked Mr Benoit for the services he had given MAP over the years, especially in the formulation of the MSSD.

78. Following the usual exchange of courtesies, the President declared the meeting closed at 1 p.m. on Friday, 26 May 2006.

Annex I**List of Participants****11th meeting of the MCSD, Nicosia, Cyprus, 24-26 May 2006****MCSD MEMBERS****BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA****MR. TARIK KUPUSOVIC**

Special Advisor to the Minister
 Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment
 Hydro Engineering Institute
 Box 405, S. Tomica,1
 71000 Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
 Tel/Fax: 387 33 207949
 Fax: 387 33 212 466
 Email: heis@heis.com.ba
 E-mail: tarik.kupusovic@heis.com.ba

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF HERZEGOVINA**MR. PERICA JURKOVIC**

President of Chamber of Commerce of Herzegovina -
 Neretva Canton
 Kralja Zvonimira 6
 88 000 Mostar
 Bosnia and Herzegovina
 Tel/fax: +387 36 33 35 93
 E-mail : g_p.komora.hnz_k@tel.net.ba

**COORDINAMENTO AGENDE 21 LOCALI
ITALIANE****MR. ERIUCCIO NORA**

Director
 Segreteria Nazionale Coordinamento Agende 21
 Locali Italiane
 c/o Provincia di Modena, Viale Martiri della Libertà
 34, 41100 Modena, Italy
 Tel: 0039059 209434
 Fax: 0039059 209398
 E-mail:
 coordinamento.agenda21@provincia.modena.it

CROATIA**MS. MARIJANA A. MANCE**

Head
 International Relations Department
 Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical
 Planning and Construction
 Ul. Republike Austrije 14
 10000 Zagreb
 Croatia
 Tel: [385] 1 3782452
 Fax: [385] 1 3717149
 E-mail: marijana.mance@mzopu.hr

CYPRUS**MR. NICOS GEORGIADES**

Director, Environment Service
 Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources
 and Environment
 17 Taghmatarhou Poulou, Ayios Andreas
 1411 Nicosia, Cyprus
 Tel: 357 22303883
 Fax: 357 22774945
 E-mail: ngeorgiades@environment.moa.gov.cy

MR. CHARALAMBOS HAJIPAKKOS

Senior Environment Officer
 Environment Service
 Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and
 Environment
 Nicosia, 1411, Cyprus
 Tel. 00-357-22 -303851, Fax 00 -357 -22 -774945
 Email chajipakkos@environment.moa.gov.cy

**(CEDARE)-CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENT &
DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ARAB REGION &
EUROPE****MR. KHALED ABU ZEID**

Regional Water Programme Manager
 2 El Hegaz Street
 P.O.Box 1057 Heliopolis Bahary
 Cairo, Egypt
 Tel: (202) 451-3921 / 2 / 3 / 4 Extension: 661
 Fax: (202) 451-3918
 E-mail: kabuzeid@cedare.org

**ENDA MAGHREB- ENVIRONNEMENT
DEVELOPPEMENT ET ACTION AU MAGHREB
MR. MAGDI IBRAHIM**

Coordinator, Enda Maghreb
 12 rue Jbel Moussa - Apt. 13 "Joli Coin"
 Agdal, Rabat
 Morocco
 Tel: 212 37 67 10 61/62/63
 Fax: 212 37 67 10 64
 E-mail: coord@enda.org.ma, magdi@enda.org.ma

EGYPT**MR. OMAR ALI ABOU EICH**

Counsellor -Head of Environment and Sustainable
 Development Affairs
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 Corniche El Nile Street
 Maspero, Cairo, Egypt
 Tel: 20-2-5747847, Tel (mobile): 20-12-1021644
 Fax: 20-2-5747847
 E-mail: oeich@hotmail.com

GEN. OSAMA M. ABD ELSALAM

General Director
International Relations & Technical Cooperation
Department, Cabinet of Ministers
Tel: 20-2-5256452 ext.:7514, Fax: 20-2-5256457

