



# **The Mediterranean Action Plan and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: Identifying Goals and Capacities – Improving Co-operation and Synergies**

**Report to the Mediterranean Action Plan**

**28 June 2002**

**Axel Conrads, Eduard Interwies, R. Andreas Kraemer**

**Ecologic, Pfalzburger Strasse 43-44, 10717 Berlin, Germany, [www.ecologic.de](http://www.ecologic.de)**

**Tel. +49 30 86880-0; Fax: +49 30 86880-100; [office@ecologic.de](mailto:office@ecologic.de)**

# CONTENT

- 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 4**
- 2 BACKGROUND..... 6**
  - 2.1 A HISTORY OF ENVISIONING CO-OPERATION..... 6
  - 2.2 STRUCTURE AND BASIS OF THE REPORT ..... 7
- 3 THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN (MAP)..... 9**
  - 3.1 GOALS ..... 9
    - 3.1.1 *The “New” Agenda: The Mediterranean Action Plan II*..... 9
    - 3.1.2 *The Regime of the Barcelona Convention*..... 11
      - 3.1.2.1 Dumping Protocol ..... 11
      - 3.1.2.2 Emergency Protocol and new Prevention and Emergency Protocol..... 11
      - 3.1.2.3 Land-Based Sources (LBS) Protocol..... 12
      - 3.1.2.4 Specially Protected Areas (SPA) and Biodiversity Protocol ..... 12
      - 3.1.2.5 Offshore Protocol ..... 13
      - 3.1.2.6 Hazardous Wastes Protocol..... 13
  - 3.2 INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE ..... 13
    - 3.2.1 *Central Bodies*..... 14
    - 3.2.2 *Funding*..... 14
    - 3.2.3 *Advisory Bodies*..... 14
      - 3.2.3.1 National Focal Points (NFPs)..... 14
      - 3.2.3.2 Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSDD)..... 14
      - 3.2.3.3 Comments on MAP Advisory Bodies ..... 15
    - 3.2.4 *MAP Co-ordinating Unit (MEDU)*..... 17
    - 3.2.5 *The Centres* ..... 17
      - 3.2.5.1 Programme for the Assessment and Control of Pollution in the Mediterranean Region (MEDPOL)..... 18
      - 3.2.5.2 Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC)..... 21
      - 3.2.5.3 Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC)..... 23
      - 3.2.5.4 Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean (REMPEC) ..... 27
      - 3.2.5.5 Specially Protected Areas Regional Activities Centre (SPA/RAC)..... 28
      - 3.2.5.6 Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (CP/RAC) ..... 29
      - 3.2.5.7 Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre (ERS/RAC)..... 30
      - 3.2.5.8 Secretariat for the Protection of Coastal Historic Sites (100 HS) ..... 30
  - 3.3 ASSESSMENT..... 31
    - 3.3.1 *Programmatic Focus*..... 32
    - 3.3.2 *The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development*..... 32
    - 3.3.3 *National Focal Points* ..... 34
    - 3.3.4 *Centres* ..... 34
- 4 THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERSHIP ..... 36**
  - 4.1 GOALS ..... 36
    - 4.1.1 *The Barcelona Declaration*..... 36
    - 4.1.2 *The Short and Medium-Term Priority Environmental Action Programme (SMAP)* ..... 37

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 4.2      | EURO-MED INSTITUTIONS AND ACTIVITIES .....   | 39        |
| 4.2.1    | <i>Priorities at the Regional Level</i> .....  | 39        |
| 4.2.1.1  | Priorities within the Economic and Financial Partnership .....   | 39        |
| 4.2.1.2  | Current Euro-Med Policy Regarding Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development .....                                       | 40        |
| 4.2.2    | <i>Association Agreements</i> .....  | 41        |
| 4.2.3    | <i>SMAP Correspondents and SMAP Correspondents Network</i> .....   | 42        |
| 4.2.4    | <i>Financial Instruments</i> .....   | 42        |
| 4.2.4.1  | MEDA Regulation, Programming and Project Selection .....   | 42        |
| 4.2.4.2  | The European Investment Bank.....  | 44        |
| 4.2.4.3  | Results and Analysis.....  | 45        |
| 4.3      | KEY ISSUES REQUIRING ACTION.....   | 46        |
| 4.3.1    | <i>Programmatic Outset and Activities at the Regional Level</i> .....  | 47        |
| 4.3.2    | <i>The National Levels</i> .....   | 49        |
| 4.3.3    | <i>SMAP Correspondents</i> .....   | 51        |
| 4.3.4    | <i>MEDA</i> .....  | 51        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>SECTORAL SYNERGIES – OPTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.....</b>   | <b>53</b> |
| 5.1      | TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT: TOWARDS AN AREA OF SUSTAINABLE FREE TRADE.....  | 53        |
| 5.2      | INFORMATION (REPORTS, INDICATORS AND STATISTICS) .....   | 54        |
| 5.3      | SUSTAINABLE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING LAND-BASED SOURCES, TOURISM AND THE PRESERVING OF MEDITERRANEAN BIODIVERSITY) ..... | 55        |
| 5.4      | WATER MANAGEMENT .....   | 59        |
| 5.5      | POLLUTION FROM MARINE ACTIVITIES.....  | 61        |
| 5.6      | OUTLOOK: TRANSPORT AND ENERGY.....   | 62        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>CROSS-SECTORAL SYNERGIES – OPTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....</b>  | <b>63</b> |
| 6.1      | POLICY PLANNING AT CENTRAL POLITICAL LEVEL .....   | 63        |
| 6.2      | CAPACITY BUILDING AT CENTRAL LEVELS .....  | 66        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>CONCLUSION.....</b>   | <b>68</b> |
| <b>8</b> | <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>  | <b>70</b> |
| 8.1      | <i>UN AND MAP DOCUMENTS</i> .....  | 70        |
| 8.2      | <i>EU AND EURO-MED DOCUMENTS</i> .....   | 71        |
| 8.3      | <i>LITERATURE</i> .....  | 72        |

## 1 Executive Summary

This study by Ecologic was conducted with the support of the United Nations Environment Programme's Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP), and the French Ministry of Environment and the Plan Bleu Regional Activity Centre (PB/RAC). Based on conclusions of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the MAP Contracting Parties in Monaco on 14-17 November 2001, it explores the possibilities for co-operation and synergies between MAP and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP). The study was undertaken in parallel to the preparations of the Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers of Environment in Athens on 8 to 10 July 2002 with a view to integrating environmental policy concerns into different EMP sector policies. This report:

- Describes the programmatic development and operational scope of the MAP, including its legal instruments and institutions;
- Examines the degree to which environmental protection requirements are integrated into declarations and policies of the EMP;
- Provides depth with a view to parallel activities through case studies in the field of:
  - Trade (establishment of a Mediterranean Free Trade Zone),
  - Information and strategies (statistics, indicators, etc.),
  - Coastal zone management (incl. land-based sources, tourism, biological diversity),
  - Water management,
  - Marine activities and their attendant pollution.
- Presents a number of options and proposals for enhancing synergies between MAP and the EMP.

In summary, we find that MAP and the EMP have different purposes, structures and vectors of institutional development but share sustainable development as the overall goal of regional policy co-ordination. MAP is a relatively mature, diversified system involving (almost) all countries in the Mediterranean basin in a partnership of (formally) equals and focuses on sustainable development from an originally environmental background. MAP now has a number of offices and centres throughout the region, and range of activities beyond environmental policy in a traditional sense. The EMP is younger, originally conceived against a background in external relations and security and covers a number of sectors – especially in the economic and financial area, focussing on trade, industry, energy, transport, and telecommunications, all of which are highly relevant for environmental protection and sustainable development – in an overall framework of proximity policy. The EMP is politically and financially stronger, centred in Brussels rather than the Mediterranean basin, and driven by the EU and its Member States. MAP and the EMP are overlapping in their goals and activities, including a common focus on unsustainable trends in the region, but co-operation is rare in spite of possible synergies.

Options for enhancing co-operation are identified on two levels:

MAP can contribute regional expertise (and existing networks) on the level of *policy planning*, and in the integration of environmental protection requirements into other policies. This would

require the establishing of joint MAP-EMP work processes for achieving common goals. Co-ordinated activities would also avoid a duplication of work. Further options are the use of the Blue Plan RAC in assessing the sustainability impact of trade liberalisation, debates on environmental policy integration in the Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (MCSD) as a Mediterranean political forum and the development of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development by the MCSD. Short and Medium-Term Priority Environmental Action Programme (SMAP) Correspondents and MAP National Focal Points could be merged. However, as far as EMP funds are involved, final decisions will be taken within the EMP structures.

Secondly, MAP can contribute existing capacities for policy implementation and indicator monitoring. While the EMP has the administrative and financial capacities to set up ambitious programmes in the field of environmental protection and sustainable development, it lacks own capacities as well as partners for the implementation of its programmes. MAP institutions have the potential to become such partners. Building up a co-operation for the joint implementation of EMP programmes –decided under the participation of MAP as pointed out above – will have additional synergetic effects. Examples are the expansion of current co-operation on indicators, strengthening the Priority Action Programme RAC for tasks in integrated coastal zone management, joining activities on pollution from marine activities, or the building up of the entity of MAP institutions as a think tank backing up the activities of the EMP through capacity building in the Mediterranean region. To this end, MAP institutions following an independent evaluation of existing capacities would need to focus on the development of operational capacities and on building up expertise in practical support for the implementation of programmes and policies. The European Commission, acting for the EMP, should develop its dialogue with MAP to explore capacity-building options.

## 2 Background

Since 1975, Mediterranean states and the EU are jointly combating environmental pollution and degradation in the Mediterranean region under the *Mediterranean Action Plan* (MAP), an initiative set up under the auspices of UNEP as part of its *Regional Seas* activities. At their 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting in Monaco on 14-17 November 2001, MAP Contracting Parties decided to take steps towards closer co-operation with the *Euro-Mediterranean Partnership* (EMP), a process initiated by the EU for improved political, economic and cultural co-operation and thus peace and stability in the Mediterranean region. Since the launching of the EMP in Barcelona in 1995, a co-operation between MAP and Euro-Med has been envisioned on both sides. Now, the “Barcelona Process” having been re-invigorated by the partner states in November 2000, MAP Contracting Parties have taken the up-coming *Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers of the Environment* in Athens on 8-10 July 2002 as an opportunity to take steps towards “a strategy for the improved integration of environmental policies” into the different EMP policy sectors. They requested the MAP secretariat “to elaborate proposals for improving operational synergies between MAP and the EMP”<sup>1</sup>. It is this request which became the mandate for the present report.

### 2.1 A History of Envisioning Co-operation

The collapse of the peace process between Israel and Palestine and the escalation of violence in the area may be viewed as reasons that prompted EU and Mediterranean Foreign Ministers at their 4<sup>th</sup> Conference on 15-16 November 2000 to “re-invigorate”<sup>2</sup> a process that had been launched five years ago, but until then had failed to live up to expectations. In the wake of an increasing toll of human life in the Near East and the events of 11 September the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership moved high up the agenda.

From its very beginning, the establishment of a Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area (MFTA) by 2010 was at the heart of the initiative: this was considered to hold out a general prospect of increasing dialogue, development, prosperity and thus stability around the Mediterranean Sea. Although the *Barcelona Declaration*, the funding document of the EMP, explicitly provided for reconciling economic development with environmental protection, the MFTA had given rise to concern that increased trade might have a strong negative impact on the environment and contravene the criterion of *environmental sustainability* that had been agreed on at the Rio World Summit in 1992. On the grounds of experiences with other trade agreements, it is argued<sup>3</sup> that a MFTA could

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, section 178 and Annex IV, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> EURO-MED 2000: Presidency's Formal Conclusions, 4<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Minister, Marseilles, 15-16 November 2000, section 1-4.

<sup>3</sup> Amongst others: Friends of the Earth – Mednet (w/o): Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade Zone. Can It Be Sustainable?; Katz, David (Ed.) 1999: Environmental Impacts of a Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade Zone: Case Studies and Assessments; Katz, David 1997: The Euro-Mediterranean Free-Trade Zone: Lessons from NAFTA, p. 9.