MR. AHMED ABD EL HADY EL GOHARY

Liaison Officer to the Parliament
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
Tel : 20-1-01446699
Fax: 20-2- 5256454
agohary_@hotmail.com

MS. CHRISTINE ABDALLA ISKANDAR BOCTOR

MAP Coordinator for Egypt
Spécialiste de Relations Internationales et de
Conférences
Cel : 0020105774691
Tel: 202 525 64 52 Internal: 7427
Fax : 202 525 64 54
Email: christineiskandar@yahoo.fr

Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
Cabinet of Ministers
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA)
30 Misr-Helwan El-Zyraie Road
P.O. Box 11728 Maadi
Cairo, Egypt

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

MR. GEORGES STRONGYLIS

Coordinator of Mediterranean Files
EC-Environment D.G., DG ENV. E3
Avenue de Beaulieu, 9
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: 322 2968745
Fax: 322 2994123
E-mail: George.strongylis@cec.eu.int

GREECE

MR. JOHN VOURNAS

Director General for the Environment
and Physical Planning,
Ministry for the Environment, Physical Planning and
Public Works
15 Amaliados Street, Athens
Greece
Tel: 302106457990
Fax: 302106410641, 2108647420
E-mail: jvournas@minenv.gr

ISRAEL

MS. GALIT COHEN

Head, Unit of Environmental Policy
Ministry of Environment
5, Kanifei Nesharim,
P.O.Box 34033 Jerusalem
95464 Israel
Tel: 972 2 6553862
Mob: 972 50 6233377
Fax: 972 2 6553853
E-mail: galitc@sviva.gov.il

**LEGAMBIENTE- LEAGUE FOR THE
ENVIRONMENT**

MS. ROMINA BIOCCHI

MS. MICHELA PRESTA

International Department
Loc. Enaoli 58010 Rispescia (Gr) ITALIA
Tel. +39 0564/48771 - Fax +39 0564/487740
mediterraneo3@festambiente.it
International Department
LEGAMBIENTE
Via Salaria 403
00199 Roma, Italy
Tel. +39 06 86268330
Fax. +39 06 86218474

ITALY

MR. PAOLO SOPRANO

Head of Division I
Department for Environmental Research and
Development
Ministry for the Environment and Territory
Via C. Colombo, 44
Tel: 3906 57228210
Fax: 3906 57228225
E-mail: soprano.paolo@minambiente.it

MS. MARIA DALLA COSTA

Head, International Relations Services
National Agency for Environmental Protection and
Development (APAT)
Via Curtatone 3, Rome, Italy
Tel: 39 06 50074201
Fax: 39 06 50074276
E-mail: dallacosta@apat.it

MS. ANGELICA CARNELOS

Expert
Tel: 39 06 57228183, Fax :39 06 57228178
E mail: carnelos.angelica@minambiente.it

MR. FRANCESCO PRESICCE

Expert
Tel: 39 0657228162
Fax :39 06 57228178
E-mail: presicce.francesco@minambiente.it

MS. FEDERICA SPROVIERI

Expert
Tel: 39 06 57228111
Fax :39 06 57228177
E mail : sprovieri.federica@minambiente.it

Department for Environmental Research and
Development
Ministry for the Environment and Territory
Via C. Colombo, 44
Rome, Italy

LEBANON

MS. SANA SAIRAWAN

Chief of Planning and Programs Service
Ministry of Environment- Lebanon
Down town - Lazarieh Bldg -
P.O.Box 11-2727, Beirut, Lebanon
Tel: 961 1 976514 / 976555 ext: 450
Fax: 961 1 976530
Email: s.sairawan@moe.gov.lb

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

MR. ABDULFATAH BOARGOB

Environmental Advisor, Head of delegation
Tel/Fax : 218 21 48370266
E-mail: aboargob@yahoo.com

MR. NURI EMHEMED ALMARGHANI

Tel: 218 21 48370266
Fax: 218 21 4872160
E-mail: nmarghani@yahoo.com

Environmental General Authority
Al Geran, P.O. Box 83618
Tripoli, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

MALTA

MS. MARGUERITE CAMILLERI

Policy Coordinator Manager
Director General's Office
Malta Environment and Planning Authority (MEPA)
St. Francis Ravelin street
Marsa, Floriana CMR01 Malta
Tel: 356 2290 1529
Fax: 356 2290 2295
E-mail: marguerite.camilleri@mepa.org.mt

MEDITERRANEAN INFORMATION OFFICE FOR ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (MIO-ECSDE)

MR. MICHAEL SCOULLOS

Chairman

MS. ANASTASIA RONIOTES

Programme Officer

12 Kyristou Street
105 56 Athens, Greece
Tel: 30210 3247267-3247490
Fax: 30210 3317127
E-mail: mio-ee-env@ath.forthnet.gr

MEDCITIES

MR. ALEXIOS MICHAELIDES

Deputy Mayor of Larnaca
Minicipality of Larnaca
P.O.Box 40059, 6300 Larnaca, Cyprus
Tel:35799640180, 35724639957
Fax:35724639956
E-mail:smands@cytanet.com.cy

MedCités- General Secretariat

Mancomunitat de Municipis de l'Area,
Metropolitana de Barcelona, C/ 62, Núm. 16/18
Sector A, Zona Franca, 08040 Barcelona, Spain
Tel: 34-93-2234165, Fax:34-93-2234849
E-mail: desurb@amb.es

MONACO

MR. PATRICK VAN KLAVEREN

Délégué à l'Environnement International et
Méditerranéen
Représentant Permanent de la Principauté auprès du
PNUE, Ministère d'Etat, Place de Visitation, Monaco
Tel: 377 93 152122, Fax: 377 93 509591
E-mail: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

MOROCCO

MR. ABDEL FETAH SAHIBI

Chef de la Division de la Coopération Internationale
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire, de l'Eau et
de l'Environnement
4 place Abou Baker Esseddik.
Avenue Fal Ould Amir - Agdal
Rabat, Maroc
Tel: 212-37-772662
Fax: 212-37-772640
E-mail: sahibi@minenv.gov.ma

METAP- WORLD BANK/MEDITERRANEAN ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

MR. SHERIF ARIF

METAP Coordinator / Regional Environment
and Safeguard Advisor
Water, Environment, Social and Rural Development
The World Bank
Middle East and North Africa Region
1818 H. Street; NW, room H8-133
Washington DC 20433
United States of America
Tel: 1202 4737315
Fax:1202 4771609
E-mail:sarif@worldbank.org

REC-REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

MS. MARTA SZIGETI BONIFERT

Executive Director
2000 Szentendre, Hungary, Ady Endre ut 9-11
Tel: 36 26 504 000
Fax: 36 26 311 294
mbonifert@rec.org, info@rec.org

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO

MS. JELENA KNEZEVIC

Advisor
Ministry of Environmental Protection and
Physical Planning
81000 Podgorica, Serbia and Montenegro
Tel: 38167255604 or 381 81 482313,
Fax: 381 81 234131
E-mail: jelenak@mn.yu

SLOVENIA

MR. MITJA BRICELJ

Undersecretary
Ministry for Environment and Physical Planning
48 Dunajska, SI-1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia
Tel: 386 1 4787384
Fax: 386 1 4787419
E-mail: mitja.bricelj@gov.si

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

MS. MANAL AL SAKKA

Director of EIA Department
Ministry of Local Administration and Environment
P.O. Box 3773, Tolyani Street
Damascus, Syrian Arab Republic
Tel/Fax: [963] 11 461072
E-mail: msakka@postmaster.co.uk
E-mail: env-min@net.sy

MS. MOKHLESA AL-ZAEIM

NSSD- National Coordinator
Fund for Integrated Rural Development of Syria
'FIRDOS'
Tel: 963-11-6125026
Mobile: 963-94- 319563, Fax: 963-11-6125030
E-mail: mokhlesa@scs-net.org, nssd@firdos.org.sy