- increase pressure on natural resources such as open spaces, soil, water, plant and animal biodiversity;
- increase levels of air, soil and water pollution including the production of hazardous wastes;
- produce incentives to reduce environmental standards for short-term economic benefits or to exploit loopholes in environmental law, turning the southern partners into “pollution havens”<sup>4</sup>.

Such concerns were voiced most explicitly by Non-Governmental Organisations at the *Euro-Mediterranean Civil Forums* held at the occasion of the *Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers Conferences*, the top steering body of the Euro-Mediterranean Process.<sup>5</sup> They underline the need to have an environmental dimension to the EU’s Mediterranean policy and to integrate environmental concerns into the definition and implementation of this policy and the MFTA in particular.

## 2.2 Structure and Basis of the Report

Following the terms of reference for this study, in order to establish a basis for subsequent options for improving synergies, the following chapter identifies the programmatic thrust of MAP and the capacities that have been developed under it (chapter 3). It then examines which the objectives of the EMP are, to what extent Euro-Med activities are conducive to environmental and sustainability goals, and – in conclusion – what the key issues are that need to be addressed (chapter 4).

Based on this groundwork, in the following two chapters (chapters 5 and 6), the report elaborates options for the improvement of synergies of the activities of MAP and the EMP in the domain of environmental protection and sustainable development. Such synergies can either be enhanced by a complementary ‘job-sharing’ which matches the strong points of the one with deficits of the other or a better co-ordination of parallel activities to avoid a duplication of work. The report therefore does *not* provide a comprehensive account to what extent objectives of either of the two processes have been accomplished or not.

For the identification of parallel structures, a particular focus (chapter 5) is put on five sectors that have been selected by MAP : *trade and environment, information and strategies, sustainable coastal zone management, water management and pollution through marine*

---

<sup>4</sup> Liberty, Dan and Ariela Zerbiv 1999: Legal Environmental Gaps within the Euro-Med Partnership and their Potential Effect on the Environment under a Free Trade Zone: Comparative Law Analysis and a Proposal for a Draft Protocol on Investment and Environmental Civil Liability, in Katz, David (Ed.) 1999: Environmental Impacts of a Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Zone: Case Studies and Assessments, p. 58.

<sup>5</sup> Euro-Med 2000: The Marseille Declaration of Environmental Organisations, Euro-Med Civil Forum, Marseilles, 10-12 November 2000. Similar Euro-Med 1999: The NGO Declaration to the Euro-Mediterranean Ministers of Foreign affairs, Environmental Civil Forum, Stuttgart, 13-15 April 1999 and Euro-Med Civil Forum 2002: Position paper of the environmental NGOs on the occasion of the 5<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Ministers at Valencia, 22-23 April 2002.

*activities*. On this basis, sectoral options for the improvement of synergies are put forward, most of them implying an invitation for both sides to take measures accordingly.

The final chapter (chapter 6), building upon to the preceding analysis, puts forward cross-sectoral proposals for fostering synergies between MAP and Euro-Med, and concludes with a characterisation of MAP–Euro-Med co-operation along the lines of the options set out in the previous chapters.

The present report relies in the first place on documents published by MAP and Euro-Med. Publications of the relevant Non-Governmental Organisations and related items of literature were reviewed. In addition, the report draws on interviews that were conducted with representatives of MAP (MEDU and the Plan Bleu), officials within the European Commission, the European Environment Agency and Eurostat. Questionnaires were sent out to all Non-Governmental and Inter-Governmental Organisations that have been appointed Partners of MAP, but were answered only by some. Earlier work on the question of synergies between MAP and Euro-Med carried out by the French Ministry of the Environment is taken into account.



### 3 The Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP)

Following the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972, which had identified the Mediterranean as among the “particularly threatened bodies of water”<sup>6</sup>, Mediterranean states requested the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to set up an activity framework for environmental co-operation in the Mediterranean region. In 1975 the *Mediterranean Action Plan* (MAP) was approved by 16 Mediterranean states and the EU. On 16 February 1976, at a conference in Barcelona, the *Barcelona Convention* was adopted. With its ensuing Protocols, the Barcelona Convention transfers the Action Plan into legally binding commitments. Today, Contracting Parties of the Barcelona Convention are the EU and 20 Mediterranean States: the original members Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Libya, Malta, Morocco, Spain, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey, and Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Monaco and Slovenia.

With view to identifying what MAP stands for and what the thrust of the initiative is, this chapter will firstly lay out the goals of the Mediterranean Action Plan and the entailing legal commitments (chapter 3.1). The second part (chapter 3.2) will focus on the institutions that have been established under MAP and put forward what MAP’s capacities are and what MAP would be able to deliver with a view to co-operation with the Euro-Med process. On this basis, a short characterisation and assessment of MAP’s potential as a partner of the Euro-Med process will follow (chapter 3.3).

#### 3.1 Goals

##### 3.1.1 The “New” Agenda: The Mediterranean Action Plan II

A typical offspring of the environmental policy of the 1970s, the initiative’s initial concern was to assist governments to control marine pollution by targeting the different pollutants in a limited sectoral approach. However, in 1994, MAP responded to the results of the 1992 Rio Conference on Environment and Development, which corresponded to working results of its Regional Activity Centres such as the *Blue Plan* or the *Priority Actions Centre*. Translating the requirements of the World Summit’s Agenda 21 onto the regional Mediterranean level, MAP set up Agenda MED 21, which led to the adoption of MAP II on 10 June 1995.

With the adoption of MAP II,<sup>7</sup> a second phase in the MAP process was launched, changing its classical pollutant-centred policy approach to an integrative strategy of environmental protection and sustainable development.

Parallel commitments to the protection of the environment (MAP II, Objectives point 2 and 3), and the improvement of the quality of life in the Mediterranean region (MAP II, Objectives

---

<sup>6</sup> UNO 1972: Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-6 June 1972, Identification and controls of pollutants of broad international significance, Subject Area III.

<sup>7</sup> Action Plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Sustainable Development of the Coastal Areas of the Mediterranean, Annex I to the Barcelona Resolution on the Environment and Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Basin, 1995.

point 6) effectively describe as the overall new goal of MAP *environmentally sustainable socio-economic development*.

At the same time, with MAP II it was recognised that lasting environmental protection needs to take into account all socio-economic policies. MAP therefore strives

“to ensure *sustainable management* of natural marine and land resources and to *integrate* the environment in social and economic development, and land-use policies”. (MAP II, Objectives point 1, *italics* by the authors)

A comprehensive list of socio-economic sectors to be targeted for integration was set up including<sup>8</sup>

- the economic sector with agriculture, industry, energy, tourism, transport,
- urban development,
- the management of natural resources including water, soil, forests and marine life

effectively making environmental integration a major goal of MAP activities.

Further focal areas of the new agenda became

- integrated coastal area management including preserving biological diversity,
- the observation of trends and the formulation of sustainability strategies,
- national and local capacity building,
- the conservation and sustainable management of cultural heritage sites in the region.

The old MAP focus of

- assessment, prevention and elimination of marine pollution

thus became one objective among many others.

Policy goals of MAP II and its enclosed *Priority Fields of Activities*<sup>9</sup> can be attributed to the following four objectives of an integrated and sustainable policy:

|                                       |   |  |                                      |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Enhancement of knowledge and research | Assessment, prevention and reduction of pollution | Integrated sustainable planning and policing | Public information and participation |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|

---

<sup>8</sup> For the following cf. the sections of Chapter I of the Action Plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Sustainable Development of the Coastal Areas of the Mediterranean.

<sup>9</sup> Priority Fields of Activities for the Environment and Development in the Mediterranean Basin, Annex II to the Barcelona Resolution on the Environment and Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Basin, 1995.

### **3.1.2 The Regime of the Barcelona Convention**

With the 1976 *Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution*, which entered into force in 1978, and subsequent Protocols, MAP cornerstones were transferred into binding law. In connection with the launching of the MAP II process, the Barcelona Convention was amended in 1995<sup>10</sup>. The Protocols have since been revised and supplemented. Most of the amendments, including the new Barcelona Convention, are still in the process of ratification<sup>11</sup>.

The “general undertaking” of the 1976 Convention is “to prevent, abate and combat pollution of the Mediterranean Sea area and to protect and enhance the marine environment in that area” (Article 4 [1]). Once the 1995 amendment has entered into force this original undertaking will be explicitly aimed “towards its sustainable development”. More precisely, the 1995 Convention commits Contracting Parties – “in accordance with their capabilities” – to compliance with the precautionary principle and to the polluter pays principle. Furthermore, Parties are committed to integration strategies such as environmental impact assessment and the integrated management of the coastal zones (Article 4 [3]).

#### **3.1.2.1 Dumping Protocol**

According to the Dumping Protocol of 1976<sup>12</sup> (subsequent to Article 6 of the Convention), the dumping of a specified list of substances (Article 4, Annex I) is prohibited or subject to a prior permit to be issued in accordance with considerations defined in the Protocol (Article 5, Annex II, III). Records of permits are to be monitored by the Parties of the Protocol.

Under the 1995 Dumping Protocol – not yet in force – the dumping of wastes and other matters will be generally forbidden, including incineration at sea. Special permissions may be issued only for dredged material, fish waste or organic materials from the processing of fish, platforms and other man-made structures at sea, and safe geological materials (Article 4).

#### **3.1.2.2 Emergency Protocol and new Prevention and Emergency Protocol**

The initial Emergency Protocol was signed in 1976<sup>13</sup>. It focuses on co-operative action for preparedness and response to marine pollution emergencies (Article 1). It will be replaced by the new Prevention and Emergency Protocol which was only recently adopted on 26 January 2002 and therefore has not yet entered into force.

---

<sup>10</sup> Now the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean, 1995.

<sup>11</sup> The amended texts of the Convention and the Protocols will enter into force on ratification of at least three-quarters of the Contracting Parties – i.e. 16 Parties – to the Convention or the Protocol concerned (Article 16 [3] of the 1976 Barcelona Convention, Article 22 of the 1995 Convention). The new Offshore Protocol, Hazardous Wastes Protocol and Prevention and Emergency Protocol will enter into force on the deposit of at least six instruments of ratification (Article 27 [3] of the 1976 Barcelona Convention, Article 33 of the 1995 Convention). On the current status of ratification of the Convention and its Protocols see Annex 1.

<sup>12</sup> Protocol for the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft, 1976.

<sup>13</sup> Protocol Concerning Co-operation in Combating Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Oil and other Harmful Substances in Cases of Emergency, 1976.

While the original Protocol only deals with co-operation in cases of *accidental* pollution, the new Protocol also provides for co-operation with respect to pollution from the day-to-day operation of ships, i.e. *incidental* pollution (Article 3). The new Protocol emphasises the precautionary principle (Preamble). It also adds provisions concerning emergency measures on board, on off-shore installations and in ports (Article 11), reimbursement of costs of assistance (Article 13), port reception facilities (Article 14), and environmental safety of maritime traffic (Article 15). Parties are obliged to set up strategies concerning the reception of ships in distress presenting a threat to the marine environment (Article 16). Reporting obligations, mostly of an ad hoc nature, are expanded (Article 8). A number of existing provisions are improved, such as on contingency plans and operational means concerning the prevention of pollution incidents (Article 4). Information on the national competent authorities and relevant regulations has to be reported to the REMPEC, the competent MAP Regional Centre (section 3.2.5.4).

### **3.1.2.3 Land-Based Sources (LBS) Protocol**

The 1980 LBS Protocol<sup>14</sup> (subsequent to Article 8 of the Convention) covers all sorts of sources of pollution, including man-made offshore structures. It puts parties under the obligation to strive for the elimination of an enclosed list of substances (Article 5, Annex I) and to limit pollution by issuing permits in accordance with defined criteria (Article 6, Annex II and III). Subsequent to Art. 5, 6 and 7 of the 1980 LBS Protocol, in 1997 the Contracting Parties adopted the *Strategic Action Programme (SAP)*<sup>15</sup>. The SAP is providing a detailed step-by-step plan for the reduction of pollution (see section 3.2.5.1.).