TUNISIA

MS. NOURA LAROUCSI

Directrice Général de l'Agence Nationale de
Protection de l'Environnement (ANPE)
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement
Durable
Immeuble ICF Cité des Sciences
Tunis, Tunisie
Tel : 21671 767448
Fax: 21671 751268
E-mail: anpe.dg@anpe.nat.tn
Email: dg@anpe.nat.tn, dg.hpm@anpe.nat.tn

TURKEY

MR. IZAMETTIN EKER

Director for Regional & Bilateral Relations
Department of Foreign Relations
and European Union
Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Turkey
Address: Sogutozu Caddesi No.14/E Bastepe
Ankara, Turkey
Tel: 0090-312-207 54 03
Fax: 0090-312-207 54 54
Cell: +90-505-620 40 42
E-mail: izameker@yahoo.com

**UNION MÉDITERRANÉENNE DES
CONFÉDÉRATIONS D'ENTREPRISES -UMCE
MR. HICHAM ABOU JAOUDE**

UMCE Representative
Association of Lebanese Industrialists
P.O.Box 11-1520, Riad el Solh
Beirut, Lebanon
Tel: 9611350280/1/2 +9613412267
Fax: 9611351167
E-mail: h.aboujaoude@umce-med.org
E-mail: hichamaj@hotmail.com

2, rue Hadmhrumet Nortre Dame 1002
Tunis Belvedere, Tunisia
Tel: 21671 280177
Fax: 21671 281495

ALTERNATE MCSD MEMBERS

**AIFM-ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE FORETS
MEDITERRANEENNES**

MR. MOHAMED LARBI CHAKROUN

President
14, rue Louis Astouin
13002 Marseille, France
Tel : 33 4 91 90 76 70
Fax : 33 4 91 90 71 62
E-mail: info@aifm.org

EAMS- EURO ARAB MANAGEMENT SCHOOL

MR. PIETRO SODDU

Research Fellow on Tourism and Environment
EAMS - Euro Arab Management School
C/Carcel Baja nº 3
18001, Granada, Spain
Tel: +34 958 805050 (235)
Fax: +34 958 800152
E-mail: psoddu@eams.fundea.es

**HELMIPA- HELLENIC MARINE ENVIRONMENT
PROTECTION ASSOCIATION**

MR. CONSTANTINOS TRIANTAFILLOU

Assistant to the Director General
5 Pergamou Street, Athens
Greece
0030 210 9326277
0030 210 9353847
E-mail: helmepajunior@helmepajunior.gr
helmepa@helmepa.gr

INTERNATIONAL OCEAN INSTITUTE

MR. CHARLES GALDIES

Programme Manager
International Ocean Institute - Headquarters
P.O. Box 3
Gzira GZR 01, Malta
Tel: +356 21 346 528
Fax: +356 21 346 502
E-mail: ioihq@ioihq.org.mt

**MEDMARAVIS-RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION
OF ISLAND & COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS IN THE
MEDITERRANEAN**

MR. MICHEL JACOVIDES

94 Anexartissias street
PO. Box 50005
3600 Limassol, Cyprus
Tel: 357 25823696
Fax: 357 25823697
E-mail: iakovidi@spidernet.com.cy

MEDMARAVIS

Iou Pijounié, route d'Esparron
BP 2, St. Maximin F-83470
France
[33] 494594069
[33] 494594738
medmaraxm@wanadoo.fr

**STATION BIOLOGIQUE DE LA TOUR DU VALAT
MR. JEAN JALBERT**

Directeur Général
Le Sambuc, F- 13200 Arles,
France
Tel : +33 4 90 97 20 13
Fax : +33 4 90 97 20 19
jalbert@tourduvalat.org

UOA - UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN

MR. IOANNIS SPILANIS

Assistant Professor
Laboratory of Local and Islands' Development
Department of Environment - University of the Aegean
University Hill - GR 81100 Mytilini, Greece
tel: +3022510 36229
fax: +3022510 36290
gsipi@aegean.gr

**UNITED NATIONS BODIES AND SECRETARIATS
AND OTHER OBSERVERS**

**UNEP/GPA-UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME/GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF
ACTION**

MS. ANNIE MUCHAI

Associate Liaison Officer
Kortenaerkade 1
2518 EX, the Hague, the Netherlands
Tel: 31703 114479
Fax: 31703 456648
E-mail: a.muchai@unep.nl

**UNIDO-ICS/ UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL
DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION –
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SCIENCE AND
HIGH TECHNOLOGY**

MR. GENNARO LONGO

Director
Environment Area
Special Adviser
Technology Development
Area Science Park, Building L2
Padriciano 99, 34012 Trieste, Italy
Tel.: +39-040-9228104
Fax: +39-040-9228136
E-mail: gennaro.longo@ics.trieste.it

EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

MR. DAVIS STANNERS

Programme Manager
Strategic Knowledge and Innovation
European Environment Agency
Kongens Nytorv 6
DK-1050 Copenhagen K
Denmark
Tel: 45.33367101
Fax: 45.3336.7128
E-mail: david.stanners@eea.europa.eu

LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES

MR. DJAMEL-EDDINE DJABALLAH

Counsellor
El-Tahrir Street
Cairo, Egypt
Tel: [20] 2 5750511
Fax: [20] 2 5740331

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE
EURO-MEDITERRANEAN FREE TRADE AREA
SIA/EMFTA**

MR. CLIVE GEORGE

Institute for Development Policy and Management
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road, Manchester
M13 9QH, UK
Tel.: (44) 161 275 0812/0811
Fax.: (44) 161 275 0423
E-mail: clive.george@man.ac.uk
mzdsszkg@manchester.ac.uk

**RAED-ARAB NETWORK FOR ENVIRONMENT
AND DEVELOPMENT**

MR. EMAD ADLY

General Coordinator
3A Misr Letmaameer Buildings
Zahraa Maadi Street, Maadi
P.O. Box 2, Magles Elshaab,
Cairo, Egypt
Tel: 202 5161519- 202 5161245
Fax: 202 5162961
Email: aoye@link.net,

PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

MR. SAID JALALA

Director General
Ministry of Environment
Gaza, Palestinian Territories
Tel: 00970599 255488
E-mail: Said_Jalala@hotmail.com

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN**REGIONAL MARINE POLLUTION EMERGENCY
RESPONSE CENTRE FOR THE
MEDITERRANEAN SEA (REMPEC)****MR. FREDERIC HEBERT**

Director

Manoel Island,

GZR 03, Malta

Tel: 356-21-337296/7/8

Fax: 356-21-339951

E-mail: fhebert@rempec.org; rempec@rempec.org**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR
THE BLUE PLAN (BP/RAC)****MR. GUILLAUME BENOIT**

Director

E-mail: gbenoit@planbleu.org**MR. LUC DASSONVILLE**

Deputy Director

E-mail: ldassonville@planbleu.org**MS. ELISABETH COUDERT**E-mail: coudert@planbleu.orgPlan Bleu, Centre d' Activité Régional
(PB/CAR)

15 rue Ludwig van Beethoven

Sophia Antipolis

F-06560 Valbonne, France

Tel: 33-4-92387130/33

Fax: 33-4-92387131

E-mail: planbleu@planbleu.org**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE
PRIORITY ACTIONS PROGRAMME (PAP/RAC)****MR. IVICA TRUMBIC**

Director

11 Kraj Sv. Ivana

21000 Split

Croatia

Tel: 385 21 340470

Fax: 385 21 340490

E-mail: ivica.trumbic@ppa.htnet.hr**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR SPECIALLY
PROTECTED AREAS (SPA/RAC)****MR. ABDLERAHMEN GANNOUN**

Director

Boulevard Yasser Arafat

B.P. 337 - 1080 Tunis Cedex

Tunisia

Tel: 216 71 206 851 & 216 71 206 485

Fax: 216 71 206 490

E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.orgE-mail: gannoun.abderrahmen@rac-spa.org**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR CLEANER
PRODUCTION (CP/RAC)****MS. VIRGINIA ALZINA**