With the 1996 Amendment – not yet in force – a more comprehensive Protocol with elaborated Annexes was adopted.

### **3.1.2.4 Specially Protected Areas (SPA) and Biodiversity Protocol**

The 1995 SPA And Biodiversity Protocol<sup>16</sup> (subsequent to Article 10 of the 1995 Convention) entered into force in December 1999 replacing the 1982 Specially Protected Areas Protocol. It commits parties to take the necessary measures to “protect, preserve and manage in a sustainable and environmentally sound way areas of particular natural or cultural value, notably by the establishment of specially protected areas” and to “protect, preserve and manage threatened or endangered species of flora and fauna” (Article 3 [1]).

Parties are committed to draw up a list of Specially Protected Areas of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMI List). Proposals can be made by the country concerned or by neighbouring countries and have to be included if consistent with the defined criteria (Annex I of the Protocol) and agreed upon by the Contracting Parties (Articles 8 and 9). For established SPAs, provisions are made as to their protection, monitoring and sustainable management under the involvement of local communities (Articles 6 and 7). Finally, parties are committed to compile inventories of species of fauna and flora that are endangered or

---

<sup>14</sup> Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources, 1980.

<sup>15</sup> UNEP/MAP 1997: Report of the 10<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex IV, Appendix II.

<sup>16</sup> Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, 1995.

threatened and of areas that contain rare or fragile ecosystems or are important for threatened species or as a reservoir of biological diversity (Article 15).

#### **3.1.2.5 Offshore Protocol**

According to the law currently in force, Parties are generally committed to take all measures to prevent, abate and combat pollution resulting from exploitation, exploration or scientific activities (Article 7 of the 1976 Convention). The subsequent 1994 Offshore Protocol<sup>17</sup>, upon entering into force, will additionally provide prior authorisation according to requirements defined by the Protocol (Article 4 and 5) and the imposition of certain obligations onto operators concerning wastes and harmful substances (Article 8 to 14).

#### **3.1.2.6 Hazardous Wastes Protocol**

Once it has entered into force, the 1995 Hazardous Wastes Protocol<sup>18</sup> (subsequent to Article 11 of 1995 Convention) will require parties to take all appropriate measures to eliminate pollution resulting from the transboundary movement and disposal of hazardous wastes “to the fullest possible extent” and to eliminate such movements if possible.

The 1995 Hazardous Wastes Protocol will additionally commit Parties to strive for the elimination of the generation of such wastes at all. Contracting Parties are obliged to generally prohibit the export and transit of hazardous wastes to developing countries and Non-EU countries, and also to prohibit all imports (Article 5). Exceptions, subject to extensive notification requirements, may be made for Mediterranean developing countries that do not have the technical capabilities or the facilities for the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes (Article 6).

### **3.2 Institutional Structure**

With a view to possibly integrating the strong points of MAP within a MAP–Euro-Med co-operation structure, an analysis of the institutional structure and capacities of MAP are required. In 1999, at their 11<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting, the Contracting Parties decided to have MAP components evaluated. Such evaluation appears an important precondition for a *final*, definitive assessment of MAP’s capacities. However, the evaluation process is planned to be finalised only just before the 2005 Meeting of the Contracting Parties. So far, only three of MAP’s Regional Activity Centres have been evaluated. A profound evaluation of the others is beyond the scope of the present report. Thus, for these components, only a description of self-reported mandate, financing and activities can be given and comments that have been made on performance can be reported. However, with the reservation mentioned, options for the integration of these MAP components into a MAP–Euro-Med-Partnership shall still be made.

---

<sup>17</sup> Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution Resulting from the Exploration and Exploitation of the Continental Shelf and the Seabed and its Subsoil, 1994.

<sup>18</sup> Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, 1996.

### **3.2.1 Central Bodies**

The MAP process is governed by the Contracting Parties, which convene for ordinary meetings every two years to review the implementation of MAP and decide on general policy and strategic issues. Civil society is included by a number of non-governmental organisations invited to attend the meetings as observers, next to representatives of UN specialised agencies and other intergovernmental organisations engaged in the Mediterranean. In the interim period, the secretariat is advised by the MAP Bureau, composed of six representatives of the Contracting Parties, meeting twice a year.

### **3.2.2 Funding**

MAP institutions are funded primarily by the Mediterranean Trust Fund (MTF), to which all Parties of the Barcelona Convention contribute according to a UN assessment scale. MAP Regional Activity Centres are also funded by the respective host countries. The 2002-2003 budget totalled approximately US\$ 5 million per year with US\$ 400,000 Greek counterpart contributions and US\$ 50,000 UNEP counterpart contributions. The problem of delays of contributions of Contracting Parties to the MTF has apparently been contained. For the 1998/1999 biennium an expenditure ratio of 94% was reported, for 2000/2001 an expenditure ratio beyond 95% is expected.<sup>19</sup>

### **3.2.3 Advisory Bodies**

#### **3.2.3.1 National Focal Points (NFPs)**

The Contracting Parties are assisted by two advisory bodies, one of which is constituted by the National Focal Points (NFPs). These are appointed each by a Contracting Party and have biannual meetings to consider the progress of MAP and formulate recommendations as to the programme and budget for the coming biennium. Accordingly, NFPs are regularly updated on MAP activities and the results achieved under MAP.

#### **3.2.3.2 Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)**

As a second advisory body to the process, the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) was established in 1995 as part of the new approach of MAP II. The Commission is composed of 21 representatives of the Contracting Parties, usually officials from the national Ministries of Environment, and five representatives each from local authority networks concerned with environmental and sustainability issues, socio-economic actors, and NGOs working in the fields of environment and sustainable development. These 15 representatives of civil society are selected for two-year terms by the Meeting of the Contracting Parties.<sup>20</sup>

The MCSD has been mandated to

---

<sup>19</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, section 23-24 and Annex V, p. 8.

<sup>20</sup> UNEP/MAP 1998: "Rules of Procedure", "Terms of Reference" and "Composition", Constitutive Documents of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, p. 11-14.

1. identify and evaluate major economic, ecological and social problems and make appropriate proposals thereon;
2. monitor the implementation of the Contracting Parties' decisions;
3. establish a regional strategy for sustainable development;
4. facilitate the exchange of information related to sustainable development among institutions and enhance regional co-operation for the integration of environment and development issues.<sup>21</sup>

The MCSD does not dispose of its own permanent expert capacities, but such are provided through the Regional Activity Centres. Limitations might arise from the fact that, in absence of a clear mandate, the Centres do not receive additional funds for fulfilling this role, though. Also, through the MCSD working groups the body managed to mobilise outstanding experts. The working groups, thus, became the actual scientific forum. Eight thematic working groups, as set out in the table below, have been elaborating sets of recommendations and proposals for action.

|                                |  |   |  |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Free trade and the environment | Indicators for sustainable development | Sustainable management of coastal regions | Industry   |
| Tourism                        | Water demand management                | Urban development                         | Information, awareness, education, participation |

### 3.2.3.3 Comments on MAP Advisory Bodies

Concerning the advisory structure shared between the NFPs and the MCSD, in its 2001 "Strategic Review"<sup>22</sup> the MCSD has commented quite self-critically: "The basic composition of the MCSD with 21 out of 36 representatives hailing from the Contracting Parties leads to a degree of predominance of governmental representation." Furthermore: "It is often the same representatives of the Contracting Parties in the MCSD who discuss the latter's recommendations during the meetings of MAP national focal points, and who are later involved in taking decisions at the ordinary meetings of the Contracting Parties: the same individuals advising themselves, only wearing different hats."

Concerning the MCSD, it was noted that the diversity of conditions and problems which prevail in the region would be reflected in a "somewhat limited" way due to the relatively limited number of members from the other three groups.<sup>23</sup> However, at their 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary

<sup>21</sup> UNEP/MAP 1998: "Rules of Procedure", "Terms of Reference" and "Composition", Constitutive Documents of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, p. 7.

<sup>22</sup> The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development 2001: Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region, p. 54-61.

<sup>23</sup> The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development 2001: Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region, p. 55.

Meeting<sup>24</sup>, Contracting Parties stressed the MCSD's "pioneer role" in establishing links with civil society. Among MCSD members and MAP components, requested to assess the MCSD's activities for the 7<sup>th</sup> MCSD Meeting, it was recognised "that its pluralism and participatory approach made it a unique regional forum for dialogue and for promoting sustainable development strategies".<sup>25</sup>

As to the results produced by the MCSD, at the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting<sup>26</sup> general satisfaction was expressed. Representatives wanted to see the role of the MCSD strengthened. Non-EU countries apparently placed even higher value on the Commission's work with comments ranging from "most valuable" (Morocco, Croatia) or "instrumental" for the development of a country (Albania) to "most important source of support" for the revision of national development approaches (Turkey). Criticism raised at the MCSD's 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting<sup>27</sup> resulted rather from "the lack of follow-up and implementation" of the MCSD's findings and recommendations, this impacting on the visibility and credibility of the MCSD. Therefore, a greater effect of the MCSD's work needed to be ensured. Recommendations should be accompanied by practical suggestions and guidance for their implementation. As to contents, it was "widely felt that too much emphasis was placed on environmental considerations to the detriment of the social and economic dimensions of sustainable development" among MCSD members and MAP components.

Accordingly, the MCSD has a high reputation among environmental NGOs. The signatory NGOs to the conclusions of the *Valencia Civil Forum* on 12-14 April 2002 agreed to call the Environment Ministerial in Athens to establish a *Euro-Mediterranean Sustainability Council* – a primarily advisory body similar to the North American *Commission for Environmental Co-operation* (CEC) established in the context of NAFTA – to be mandated to address issues of regional environmental concern and to promote sustainable development within the establishment of the MFTA. The view of *Friends of the Earth Middle East*, an umbrella organisation of leading Middle East environmental NGOs, observer to the Meetings of the Contracting Parties and the most active civil player with regard to the establishment of the MFTA, is that MAP could provide the expertise and input necessary to implement a comprehensive Euro-Mediterranean Sustainability Strategy. Through the MCSD, MAP could assign special committees that would meet regularly and evaluate Euro-Mediterranean activities.

However, there are also assessments of other intergovernmental and non-governmental MAP partner organisations which conclude that the MCSD would *not* be in the position to advise, monitor or comment on Euro-Med policies. Lacking scientific expertise and being politically dependent, the MCSD could not be more than a useful *forum for dialogue*,

---

<sup>24</sup> For the following: UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, section 144-160.

<sup>25</sup> UNEP/MAP 2002: Report of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, section 13.

<sup>26</sup> For the following: UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, section 144-160.

<sup>27</sup> UNEP/MAP 2002: Report of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Mediterranean commission on Sustainable Development, section 13-18.



reviewing processes and informing policy-making, hopefully “more strongly than we have seen in the past”.

Within the European Commission, the launching of the MCSD has been welcomed as an initiative to move beyond the collection of data and the setting up of legal frameworks, towards establishing “a new approach” of environmental policy and thus living up to the “new” agenda of MAP. However, while a certain quality of MCSD recommendations has been recognised with respect to identifying causes and long term goals, European Commission officials have criticised that the MCSD has not been providing the guidance necessary for implementation of these recommendations. Too little had been done also for their visibility and follow-up. It has been pointed out that the MCSD needs to become more direct (“political”) in its recommendations. Others in the European Commission have been much more critical about the quality of the MCSD’s output.