Director

E-mail: valzina@yahoo.com**MR. ENRIQUE DE VILLAMORE MARTÍN**

Technical Officer

E-mail: evillamore@cema-sa.org

c/Paris 184, 3rd floor

08036, Barcelona, Spain

Tel:34934151112

Fax:34932370286

E-mail: cleanpro@cema-sa.org**INFO/RAC-MAP****REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE ON INFORMATION
AND COMMUNICATION****MR. SERGIO ILLUMINATO**

Director General

E-mail: director@inforac.org**MR. PAOLO GUGLIELMI**

Programme Manager

E-mail: pguglielmi@inforac.org**MR. ROMAN PRYJOMKO**

Partnership, Governance,

System Design Coordinator

E-mail: rpryjomko@inforac.org**MS. SIMONETTA LOMBARDO**

Communication Officer

E-mail: slombardo@inforac.org**MS. FEDERICA DE MICHELI**

Media Communication Manager

MS. PAOLA RICHARD

Press Officer, Communication Unit

Mobile : 39 346 3795736

MS. TERESA BORELLI

Study and Research Coordinator

MS. MARIA TVERITINA

Media Unit

MR. STEWART CENCI

Media Unit

MR. ANDREA MARCHESE

Design & Graphic Officer

MR. CLAUDIO VALERIO**MR. MAURIZIO FELICETTI**

Filming Unit

Via Cagliari, 40

00198 Rome

Italy

Tel: 39-06-85305147

Fax: 39-06-8542475

E-mail: info@inforac.orgwww.inforac.org

**MAP SECRETARIAT FOR
100 MEDITERRANEAN HISTORIC SITES
MR. DANIEL DROCOURT**

Coordinator

Atelier du Patrimoine de la ville de Marseille

10 ter square Belsunce, 13001 Marseille, France

Tel: 33 491 907874

Fax: 33 491 561461

E-mail: ddrocourt@mairie-marseille.fr

COORDINATING UNIT FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

MR. PAUL MIFSUD

Coordinator

Tel: 302107273101

E-mail: paul.mifsud@unepmap.gr

MR. F. SAVERIO CIVILI

MED POL Coordinator

Tel: 302107273101

E-mail: paul.mifsud@unepmap.gr

MR. PHILIPPE ALIROL

Senior Sustainable Development Officer

Tel: 302107273126

E-mail: p.alirol@unepmap.gr

MS. TATJANA HEMA

Programme Officer

Tel: 302107273115

E-mail: thema@unepmap.gr

MS. LUISA COLASIMONE

Information Officer

Tel: 302107273103

E-mail: luisa.colasimone@unepmap.gr

Coordinating Unit for the
Mediterranean Action Plan
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
P. O. Box 18019
116 10 Athens, Greece
Tel: 30210 7273100
Fax: 30210 7253196-7
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr
www.unepmap.org