### **3.2.4 MAP Co-ordinating Unit (MEDU)**

As a central secretariat to the MAP process, MEDU, established in 1980 and since 1982 located in Athens, prepares the meetings of the Contracting Parties and of the Bureau and is responsible for the follow-up of their decisions. MEDU co-ordinates all activities of MAP and reports to the Contracting Parties. In 2001, MEDU operated on a budget of US\$ 2.17 million. It is staffed with 19 people including twelve administrative staff also supporting the MEDPOL Programme (see section 3.2.5.1).<sup>28</sup>

In their 1998 “Report on Data Collected in the Framework of the European Regional Seas Conventions”, the European Environment Agency (EEA) – while being critical of MAP performance in general – recognised that the MAP infrastructure “can boast of a valuable asset, the MEDU, which handles the routine co-ordination of the Plan in an exemplary fashion.”<sup>29</sup> However, a comprehensive evaluation of MEDU is still missing. Assessments among those interviewed concerning the MAP headquarters ranged from “not having quite understood the need to become more political and more operational” to “having been very engaged as to the re-focussing of MAP” – while lower-level MAP structures tend rather to be reticent in taking up reform.

### **3.2.5 The Centres**

Co-ordinated and supervised by MEDU, MAP has eight ancillary institutions for implementation and capacity-building with different mandates within the scope of the Programme. A ninth Centre for sustainable tourism in Turkey (Regional Activity Centre/Eco-Tourism) is currently under discussion.

As pointed out above, only three of MAP’s Regional Activity Centres – the Blue Plan, the Priority Action Programme and the 100 Historic Sites Programme – have been evaluated so far. It is beyond the scope of this report to elaborate an assessment concerning the quality, effects or efficiency of the work of the other Centres. Therefore, here only a description of

---

<sup>28</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 6-12 and 26-33.

<sup>29</sup> European Environment Agency 1998: Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions, p. 49.

self-reported mandate, financing, and activities can be given. However, comments attained relating to the Centres' performance have also been included. It needs to be stressed that only some of those interviewed in the European Commission had – a limited – knowledge about MAP programmes and activities. Apart from the Blue Plan (section 3.2.5.2), the MAP Regional Activity Centres were largely unknown.

Details of activities relating to sectors that are especially dealt with in chapter 5 will be laid out there.

### **3.2.5.1 Programme for the Assessment and Control of Pollution in the Mediterranean Region (MEDPOL)**

MEDPOL<sup>30</sup>, today based at MEDU in Athens, was created in 1975 to assess, qualify and quantify the marine environmental problems of the Mediterranean Sea. Now, the Programme is expected to move towards *assisting* Mediterranean Countries in the formulation and implementation of pollution monitoring and reduction programmes. The Centre is responsible for the follow-up of the implementation of the Land-based Sources, the Dumping and the Hazardous Wastes Protocol.

In 2001, the MEDPOL Programme was managed by a total of professional and administrative staff of some eight<sup>31</sup> people supported by general MEDU administrative staff. In 2001, US\$ 968,500 were allocated to MEDPOL. Counterpart contributions of WHO, WMO, IAEA and UNESCO for the current biennium (2002-2003) were estimated US\$ 580,000 US\$ per year.<sup>32</sup>

#### 3.2.5.1.1 Activities

In the absence of an external evaluation, the following description reflects the Programme's activities as reported by MAP publications and documents<sup>33</sup>:

Phase I of the MEDPOL Programme was formulated and co-ordinated by UNEP with technical and scientific co-operation of UN specialised agencies FAO, WHO, WMO, IOC of UNESCO and IAEA. US\$ 9 million were spent on assistance, including the purchase of analytical instruments, maintenance service of instruments and a full programme of training, to enable all laboratories in the region to fully participate in the Programme activities. While Phase I was directed mainly towards generating data that could be used for research purposes and in baseline studies, Phase II was orientated more towards the implementation of national monitoring programmes in order to establish trends and evaluate the effectiveness of measures adopted for pollution reduction. By the end of Phase II, the MEDPOL data bank included a large inventory related to chemical contaminants in biota and micro-organisms in sea water.

---

<sup>30</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, the following is based on: UNEP/MAP (w/o): MEDPOL - Programme for the Assessment and Control of Marine Pollution in the Mediterranean.

<sup>31</sup> Including 3 people for the GEF-Programme, see chapter 3.2.5.1.1.

<sup>32</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 6-12 and 26-33.

<sup>33</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report by the Secretariat on Programme, Recommendations and Budget for the 2002-2003 Biennium, p. 13-17 and UNEP/MAP 2001: Protecting the Mediterranean from land-based pollution, p. 34-40.

In the EEA “Report on Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions”<sup>34</sup>, MEDPOL/MAP activities have been summarised as follows: “MEDPOL/MAP provides an institutional infrastructure for scientific and technical capacity-building in the Mediterranean basin.” The exchange of information, expertise and experience was promoted through conferences, workshops, seminars, study tours, fellowships, training courses, grants for attending meetings, etc. and, in the case of “needy national institutes/laboratories”, providing limited funds for buying equipment.

With Phase III, only fully operational since 2000, MEDPOL intends to switch from pollution monitoring to pollution control. Also, MEDPOL shall co-operate more closely with the other components of MAP, in particular with regard to the LBS protocol and the Coastal Area Management Programmes conducted by the Priority Actions Centre. While Phase III still foresees the monitoring of trends and biological effects, and of the effectiveness of national pollution control measures, it includes also an assistance component to assure data and monitoring qualities and provide equipment and training, both for the interpretation of data and managerial aspects, such as the operation of sewage treatment plants.

“The main task” of MEDPOL, which is expected to integrate all present activities and acquired capacities<sup>35</sup>, has become the implementation of the *Strategic Action Programme* (SAP) adopted by the Contracting Parties in 1997 according to the commitment of Art. 5, 6 and 7 of the 1980 LBS Protocol to set up pollution reduction programmes<sup>36</sup>. The SAP is meant to offer governments a concrete guideline for action. The implementation of National Action Plans to combat pollution from land-based activities is the operational long-term output of the SAP. Activities in the 2002-2003 biennium aim at establishing the basis for the long-term implementation of the SAP: investment studies for the most important “hot spots”, the development of administrative, legal and fiscal mechanisms for the different countries, guidelines and plans to strengthen the technical capacity and making provisions for training courses for trainers.

The Programme has been awarded funding for a number of groundwork activities for the implementation of the SAP: a contribution of US\$ 6 million over three-years to start in January 2001 was approved by UNPD Global Environment Facility (GEF). GEF/SAP also benefits from a substantial support from the French Global Environment Facility (FGEF). Additional donors include METAP and ICS-UNIDO.

In greater detail, MEDPOL activities in the 2000-2001 biennium included<sup>37</sup>

1. **supporting the preparation of MEDPOL national monitoring programmes** covering trend, biological effects and compliance monitoring: monitoring agreements have been finalised in six countries, draft programmes were prepared in four and negotiations launched in further six;

---

<sup>34</sup> Confer European Environment Agency 1998: Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions, p. 48.

<sup>35</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report by the Secretariat on Programme, Recommendations and Budget for the 2002-2003 Biennium, p. 14.

<sup>36</sup> UNEP/MAP 1997: Report of the 10<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex IV, Appendix II.

<sup>37</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report by the Co-ordinator on Activities during the 2002-2003 Biennium and Recommendations and Programme Budget for 2002-2003 – Proposals by the Secretariat, p. 42-47.

2. **preparation of a new database adapted to the needs of Phase III** accommodating data from trend compliance and biological effects monitoring: attention was put to compatibility with other data banks and assured data quality; training courses were organised and information bulletins distributed;
3. concerning the **review and development of indicators**, in co-operation with BP/RAC and the EEA a set of marine pollution indicators for a unified MAP Reporting System for industrial activities and chemicals was elaborated;
4. with a view to **establishing a Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR)** a pilot project to be carried out in Egypt was prepared and possibilities for similar projects in other countries investigated;
5. with respect to a **coastal litter management programme**, a questionnaire was prepared and sent to countries in order to identify gaps and problems;
6. as part of the GEF project, expert meetings were organised for reviewing the **list of pollution hot spots and preparing a priority list** based on common criteria and standards;
7. concerning **environmental inspection systems**, a meeting of the Informal Network on Compliance and Enforcement was jointly organised with the Italian Environmental Protection Agency; participants described the situation in their countries regarding existing environmental inspection systems;
8. concerning **sewage treatment**, a document on "Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants in Mediterranean Coastal Cities" and two guidelines for the management of fish waste and for platforms and other man-made structures at sea were published; following requests concerning the management and disposal of brine produced by sea water and brackish water desalination, an assessment was elaborated and guidelines prepared; as a follow-up to regional training courses on sewage treatment plant management training material for future national courses has been prepared.

#### 3.2.5.1.2 Comments on the MEDPOL Programme

Particularly among MAP partners, MEDPOL seems to be perceived as one of the strong points of MAP. Concerning the quality and comparability of data, the "Report on Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions" – while referring to the situation before 1998 – was rather critical: laboratories had been found not always following guidelines and results occasionally affected by "undue interference in scientific decisions"<sup>38</sup>. More recent comments by officials of the EEA, while apparently recognising expertise and capacities concerning data and statistics, refer to efficiency issues and a lack of ability to derive political impetus from the acquired statistical knowledge.

---

<sup>38</sup> European Environment Agency 1998: Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions, p. 50. Similarly Biermann, Frank 2000: Regionalismus oder Globalismus in der Meeresumweltpolitik?, p. 106.

### **3.2.5.2 Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC)**

The Blue Plan presents itself as a “think-tank” providing a “package” of data, systemic and prospective studies and, in certain cases, proposals for action<sup>39</sup>. The Centre was established in 1979 in Sophia Antipolis, France, with the mandate to provide the Mediterranean countries with information for the implementation of sustainable development, i.e. development that does not result in a degradation of the environment.

The Blue Plan’s budget in 2000, as reported in an external evaluation study of 2001<sup>40</sup>, amounted to US\$ 2.06 million – with about US\$ 594,000 of basic contributions of the Contracting Parties and additional US\$ 92,000 from the French Ministry for Regional Development and the Environment. In the Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties, however, French counterpart contributions for the current biennium (2002-2003) are estimated 440,000 US\$ each year<sup>41</sup>.

Further funds were received from the World Bank/UNDP/METAP (US\$ 634,000), EU LIFE-Third-Indicators (US\$ 251,000), the UNESCO, WMO, ICAMAS and other European (DG Environment and MEDA) and French (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, IFEN, DATAR, regional and local authorities, etc.) bodies. The French Ministry for Agriculture made available two top officials and an environmental expert. The Monaco government sent an official on secondment to the Blue Plan for 21 months. The Blue Plan staff totalled 20 people approximately.

#### **3.2.5.2.1 Activities**

The current main Blue Plan activities relate to

- 1. indicators, observatories and reports on environment and development:** promotion of a system of indicators for overall sustainable development in the Mediterranean, encouragement of countries to establish national observatories and lead the Mediterranean network of these observatories, analysis of the national and regional situations; re-enforcement of the capacities of the 12 southern and eastern Mediterranean countries as Euro-Med Partners in the field of environmental statistics, implementing the MEDSTAT-Environment Programme;
- 2. free trade and the environment in the context of the EMP,** assessing the impact of the MFTA;
- 3. tourism and sustainable development:** analyses of the issues, gathering of useful examples and mobilising governments and professionals;
- 4. urbanisation, urban management, waste management:** analysis of the relationship between urbanisation, urban management, waste and sustainable development and identification of proposals for action;

---

<sup>39</sup> For this section confer Blue Plan 2002 web-site.

<sup>40</sup> For the following Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001: Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, p. 20-23.

<sup>41</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 12.

5. **water and agriculture:** analysis of water resources and water demands, study of the relationship between water and agriculture, institutional analysis; reflecting on the players, the tools and the policies;
6. **rural development, soil, forest and biodiversity:** assessment of the main issues in question and seeking ways to promote sustainable development;
7. **coastal regions:** participation in “Coastal Area Management Programmes” (see section 3.2.5.3.) particularly with regard to prospective and systemic approaches; evaluation of the particular problems of the coastline.<sup>42</sup>

Activities in these fields<sup>43</sup> have evolved in the form of studies. Numerous systemic and prospective studies and monographs have been published, particularly as to the interactions between the environment and socio-economic development and the implementation of sustainable development. “The Blue Plan: the Futures of the Mediterranean Basin”, 1989 (442 p.), while – according to the evaluation study – being the first report to point out desirable scenarios for the region as of 2025 and current unsustainable developments “had a major influence on the Mediterranean region and even further afield”.

Relating to the topics mentioned above, the installation of information and observation systems for sustainable development both, at national and international level, has been worked on, statistical data on the environment collected, and indicators for sustainable development developed. On the basis of improved data, 130 indicators have been defined.

For five of the eight MCSD working groups (free trade, water, indicators, tourism, urban management), research has been conducted and political and strategic recommendations to aid decision-making have been prepared. Proposals for action have been shaped in a participative framework.

As to the circulation of information, training and assistance, during the period 1996-2000 an average of 12 reports or studies per year were published or circulated and some twenty seminars and workshops were organised.

#### 3.2.5.2.2 Evaluation and Comments

In the evaluation study, as “strong points” of the Blue Plan have been identified: a long tradition of “quality work”, a “multi-disciplinary, competent, stable and well-equipped team” benefiting from “the assistance of key figures of repute”, and the proven possibility of receiving funds from the EU and international institutions and the constant backing of the host country.<sup>44</sup> The study asserts<sup>45</sup> that the Blue Plan has “undeniably played the role of a catalyst in the setting-up or reinforcement of environment departments and national environment observatories, and in the consideration given to issues linked to sustainable development”. “As regards statistical data, significant progress has been accomplished or is well under way in several countries in the region”.

---

<sup>42</sup> Blue Plan 2002: web-site.

<sup>43</sup> For the following Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001: Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, p. 8-11.

<sup>44</sup> Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001: Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, p. 24.

<sup>45</sup> For the following unless otherwise stated Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001: Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, p. 20.

Furthermore, it concludes that “from a quantitative point of view, study productivity seems very satisfactory for a centre functioning in an unstable international context”. As to product quality, “Blue Plan studies are considered, in the framework of their discipline, as having great value,” although they “could, nonetheless, deal with certain questions in greater depth to enable the studies’ users/addressees to better understand what must be done, what measures they must take and what concrete projects they could work on.”<sup>46</sup>

The evaluators conclude, “whilst the initial Blue Plan work was of a rather general nature at the level of the region as a whole, recent studies have been better underpinned by precise information and are in tune with the realities that confront local players in the sustainable development field. The emphasis is now placed on proposals for action and modifications that could be made to policies already being applied”. The evaluators draw attention to the fact that the Blue Plan’s functions were “not limited to the production of studies”, but it had to play “a consultancy and capacity-reinforcement role”.<sup>47</sup>

Similar comments have been given on part of the European Commission and other individuals interviewed for this study. The expertise and the commitment of the Centre’s staff is appreciated and the high quality of results stressed. Co-operation with Eurostat has been estimated as “very fruitful”. In the field of water management, a particular potential is recognised and the Commission would like to see this potential contributed into the Partnership. Concerns were raised as to the Centre’s operational skills. Criticism was raised as to the work load the Blue Plan carries for the MCSD, which would prevent the Centre from producing more practical results building on its strong points.

### **3.2.5.3 Priority Actions Programme (PAP/RAC)**

PAP/RAC was established in Split, Croatia, in 1980 to assist integrated planning in the Mediterranean in order to alleviate environmental problems in coastal areas relating to socio-economic development.

The last years budgets amounted to funds between US\$ 650,000-700,000 (1995-2000), the 2001 budget to US\$ 715,000. Counterpart contributions for the current biennium (2002-2003) were estimated 150,000 US\$ per year.<sup>48</sup> As reported by an external evaluation study submitted in 2001<sup>49</sup>, PAP/RAC while consisting of a team of nine people is relying heavily on external consultants. About 35% of its funds (1990-1999) are allocated to external expertise.

#### **3.2.5.3.1 Activities**

In view of financial constraints, the Centre’s mission was narrowed down in 1995 to what had evolved as focal areas in the preceding 15 years of work:

---

<sup>46</sup> Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001: Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, p. 12-13.

<sup>47</sup> Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001: Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, p. 12.

<sup>48</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 12.

<sup>49</sup> For the following: Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan: External Evaluation study of the Priority Action centres Programme Regional Activity Centre, p. 19-21.

1. **integrated coastal area management (ICAM):** the development of related tools and methodologies and their application through Coastal Area Management Plans (CAMPs);
2. **sustainable management of water resources;**
3. **sustainable tourism;**
4. **sustainable development in urban and rural areas;**
5. **protection of soils.**<sup>50</sup>

To avoid overlaps, the Blue Plan was mandated to focus on prospective studies, while PAP/RAC was concentrating on delivering direct and tangible support on the local levels in the short and medium term.

Between 1990-2000 about 15% of PAP/RAC programming activities were dedicated to training courses and workshops, whilst the production of technical papers, guidelines and reports occupied some 55% of total effort. Expert meetings and intergovernmental meetings (including the initiation of CAMP activities) have comprised approximately 17% of total outputs, whilst technical assistance, generally in the form of advisory services, has risen from 4% to nearly 20% over the past 12 years.

Over the period 1990-1999 almost 30% of the total budget was allocated towards ICAM-related activities. Soil erosion; waste and urban management; water resources management and EIA form the other main areas of budget allocation. The principal activity of PAP/RAC, therefore, is Integrated Coastal Area Management and the development of tools and methodologies needed to implement ICAM. Central to the implementation are the CAMPs of which ten have been carried out region-wide. Another four are in preparation. CAMPs are intended to provide a 'hands-on' demonstration and training concerning ICAM tools.

The tools that have been developed in particular for ICAM include:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Geographic Information Systems (GIS)</b>     | <b>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</b> |
| <b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</b> | <b>Carrying Capacity Assessment (CCA)</b>    |

According to the report<sup>51</sup>, training courses and workshops to promote capacity building in support of ICAM have been provided to almost all Mediterranean countries. Supplementing the four tools mentioned above, topics related to:

<sup>50</sup> Confer UNEP/MAP 1997: Report of the 10<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex IV., V.

<sup>51</sup> For the following: Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 5-7.



|                                     |  |   |                                   |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|
|                                     | <b>Decision Support Systems</b>          | <b>Economic Instruments</b>                   | <b>Public Property Valuation</b>  |  |
| <b>Sustainable Urban Management</b> | <b>Solid and Liquid Waste Management</b> | <b>Sustainable Water Resources Management</b> | <b>Management of Soil Erosion</b> |  |

Numerous technical reports and guidelines on ICAM-related topics have been produced by PAP/RAC and regional experts, such as the “Guidelines for Integrated Coastal and Marine Areas Management with Special Emphasis to the Mediterranean Basin”. The latter had been referenced in a large number of major publications. Also, PAP/RAC had a leading role in supporting the MCSD working group for the sustainable management of coastal zones, urban areas, and, together with the Blue Plan, of urban areas.

PAP/RAC is increasingly engaging in assisting regional ICAM initiatives, such as through the preparation of a project document for the development and implementation of economic instruments to address pollution from land-based activities under the Strategic Action Programme. A joint proposal of PAP/RAC and the Blue Plan seeking funding from the EU funded *Short and Medium Term Action Programme* (see section 4.1.2.) to support the implementation of a Mediterranean Project on Coastal Zone Management (MedProCoast), however, was not accepted.

### 3.2.5.3.2 Evaluation Report

The report concludes<sup>52</sup>: Despite chronic under-funding and limited human resources, PAP/RAC has been “very prolific” in its activities. With regard to its budget, the Centre is assessed as “very active in terms of the number of outputs”.<sup>53</sup> PAP/RAC had “excelled in its attempt to support capacity building in environmental management and sustainable development in the region. “The programme itself has been efficiently managed and its staff are committed and professional in their approach.”

While, according to the report, initially PAP/RAC had compromised the impact and success of its work by pursuing an agenda too broad, given the quite limited funds, the gradual narrowing of the Centre’s core activities is expected to improve its efficiency. Products provided by PAP/RAC, such as training and guidelines, were “of high quality”. The evaluators assume that PAP/RAC has “undoubtedly assisted in raising awareness in the Mediterranean countries”. However, the exact was never followed up, presumably to a lack of funds<sup>54</sup>.

For a measure of PAP/RAC achievements in ICAM, the report points to the support that has been attracted among international development agencies, such as the World Bank and the

<sup>52</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 35.

<sup>53</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 20.

<sup>54</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 30.

EC. With its approaches having been documented in several technical publications by UNEP, it had gained respect as a serious contributor to ICAM.<sup>55</sup>

According to the report, the activities of PAP/RAC in the field of water resources management have been “substantial” over the past decade, “well-targeted” and “appreciated by the Contracting Parties”

PAP/RAC had become an “important, if not sole, source of information for states that lie outside of OECD and/or EU membership on EIA and SEA matters”. “Its focus on SEA had put the Centre as one of the front-runners to offer capacity building.”

The sustainable tourism activities undertaken by PAP/RAC as a priority action and as a MCSD activity “have been a very effective demonstration of capacity building, and the training courses and guidelines on carrying capacity assessment have been well received.”<sup>56</sup>

Although, the evaluators have identified dissatisfaction on behalf of the Contracting Parties: too much emphasis had been placed on the publication of technical reports, workshop proceedings and guidelines, while insufficient effort had been given to the follow-up of the implementation of these documents, to institutional strengthening and capacity building at the national levels in areas such as integrated policy and legislative framework. CAMPS though, had generally been regarded as a suitable approach for piloting and operationalising ICAM.<sup>57</sup>

The report follows this criticism, stressing that “training in the use of ICAM tools alone bears little fruit unless accompanied by intervention at the strategic level, which will enable the tools to be used effectively”<sup>58</sup>. It requires more emphasis to be put on “the facilitation and assistance to Contracting Parties in developing the appropriate institutional policy and regulatory frameworks to enable ICAM to develop. At present, whilst the pieces of the ICAM jigsaw puzzle are present, in the form of ICAM-tools, there is often no frame within which they can fit.” However, as to more recent activities a trend towards an increase in emphasis in the provision of assistance at the national level is identified.

PAP/RAC, the study concludes, “clearly has a very limited budget, and could not conceivably achieve this task [establishing such framework structures at national level] single-handedly; however, it could play a crucial role in facilitating the process by bringing key stakeholders together; guiding the re-shaping of policy and regulatory frameworks; and if necessary, assisting Contracting Parties to attract larger sources of financial support from elsewhere.”

---

<sup>55</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 29.

<sup>56</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 30-32. Activities as to waste management, soil erosion, aquaculture, historic settlements, land use planning in seismic zones and renewable energy being of only minor importance within PAP/RAC and not part of the sectoral analysis to be carried out here have been left outside.

<sup>57</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 29.

<sup>58</sup> Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001: External Evaluation Study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, p. 29.

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

Initially established in Malta in 1976 as Regional Oil Combating Centre, since 1989 as REMPEC, the Centre assists the Mediterranean states in cases of marine pollution accidents and in building up national response capabilities<sup>59</sup> Thus, REMPEC has been instrumental to international agreements such as the OPCR 1999 Convention. It is also meant to provide a general framework for the exchange of information on operational, technical, scientific, legal and financial matters and training on these subjects. The amendment of the Emergency Protocol requires REMPEC to extend its activities to the prevention of pollution incidents resulting from the day-to-day operation of ships.