AGENDA

 11th Meeting of the MCSD, Nicosia, Cyprus, 24-26 May 2006

	Wednesday 24 May	Thursday 25 May	Friday 26 May
09.00-09.30	Registration		
09.30-11.00	Introduction - Welcome and Opening remarks - Election of the Steering Committee - Agenda and organization of work - Brief presentation of MCSD progress report and documents distributed - Strategic implication of Portoroz meeting (Mr P. Mifsud) Session 1: NSSD Processes - Update of the review of NSSD (Mr Ph. Alirol) - NSSD implementation - Montenegro (Ms. J. Knezevic) - Syria (Ms M. Al-Zaeim)	Session 3: MAP support to MSSD implementation - Introduction by the MAP Coordinator (Vision) - Follow-up: indicators and thematic activities (water, energy, tourism and rural development) (BP/RAC) - Discussion	Session 6: - Other issues related to the MCSD activities - Next MCSD meeting - Adoption of the conclusions
11.00-11.30	Coffee Break	Coffee Break	Coffee Break
11.30-13.00	Session 1: NSSD Processes (cont.) - NSSD implementation - Italy (Mr P. Soprano) - Role of local level initiatives in Italy (Mr E. D'Alessio) - Initiatives and pilot action - National opportunities, challenges and synergies for the implementation of the MSSD: Some reflections from Malta (Ms M. Camilleri) - The Adriatic initiative (Mr M. Bricelj) - Discussion	Session 4: Addressing cross-sector issues - Information and Communication - Promotion of Environment and Development Report (BP/RAC) - Vision for an "Information and Communication Strategy" for the MSSD (INFO/RAC) - Discussion - Education for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean region - Presentation MIO-ECSDE - Involving the industry sector - Results of state of the art study on sustainable production and cleaner technology (CP/RAC)	Session 7: - Adoption of the conclusions (cont.) - Closure of the meeting
13.00-14.30	Lunch Break	Lunch Break	
14.30-16.30	Session 2: Current MAP processes relevant to MSSD Implementation (Priority Field of Action 2.7) - Prospective and scenarios on coastal areas (BP/RAC) - ICZM Protocol (PAP/RAC) - Prevention and reduction of land-based pollution - implementation of SAP and NAPs (MEDPOL)	Session 5: MSSD and other Global/Regional initiatives and processes - Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area - Presentation (Mr C. George) - Panel discussion: Tunisia (Ms N. Laroussi), EC (Mr G. Strongylis), UMCE (Mr H. Abou Jaoude); FoE/MedNet (Mr E. Clancy); MIO-ESCDE (Mr M. Scoullas), Facilitation: BP/RAC	
16.30-17.00	Coffee Break	Coffee Break	
17.00-18.00	Session 2: Current MAP processes relevant to MSSD Implementation (Priority Field of Action 2.7 cont.) - Implementation of the Regional Strategy for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (REMPEC) - Protection of Marine and coastal biodiversity (SPA/RAC)	- The relationship between the MSSD and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership initiative "Horizon 2020" - Dialogue: Mr G. Strongylis (EC) and Mr F. Civili (MEDPOL) - Protection of the Marine environment from pollution from Land Based Activities/2nd Intergovernmental Meeting of the GPA - Presentation by Ms A. Muchai (UNEP-GPA) - Discussion on strengthening cooperation with global/regional initiatives	

Annex III

Secretariat's summary conclusions

(incorporating comments received by members and participants)

11th Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD) 24-26 May, Nicosia, Cyprus

1. Following adoption of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD) at Portoroz in November 2005, the MCSD recognized that implementation of the MSSD, especially at country level, was the main challenge to be addressed by the Commission, and that MAP components should act as facilitators of that process.
2. The Commission acknowledged that synergies should be promoted with existing institutions, mechanisms and initiatives, taking advantage of the work already done with respect to sustainable development issues.
3. The Commission acknowledged the work carried out by the MAP components, in particular the valuable role played by Blue Plan/RAC with regard to proposing initial steps for the implementation of the MCSD programme of work in some key areas, welcomed the proposal by the Centre to undertake missions to countries to support MSSD implementation, suggested full coordination with INFO/RAC for the needed information and communication activities at the national level, and proposed the formulation of terms of reference to define those activities that should be undertaken by the Centres.
4. When implementing the MSSD, the MCSD stressed that it was important to secure synergies with and draw inspiration from relevant regional and sub-regional initiatives and strategies, for example the Arab Regional Initiative for Sustainable Development, the Revised European Union's Sustainable Development Strategy and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD).
5. The Commission stressed that human beings are at the centre of sustainable development, underlining the importance of governance and the involvement of a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including the business sector.
6. In order to ensure the implementation of the MSSD, the Commission stressed the need to enhance cross-sectoral issues, in particular to: improve information management and communication; build capacity; promote education for sustainable development; encourage the exchange of experiences; and conduct awareness- raising campaigns, targeting different audiences and taking into account the diversity of languages and cultures around the Mediterranean.
7. The Information and Communication Strategy tabled by INFO/RAC was widely appreciated as a tool for providing a new impetus to move forward the MSSD Agenda at the national and regional level, with several countries expressing the desire to participate in the proposed Advisory Group.
8. The Commission also recognized that the time is ripe to increase the coherence and convergence of information towards sustainable development, integrating different information systems and investigating successful clearinghouse models with INFO/RAC playing a prominent role.