REMPEC is managed under the joint auspices of UNEP and the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). In 2001, MAP funding amounted to US\$ 726,000 Counterpart contributions for the current biennium (2002-2003) were estimated 80,000 US\$ per year. In the 2000-2001 biennium, additional in-kind support was received from the French oil industry and the Italian Petroleum Association.<sup>60</sup>

Based on MAP publications, the Centre is developing its activities in the following areas:

1. **keeping up-to-date a Regional Information System (RIS)** concerning accidental marine pollution, preparedness, response and assistance: circulating basic documents, recommendations and guidelines; developing databanks (Transport of Chemical Substances Databank TROCS), simulation models and decision support systems, operational guides and technical documents;
2. **development and keeping up to date a regional communications network;**
3. **providing assistance for setting up national contingency plans** (currently under preparation in nine countries, in further ten countries contingency plans already existed) **and operational bilateral or multilateral agreements:** in 2000-2001, two EU LIFE projects were carried out aiming at the implementation of operational agreements between Cyprus, Egypt and Israel and the development of a national system for preparedness and response to accidental pollution in Syria; for 2002-2003 a project proposal has been made for the development of a sub-regional operational agreement between Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, to be presented to EU LIFE for funding;
4. **capacity building** including regional and national training courses: with financial support from IMO, in 2000-2001 national training courses involved Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco, Libya and Malta; an EU LIFE project aimed at capacity building and risk assessment for two Turkish ports; in 2002-2003 a workshop on MARPOL 73/78 implementation in collaboration with IMO and Greek authorities;

---

<sup>59</sup> The following is taken from: REMPEC web-site; UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the Meeting of the National Focal Points, sections 122-124; UNEP/MAP: Report of the Co-ordinator carried out during the 2000-2001 Biennium and Recommendations and Programme Budget for 2002-2003 – Proposal by the Secretariat, p. 48-52.

<sup>60</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 6-12 and 26-33; .

5. **advice in case of an accident and co-ordination of assistance**, activation of the Mediterranean Assistance Unit, which shall provide on the spot advice and technical expertise to the national authorities;
6. for 2002-2003 a two-year **MEDA project on port reception facilities** in the Mediterranean region will be carried out;
7. **reports** will be carried out on maritime traffic in the Mediterranean in collaboration with Blue Plan and Mediterranean oil industries and a follow-up to the report on the prevention of pollution from pleasure craft will be undertaken.

### **3.2.5.5 Specially Protected Areas Regional Activities Centre (SPA/RAC)**

SPA/RAC, set up in La Chargaia, Tunisie, in 1985, is assisting Contracting Parties in establishing and managing specially protected areas and implementing action plans for endangered species. It is also involved in the drawing up of biodiversity conservation strategies. In 2001, SPA/RAC funds amounted to a budget of US\$ 548.500, contributions of the Tunisian counterpart to US\$ 90,000. The Centre has staff of eleven people.<sup>61</sup>

MAP publications report activities in the following fields:

1. **technical tools for data-collection**: the Standard Data-Entry Form (SDF) for national inventories of sites of conservation, a classification of marine habitats, a reference list of Mediterranean marine habitats and a reference list of species were elaborated, specialists from Contracting Parties were trained to collect data on biological diversity using the above-mentioned tools, activities for similar tools for terrestrial habitats have been launched;
2. **supporting the setting up of SPAs**: several publications have been issued and training sessions on protected area management have been carried out, expert missions to different countries to assess the state of conservation and identify future actions and a symposium on marine protected areas were organised, a MEDA Regional Project is implemented aiming at identifying future sites of conservation and strengthening SPA management capacities by providing for pilot activities for the implementation of management plans, conducting workshops and disseminating technical information and guidelines;
3. **setting up of national Strategic Action Plans for the conservation of biological diversity** under the GEF/SAP project: work is carried out for a survey of Mediterranean marine and coastal biodiversity, a system for the evaluation of the status of marine and coastal biodiversity, and the identification of actions to be taken;
4. **implementation and reinforcement of the four adopted action plans for the conservation of endangered species** (Monk Seal, Marine Turtles, Cetaceans and Marine Vegetation) **and the launching of further action plans** (Cartilaginous Fish, birds as enlisted in the annexes of the SPA Protocol): a workshop on monitoring cetaceans strandings and an awareness course for fishermen to reduce turtles incidental capture in fishing gear was organised next to scientific conferences for

---

<sup>61</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 6-12 and 26-33.

marine turtles and cetaceans, habitats of marine turtles were started to be listed, guidelines for legislation on the conservation and management of marine turtles prepared, and a database on marine vegetation elaborated and relating software distributed to laboratories and scientists;

5. **the launching of an initiative to combat the introduction of invasive species** in the Mediterranean;
6. **fostering co-operation with related international and regional conventions and agreements:** co-operation agreements were signed with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention and various meetings organised or supported.

At the 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Contracting Parties, the representative of the EU explained that the Community was aiming at improving its links to the Centre. SPA/RAC's output particularly concerning habitats and species were intended to be included in the EU policy on conservation of marine species still to be finalised.

### **3.2.5.6 Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production (CP/RAC)**

The main goal of CP/RAC is to disseminate concepts of clean production and pollution prevention. Activities are targeted in particular at the industry as a major source of pollution. The Centre focuses on assisting MAP in its activities for the implementation of the LBS Protocol and the SAP. Here, CP/RAC co-operates with MEDPOL to encourage businesses to give priority to pollution prevention in contrast to end-of-pipe-treatment.<sup>62</sup>

As Catalan Centre for the Enterprises and the Environment (CEMA), the Centre was founded in Barcelona in 1994 to provide a "tool of the Department of the Environment of Catalonia" to promote the adoption of clean practices and technologies by Catalan companies. Albeit also MAP Regional Activity Centre since 1996, the Centre is entirely financed by the Spanish counterpart. For 2002-2003, finances were expected to amount to 625,000 US\$.<sup>63</sup>

CEMA-Activities include the dissemination of the MOED (Minimisation Opportunities Environmental Diagnosis), an instrument to assist companies to have ways for the reduction of emissions assessed by an external expert and the reviewing of projects for which subsidies through the Waste Treatment Agency have been requested.

As CP/RAC the Centre has been

1. **publishing a range of articles, guidelines and case studies** on companies that successfully minimised emissions and waste;
2. **issuing a newsletter as to activities, studies, projects and programmes** developed by Mediterranean countries in connection to cleaner production;
3. **organising meetings** for experts and representatives out of MAP countries.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> UNEP/MAP: MEDPOL – Programme for the assessment and Control of Marine Pollution in the Mediterranean, p. 40.

<sup>63</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 6-12 and 26-33.

<sup>64</sup> Cleaner Production Regional Activity Centre/ CEMA web-site.

### **3.2.5.7 Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre (ERS/RAC)**

The Mediterranean Remote Sensing Centre (CTM), based in Palermo, a joint company of the Sicily Region Government and Telespazio, the latter managing a satellite remote sensing and space telecommunication station, is also Regional Activity Centre for MAP. MAP contributions for 2001 were amounting to US\$ 47,000. For the current biennium (2002-2003) Italian counterpart contributions were expected to be 300,000 US\$.<sup>65</sup>

The mandate of the Centre is to provide information and assist in the application of data derived from remote sensing as to environmental states and changes in the Mediterranean region.

CTM/ERS/RAC activities fit into the following main areas:

1. **monitoring and assessment of environmental state and changes** (in the framework of MAP, the EU, the European Space Agency, etc.);
2. **training and capacity building activities**, including workshops and seminars promoting the knowledge about the remote sensing and its potentialities among Mediterranean decision-makers;
3. **inventories and reviews on remote sensing activities and applications** in the Mediterranean.

Consequently, the Centre co-operates closely with REMPEC for oil spill detection and monitoring. It has worked in different fields including vegetation, forestry, natural resources, coastline evolution, marine circulation, coastal dynamics, oil spill monitoring, sea pollution, control of desertification phenomena, some of which in a CAMP context or for the review of projects and programmes in the Mediterranean. A range of publications on related issues has been produced.<sup>66</sup>

### **3.2.5.8 Secretariat for the Protection of Coastal Historic Sites (100 HS)**

The Atelier du Patrimoine, established in 1980 by the City of Marseilles to advise the town planning department on matters relating to archaeology, acts as the Secretariat for MAP's 100 Historic Sites Programme for the protection of 150 threatened historic sites around the Mediterranean. The Atelier du Patrimoine is composed of around a dozen people, including five architects and one historian.<sup>67</sup> The Programme was externally evaluated in 2001. While evaluators conceded "that considerable work was done between 1989 and 1994", a series of deficits for a structured functioning of the programming was identified.<sup>68</sup> Following the recommendations of the report, at the 2001 Ordinary Meeting, the Contracting Parties requested the Secretariat to draft a new programme on cultural heritage. All that taken into account, 100 HS cannot be included into considerations as to a co-operation between MAP and Euro-Med. However, given activities on behalf of Euro-Med such as the regional MEDA

---

<sup>65</sup> UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean against Pollution and its Protocols, Annex V, p. 6-12 and 26-33.

<sup>66</sup> Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre/ CTM web-site.

<sup>67</sup> Prats, Michèle and Jellal Abdelkafi: 100 Historic Sites Programme. Evaluation Report, p. 21.

<sup>68</sup> Prats, Michèle and Jellal Abdelkafi: 100 Historic Sites Programme. Evaluation Report, p. 8-12 and p. 21.

project for prehistoric sites TEMPER<sup>69</sup>, the re-structuring of 100 HS is likely to open up areas for co-operation and synergies in the future. In fact, in order to co-ordinate forces, the re-structuring should be undertaken in close co-ordination with Euro-Med institutions.

### 3.3 Assessment

In the interviews conducted, it has been frequently acknowledged that MAP is an initiative facing many challenges. As with all UN organisations, its institutions lack sufficient funding and political power. Moreover, the area MAP covers is burdened with a series of conflicts which national governments and international conferences have long failed to settle. It has to deal with different cultures and it has to balance the interests of the advanced northern Mediterranean countries and the developing countries of the south, which both in different ways clash – at least at first sight – with the idea of environmental protection. However, with the endorsement of sustainable development in 1995 under MAP II, integrating social, economic and environmental assets, the Contracting Parties have challenged this apparent contradiction.

The difficult setting should be kept in mind with a view to any sort of assessment of MAP or with regard to the deficits of the Euro-Med process considered in the following chapter. In any case, as pointed out above, for the purposes of this report MAP goals have been described primarily in order to identify its programmatic thrust, its institutional capacities and structures parallel to the Euro-Med process.

However, as overall characterisation, it can be stated that MAP, in the first instance, has succeeded as a creator of collective awareness, as a *forum* – although changes catalysed through MAP can hardly be separated from effects of activities at the global level.<sup>70</sup>

At the same time, substantial action might be considered minor, the operational potential rather small and the level of obligations imposed by the Protocols that have entered into force so far low. This general appearance, however, seems to disguise what has been achieved: MAP has the problem of making itself and the potential which it has developed *visible*.

On the other hand, as pointed out in the cited EEA report, MAP, challenged as it is by regional differences, acknowledges multinational acceptance of common goals as a prerequisite for dealing with environmental issues and emphasises consensual decision making. Thus, it “permits developing nations to participate on an equal footing with their more

---

<sup>69</sup> TEMPER was launched within the MEDA supported EUROMED HERITAGE II Regional Programme. Funding from the EU is in excess of € 1 million. The project involves 5 prehistoric sites in Greece, Israel, Malta, and Turkey. A key objective of Temper is to publish guidelines for the development of management plans and educational programmes which can be applied to other Mediterranean prehistoric sites.

<sup>70</sup> For the following: Biermann, Frank 2000: Regionalismus oder Globalismus in der Meeresumweltpolitik, p. 104-112, and Skjaereth, Jon Birger 1996: The 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Mediterranean Action Plan: Reason to Celebrate?, p. 49-51.

advanced neighbours”. As such it “constitutes a very efficient mechanism for scientific and technical capacity-building in the Mediterranean basin”.<sup>71</sup>

Moreover, as far as MAP activities have been judged as burdened by the political conflicts in the region and environmental policies primarily used for their containment, observers to the last meetings have reported considerable progress.

On the part of the European Commission a “correct” reputation was acknowledged and the ability for “trust-building” was viewed as MAP’s main asset. However, while the data collected was judged to be “good work”, and the adoption of legal instruments acknowledged, it was raised repeatedly that MAP needed to *move on*, leave its “old-fashioned” proceedings behind and become more operational by effectively transferring identified goals into tangible action and results.

### **3.3.1 Programmatic Focus**

Looking at the programmatic focus, with MAP II the initiative has moved on from the policy approach of the 1970s focussed on combating pollution at its sources. Having embedded its original thrust, the protection of the environment, into the policy goal of sustainable development, today MAP is reconciling the objective of socio-economic development with the environmental element of sustainability. Moreover, while operating along the lines of the consensus forged in Rio, MAP establishes commitments on the forefront of environmental and sustainability policies: it endorses environmental integration and instruments for the sustainable design of policies such as sustainability impact assessment and defining overall targets through a sustainability strategy. With MAP II, it also has identified priority areas where action needs to be taken.

### **3.3.2 The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development**

Although the Convention and Protocols have not been ratified yet and the implementation of activities is not completed, MAP institutions have been building up work around the “new” issues since 1995.

The MCSD has generally gained respect for this kind of work. Although a lack of practical guidance on the implementation of recommendations and a lack of visibility and follow-up of its work is criticised, the quality of the recommendations of its working groups – while partly being criticised as too narrowly focussed on the environment – is recognised.

As with MAP in general, the MCSD’s main asset may be the credibility it has achieved as an adviser particularly among Mediterranean Non-EU-Member states. The latter might be due to the fact that the MCSD evolves from elections underlying a Non-EU/EU representation of

---

<sup>71</sup> European Environment Agency 1998: Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions, p. 49.



16:5 – compared, for instance, to decisions taken in the EMP underlying a ratio of 12:15 Non-EU/EU representation with a central role taken by the European Commission (see chapter 4).

| <u>MAP</u>         |               | <u>Euro-Med</u> |                 |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <u>Non-EU</u>      | <u>EU</u>     | <u>Non-EU</u>   | <u>EU</u>       |
| Albania            |               |                 | Austria         |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina |               |                 | Belgium         |
| Croatia            |               |                 | Denmark         |
| Monaco             |               |                 | Finland         |
| Slovenia           |               |                 | Germany         |
| <b>Algeria</b>     |               |                 | Ireland         |
| <b>Cyprus</b>      |               |                 | Luxembourg      |
| <b>Egypt</b>       |               |                 | The Netherlands |
| <b>Israel</b>      |               |                 | Portugal        |
| <b>Lebanon</b>     |               |                 | Sweden          |
| <b>Malta</b>       |               |                 | United Kingdom  |
| <b>Morocco</b>     | The EU        |                 | <b>France</b>   |
| <b>Syria</b>       | <b>France</b> |                 | <b>Greece</b>   |
| <b>Tunisia</b>     | <b>Greece</b> |                 | <b>Italy</b>    |
| <b>Turkey</b>      | <b>Italy</b>  |                 | <b>Spain</b>    |
|                    | <b>Spain</b>  |                 |                 |

(bold: member to both processes)

The MCSD, drawing on the capacities of the RACs, has also proved considerable expertise in recent years on environmental and sustainability issues. However, while within MAP the MCSD is referred to as both “think-tank” and “forum for open dialogue”<sup>72</sup>, it appears to be the latter which appropriately describes the capacities of the MCSD.

It is the Commission’s government-dominated composition, which defines it as a *political forum* rather than one of politically independent expertise and science based recommendations. Also, a “think tank” would require its own permanent expert capacities, while the MCSD draws predominantly on the RACs’ expertise.

“Think-tank” might also over-stretch expectations, as a “think-tank” may be expected to deliver specific, applicable advice for the solution of specific problems. However, such *appropriate* advice requires (1) a more narrow *local, national or sub-regional* approach which is (2) unbound by diplomatic considerateness. A political body aimed at representing a whole region as diverse as the Mediterranean, therefore, may not be expected to deliver such specific solutions. Therefore, if at all, the MCSD may be considered as a “think tank” in the sense that it addresses the general problems of the region with necessarily general recommendations.

With a view to the role the MCSD could possibly play within the Euro-Med process, MAP partners and MAP institutions have been pointing out similarities between the MCSD and the NAFTA Commission for Environmental Co-operation (CEC).<sup>73</sup> However, the CEC has also

<sup>72</sup> Cf. The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development 2001: Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region, p. 54-55.

<sup>73</sup> Indeed, similar to the MCSD, the CEC was founded as a forum for environmental matters, contact point for civil society (Article 10 [1a and 6a] NAAEC<sup>73</sup>), and to make recommendations as to valid strategies

been alleged of a lack of political independence, to the point that it has downplayed NAFTA's negative environmental impact.<sup>74</sup>

No matter how far such criticism is justified – as a lesson to be learned from NAFTA the MCSD, with its legal framework allowing governments to not only appoint who ever they are comfortable with for national representatives, but also select the 15 representatives of civil society, cannot take the role of an external monitor. Even if representatives from the Ministries of the Environment would not be replaced all the way by officials from the Ministries of Trade – there would always be the prospect of undue interference into advice that should pay account to environmental protection and sustainable development only. .

This is not to say that the MCSD could not play any role concerning the Euro-Med process. With its "Strategic Review", the MCSD has presented itself as a forum, able to raise unpleasant questions both as to its own performance and as to the engagement of Contracting Parties. But with its present composition, the MCSD appears too vulnerable to be chosen as an *institutional* monitor or advisor *within* the Euro-Med process. However, it could possibly be a *forum for political discussion*, awareness raising and the formulation of goals and demands from outside the Euro-Med process, thus preserving its role as an independent, credible, and increasingly reputed body. An ambitious role like this would certainly require the Contracting Parties to designate high-ranking officials as representatives to the forum.

### **3.3.3 National Focal Points**

The strength of the National Focal Points is certainly that representatives from the different governments involved in the MAP process are updated on MAP activities on a regular basis. Their strength, therefore is that through them all sorts of relevant information gathered under the MAP process can be fed directly into Mediterranean countries, governments and civil society. Thus, NFPs represent an important tool with respect to capacity building at national levels.

### **3.3.4 Centres**

As partners for Euro-Med and contributors of expertise to the EMP-process, the Blue Plan, PAP/RAC, MEDPOL, REMPEC and SPA/RAC need to be taken into account. While PAP/RAC and the Blue Plan may be considered as having also operational potential, in the absence of an evaluation as to the effectiveness and efficiency of the other Centres' activities, this could not be assessed with regard to MEDPOL, REMPEC and SPA/RAC.

On the basis that could be established here, it is also hardly possible to make a secure assessment as to what role CP/RAC and ERS/RAC could possibly play in a MAP-Euro-Med co-operation. Their activities in the framework of MAP so far seems rather limited. They might play a role through supporting the other Centres with specific "services" in the domain they have focussed on in the last years.

---

and techniques, indicators and implementation (Article 10, 2). While not having any competencies to interfere with government policies – similar to the MCSD – "its main instrument for affecting change is to make complaints public and to advise governments". For the latter, see Katz, David 1997: The Mediterranean Free Trade Zone: Lessons from NAFTA, p. 7.

<sup>74</sup> Katz, David 1997: The Mediterranean Free Trade Zone: Lessons from NAFTA, p. 17.

For the 100 Historic Sites Programme, with the Programme currently being fundamentally re-structured, at the present stage, an assessment is impossible, although a role can well be envisioned for the future as pointed out above.

The quantity and quality of work of the Blue Plan, as has been asserted by the external report, seem to be verified by the impressive amount of funds that the Blue Plan has been able to raise for projects. Clearly, its capacities were developed in analysing considerable amounts of data on the current situation of the Mediterranean environment and on trends of unsustainable development. Therefore, it is the scientific domain of prospective studies and systemic analysis where the Blue Plan will be able to contribute in the first instance. However evaluators have identified the potential to also respond to the challenges of implementation and produce more tangible help for policy makers. It is PAP/RAC in particular, with its established experience in conducting CAMPs, that is likely to have acquired also operational capacities, a potential which could be built upon and applied on a larger scale within Euro-Med.

The indicator of fund-raising success might also be taken as a recommendation for MEDPOL. Similarly, with SPA/RAC and REMPEC having been found eligible for MEDA funds, an operational potential may be expected. However, only the progress of current activities can allow a more definite assessment. Nevertheless, options relating to including these three Centres in a co-operation structure can be identified and shall be pointed out.

## 4 The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership

In reaction to increasing bilateral trade and development co-operation in the Mediterranean region, on 27-28 November 1995 at their Conference in Barcelona, EU and Foreign Ministers from Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the Palestinian Authority, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey<sup>75</sup> launched what is referred to today as the ‘Euro-Mediterranean Partnership’ or the ‘Barcelona Process’. The following chapter will set out the proclaimed goals of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, with focus on those relating to environmental protection and environmentally sustainable development (chapter 4.1). Furthermore, the institutions responsible for steering and implementing the Euro-Mediterranean process will be presented, with emphasis on the activities relevant to these objectives and the problems that have been identified by Euro-Med institutions themselves (chapter 4.2). For a conclusion, with a focus on what MAP might be able to deliver in terms of expertise and operational capacities in the realm of environmental protection and sustainability, key issues requiring action are identified (chapter 4.3).

### 4.1 Goals

#### 4.1.1 The Barcelona Declaration

The Barcelona Process, as made explicit by the preamble of the Barcelona Declaration, is aimed in the first place at turning the Mediterranean basin into “an area of dialogue, exchange and co-operation” expected to guarantee “peace, stability and prosperity”.<sup>76</sup> To this end, in its three chapters, the Declaration envisions a threefold partnership:

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>I.</b><br>A political and security partnership for “establishing an area of peace and stability” | <b>II.</b><br>An economic and financial partnership for “creating an area of shared prosperity” | <b>III.</b><br>“A partnership in social, cultural and human affairs” for “developing human resources and promoting understanding” |
|---|---|---|

Emphasis is explicitly given to “sustainable and balanced economic and social development”, i.e. the second chapter, at the heart of which is the “acceleration of the pace of sustainable socio-economic development” and the “reduction of the development gap”. The primary pathway to meet these ends is, along with increased financial assistance through the EU, the establishment of a Mediterranean free-trade area by 2010.

<sup>75</sup> Libya has observer status at certain meetings.

<sup>76</sup> Citations in this section are taken from the Conference Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Conference, Barcelona, 27-28 November 1996.

Also 11 September did not shift this emphasis within the EMP, but rather provided additional arguments to put in place a free trade zone, for free trade is considered to deliver prosperity and development as the required precursor to stability and peace. On 5-6 November 2001, the Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers Conference in Brussels agreed to deepen the dialogue between cultures and civilisations, with a focus on youth, education and the media. However, they also pointed out that “a fair global system of prosperity and development should help to strengthen the stability of the international community”. The MFTA, therefore, is still at the heart of the process.

However, although the Partnership is primarily aimed at socio-economic development, the Barcelona Declaration has defined the following triad with regard to environmental goals and sustainability:

- “reconciling economic development with environmental protection”;
- “integrating environmental concerns into the relevant economic policy”;
- “mitigating the negative environmental consequences”.

For the accomplishment of these objectives the Declaration stresses its “attachment” to the Mediterranean Action Plan and the necessity of co-operation.

**4.1.2 The Short and Medium-Term Priority Environmental Action Programme (SMAP)**

For the implementation of the defined environmental goals, the Barcelona Declaration provided for setting up a Short and Medium-Term Priority Environmental Action Programme (SMAP). With the Declaration of Helsinki, hosting the Euro-Mediterranean Conference on the Environment in 1997, the Action Programme was incorporated into the fundamental framework of the Barcelona Process, providing a more precise definition of its environmental and sustainability objectives:

- “to help to change the current trend of environmental degradation”;
- “to contribute to sustainable development” including “the protection of the environment” and “the improvement of health and living conditions”;
- “to contribute to the further integration of environmental policies into all other policies”;
- “to ensure that, with the building of a Free Trade area, steps are taken from the start to highlight trade and environment issues”.<sup>77</sup>

Efforts shall be focussed on the following five priority fields of action:

|                             |                  |                       |                                    |                           |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Integrated water management | Waste management | Hot spots (pollution) | Integrated coastal zone management | Combating desertification |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|

<sup>77</sup> Euro-Med 1997: Conference Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment, Helsinki, 28 November 1997, Annex 1, Objectives of the Programme, section 1.