9. The MCSD urged that the Mediterranean should have a clear profile and identity in order to enhance its visibility at international level. The MCSD member should all contribute to this and take all opportunities to act into this direction.
10. The Commission recognized that the MSSD represents a turning point for the MAP and its components and called on them to build strategic alliances with other main players in the region, in order to mobilize more effectively the human resources and expert knowledge needed, capitalizing on exiting work by leading institutions and networks in the MSSD implementation areas, avoiding unnecessary duplication working groups.
11. The expert groups to be set up to address MSSD priorities, if needed to provide a clear added value to existing regional cooperation, should respect broad geographical and stakeholder representation taking into account the need in certain countries to address the lack of expertise, involve those MCSD members who indicated their interest, and ensure the participation of civil society and local actors in such groups.
12. While commending the efforts made by countries in developing National Strategies for Sustainable Development (NSSDs), the Commission recognized that countries were facing common difficulties such as lack of funding and limited involvement of ministries other than the Ministry of the Environment, and expressed the firmly held view that Ministries of Finance and economic institutions should also be encouraged to mainstream sustainable development in policies and that all stakeholders should participate fully in the process.
13. The MCSD welcomed the support given by Italy and Monaco to Egypt, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Serbia and Montenegro for the development of their NSSDs, as well as that offered by the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation, through its Azahar Programme, to Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lebanon and Tunisia for the same purpose. The Members commanded the countries' achievements in NSSD formulation.
14. Expressing its appreciation of the Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area, the Commission stressed the need for its results to be widely disseminated in all countries concerned.
15. Emphasizing that the findings of the SIA should be taken into consideration in the current negotiation process concerning the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area, the Commission highlighted the need to further strengthen North/South and South/South development and cooperation policies.
16. Underscoring the importance of pursuing efforts towards Euro-Mediterranean integration, the MCSD noted the potential positive impact of trade liberalization on Mediterranean countries but also the serious concerns raised by the NGO community regarding possible negative consequences on communities.
17. The Commission acknowledged the role of environmental legislation, market mechanisms, technological innovation and mitigating measures in offsetting the negative social and environmental impact of the free trade area in the region, and stressed the need to pay particular attention to tax reform, and the potential threat to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and the agricultural sector.
18. Noting the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) initiative "Horizon 2020", welcoming the participatory process that had led to it, and acknowledging the role of MEDPOL in

achieving a reduction in land-based pollution, the Commission stressed on the vital synergy between MAP and EMP in working together towards the initiative's goals and its implementation in the concerned countries.

19. The MCSD recalled that the Contracting Parties, international bodies, the private sector, local authorities and NGOs should further develop cooperation with a view to identifying appropriate solutions to sustainable development issues and to mobilize appropriate resources to enhance the quality of life in the Mediterranean region.
20. Acknowledging the need to raise awareness of the private sector on the MSSD and the importance of effectively involving that sector in planning and policy making at regional and national levels, the Commission welcomed the initiatives by CP/RAC and requested the Centre to promote voluntary initiatives and identify mechanisms through which the business sector can become an active partner.
21. The MCSD recognised the fundamental role of local authorities for the implementation of the MSSD, in particular through Local Agenda 21 processes.
22. The involvement of local authorities in the MSSD implementation should be greatly encouraged, as well as the exchange of information on good practices regarding Local Agendas 21.
23. Recognizing the valuable contribution of NGOs to the activities of the MCSD and acknowledging them as a source of expertise and experience, the Commission called for the active participation of NGOs in the process to continue to be supported, with the provision of financial assistance wherever possible and justified.