It is stressed that biodiversity being an “intersectoral” issue is included in these five priority fields of action.<sup>78</sup>

The SMAP was established as a framework programme meant to provide guidance for all national and regional environmental policy in the Mediterranean and orientation for the planning, funding and implementation of environmental activities within the EMP. It is not a separate funding instrument: the major financial instrument for the implementation of the SMAP is MEDA (section 4.2.4.), the central financial instrument for the entire Euro-Med process.<sup>79</sup>

Although marked as a programme for short and medium-term action, the SMAP puts emphasis on “supportive measures” establishing a “link with the long term”. It endorses

- the promotion of Environmental Impact Assessments;
- the establishment of sustainable development indicators, evaluation and performance indicators and environmental monitoring;
- enhancing awareness and public support;
- establishing ties with civil society, partnership building;
- capacity building, including consolidation of the environmental agencies in the Mediterranean countries;
- training and education;
- the transfer of appropriate technologies, contribution to sustainable industrial conversion, convergence of legislation in a number of areas etc.<sup>80</sup>

Concerning the concept of implementation of the SMAP, the current SMAP Review draft<sup>81</sup> has recalled that from the outset it was intended to go “beyond simple policy dialogue or general orientations”, that the SMAP should rather be implemented through “practical action”, delivering “tangible results as regards environmental protection, capacity building and bringing legislation and institutions closer to those of the EU”. As a main tool “pilot or demonstration projects for the priority fields” were projected. A central role should take “national action”, i.e. “Partners were expected to take the initiative and submit projects for the implementation of SMAP, to be funded and technically assisted by the Commission within the jointly agreed national programmes”.

---

<sup>78</sup> Euro-Med 1997: Conference Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment, Helsinki, 28 November 1997, Annex 1, Priority Fields of Action: “biodiversity [...] is dealt with under at least three of the selected fields of action”. These fields making explicit references to biodiversity are Hot spots, integrated coastal zone management and combating desertification.

<sup>79</sup> European Commission 2002 SMAP web-site.

<sup>80</sup> Euro-Med 1997: Conference Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment, Helsinki, 28 November 1997, Annex 1, Supportive Measures and Link with the Long Term.

<sup>81</sup> Draft of: SMAP – Review onto the first five years of the environmental programme of Euro-Med, dated on the 15 April 2002, as submitted by the Commission at the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of SMAP Correspondents on 23-25 April 2002 in Brussels.

## **4.2 Euro-Med Institutions and Activities**

The following chapter presents the institutions steering and implementing the Euro-Mediterranean process with a focus on those that relate to the field of environmental protection and sustainable development. The different sections will also refer to the problems identified by Euro-Med institutions themselves. Here, the report relies strongly on the Commission's draft of the SMAP Review. It is stressed that this draft only represents preliminary results which are still in debate. However, since it has been set up by the Commission, it is taken that it reflects the Commission's assessment of the process, which, with view to the Commission's central role in the process, might be attributed a major significance. On the other hand, it is emphasised that the draft and, in particular, its assessments are not necessarily reflecting the opinion of the all Euro-Med Partners. On the 4<sup>th</sup> SMAP Meeting, in fact it was contested in various points and is still in the process of being brought into agreement.

### **4.2.1 Priorities at the Regional Level**

#### **4.2.1.1 Priorities within the Economic and Financial Partnership**

The defined agenda and subsequent work programmes are implemented by the Euro-Mediterranean Committee for the Barcelona Process, composed of the Troika (representatives of the present, previous and following presidency), senior officials of the EU Commission and the Mediterranean Partners, meeting on average every three months. Top steering body of the Barcelona Process, however, is the Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Ministers, convened annually. In addition, sectoral Ministers meet for Euro-Mediterranean Conferences.

As reflected by the Valencia Action Plan<sup>82</sup> adopted at the last Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, current activities in the six identified priority sectors of co-operation – industry, energy, transport, information society, water policy and environment – include the implementation of a Plan on Trade and Investment Facilitation covering customs procedures, standardisation issues and conformity assessment, regulatory framework of investment, and protection of intellectual property rights. Investment shall be promoted and the business framework for enterprises improved. With regard to the establishment of the MFTZ, the harmonisation of standards with EU rules is pursued. All existing regulatory framework on transports, telecommunications, tourism and services to enterprises shall be improved and liberalised. The liberalisation of trade in agricultural products is envisaged.

As to energy and transport, the Valencia Action Plan projects improving connections between networks and co-operation regarding the security, safety and environmental aspects – although the latter is only explicitly named in relation to transport. In the field of telecommunications, the needs of the partners shall be identified and the integration of telecommunications infrastructures improved. As to tourism, partners shall be supported in taking account of the impact of tourism in other policy areas “so as to ensure the sustainable

---

<sup>82</sup> Euro-Med 2002: Presidency's Conclusions, 5<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Valencia, 22-23 April 2002, Annex: III Economic and Financial Partnership.

development of the sector”<sup>83</sup>. Cross-sectoral needs for technical assistance shall be identified, particularly in areas such as impact studies, capacity building and statistics. Innovation and access to technologies shall be fostered.

#### **4.2.1.2 Current Euro-Med Policy Regarding Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development**

After the “re-invigoration” of the process at the 4<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Ministers, political commitment was also renewed as to the environmental objectives of Barcelona and Helsinki. At their Conferences in Brussels on the 5-6 November 2001, Foreign Ministers called the 2<sup>nd</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment in July 2002 “to develop a strategy for better integration into national policies”<sup>84</sup>, thus acting in line with the promises of the EU summit of Göteborg on 15-16 June 2001, where the EU had committed itself to sustainable development as a “fundamental objective under the Treaties”<sup>85</sup> and to establishing Sustainable Development Strategies providing “that all major policy proposals include a sustainable impact assessment”<sup>86</sup>.

Sectoral ministers, however, so far have relied on their Environmental colleagues. With “insufficient” trade<sup>87</sup>, decreasing foreign investment, and MFTZ progress generally considered as too slow, the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Trade in Toledo on the 9-10 March 2002 did not touch the issue of environment integration at all – in spite of the fact that the Barcelona and Helsinki commitments (“ensure that, with the building of a Free Trade area, steps are taken from the start to highlight trade and environment issues”) were made with particular regard to trade.<sup>88</sup> The Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Industry held in Malaga on the 9-10 April 2002 refrained from doing so, too.<sup>89</sup> Accordingly, SMAP Correspondents in their Review draft identify among “some actors” a “certain reluctance to deal with the environment as a horizontal dimension [...] and instead have the impression that the environment can be treated as a vertical/sectoral policy isolated from the others”. Inside the Commission, the view was taken that the *Mediterranean Partners* prefer to see ecological aspects addressed in a second step *following* economic development.

However, the 5<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Ministers, held in Valencia on 22-23 April, renewed the Euro-Med commitment to “ensuring sustainable development with a high degree of environmental protection”. The Conference anticipated both

---

<sup>83</sup> Euro-Med 2002: Presidency’s Conclusions, 5<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Valencia, 22-23 April 2002, Annex: III Economic and Financial Partnership, section 16.

<sup>84</sup> Euro-Med 2001: Conclusions of the Presidency, Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Brussels, 5-6 November 2001, section 20.

<sup>85</sup> I.e. Article 6 of the Treaty of the European Community: “Environmental protection requirements must be integrated into the definition and implementation of the Community policies and activities referred to in Article 3 [i.e. practically all], in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development.”

<sup>86</sup> European Council 2001: Conclusions of the Presidency, The European Council, Göteborg, 15 and 16 June 2001, section 19-24.

<sup>87</sup> Euro-Med 2001: Presidency’s Conclusions, Euro-Mediterranean Meeting on Trade, Brussels, 29 May 2001.

<sup>88</sup> Euro-Med 2002: Conclusions of the Presidency, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Trade, Toledo, 19 March 2002.

<sup>89</sup> Confer Euro-Med 2002: Presidency’s Conclusions, Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Industry, Malaga, 9-10 April 2002.



- “the launching of a sustainability impact assessment to ensure that the establishment of the Free Trade Area and environmental protection are mutually supportive” and
- the adoption of a “strategic framework for the environmental integration process in a perspective of sustainable development” by the Euro-Mediterranean Ministers of the Environment.

Finally, the Conference explicitly asked the Commission:

- “to promote initiatives to strengthen technical and institutional capacity in the region, in synergy with other programmes such as the Mediterranean Action Plan and the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development”<sup>90</sup>.

#### **4.2.2 Association Agreements**

In order to implement the Barcelona Declaration, its goals are transferred into bilateral ‘Euro-Mediterranean Association Agreements’, which have now been established with all Mediterranean Partners with the exception of Syria<sup>91</sup>. While varying in content, they all provide for the implementation of the Barcelona goals and, in particular, of bilateral free trade. At the same time as implementing trade liberalisation with the EU, Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Partners are committed to implement free trade among each other (‘horizontal’ or South-South integration).

For the bilateral track, implementation of Association Agreements (between the EU and Non-EU-States) are pursued by two common institutions, the Association Council (Ministerial) and the Association Committee (Senior Official level).

In preparation of their Report on “Free Trade and the Environment”, the Blue Plan has launched a series of studies, according to which “the integration of environmental concerns into the association agreements was “inadequate, if not altogether absent”<sup>92</sup>. This is in accordance with observations made by the SMAP Correspondents that involvement of Environment Ministries in the negotiation of the association Agreements was “extremely limited”. According to the SMAP Review draft, Environment Ministries were not even included in the Association Councils and Committees of all countries.

---

<sup>90</sup> Euro-Med 2002: Presidency’s Conclusions, 5<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Valencia, 22-23 April 2002, Valencia Action Plan, section 15.

<sup>91</sup> With Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, the European Community concluded ‘first generation association agreements’ in the 1960s and early 1970s. As a result, a customs union entered into force on 1 January 1996 between the EU and Turkey. Cyprus will follow in 2001-2002. New Association Agreements between the EU and Tunisia, Israel, Morocco, Jordan and the Palestinian Authority (interim agreement) have already entered into force. Agreements have been signed with Egypt (2001) Algeria (2001) and Lebanon (2002). At the same time, the Commission continues to implement five Co-operation Agreements concluded in the mid-1970s with Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria.

<sup>92</sup> Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001: The Free Trade and the Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context. First Synthesis Report for the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD), p. 9.

### **4.2.3 SMAP Correspondents and SMAP Correspondents Network**

For the implementation and monitoring of the environmental and sustainability goals as set out in the SMAP<sup>93</sup>, each state has appointed a national SMAP Correspondent, usually from the national Ministry of the Environment or a related Agency. SMAP Correspondents shall contribute to a dialogue on environmental protection and sustainability, strengthen environmental integration in the Euro-Med Partnership and contribute to the reviewing of the implementation of SMAP at regional level. At national level, they shall disseminate information, conduct awareness campaigns and bring together the Commission, stakeholders in the country, and potential applicants for projects to be funded. They shall ensure coherence between the different activities at national level, and present annual National Reports to the SMAP Correspondents Meeting. In their annual meetings, SMAP Correspondents are consulted on projects that have been short-listed by the Commission for funding.

SMAP Correspondents and representatives of the European Commission form the SMAP Correspondents Network, which the NGO Steering Committee (Comité de Suivi) is associated with. This Committee links international organisations and major NGOs into the process. The Commission co-ordinates the Network and, based on the submitted National Reports, publishes an Interim Regional Report and a Review of the SMAP. It is meant to foster awareness and capacity building, in particular by providing guidance and assistance to the Correspondents of the Non-EU Partners by funding activities and functions through a national institute to be designated by the competent authorities<sup>94</sup>.

According to the SMAP Review draft, SMAP Correspondents perceive themselves as “rather weak” with limited means to mobilise at national level. Their potential needs to be strengthened so that they can fulfil their strategic and operational role.

### **4.2.4 Financial Instruments**

#### **4.2.4.1 MEDA Regulation, Programming and Project Selection**

Substantial support – € 5,350 million for 2000-2006 – for the required fiscal and economical reforms is provided through MEDA, the European Union’s main financial instrument for the implementation of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. While the overall thrust of MEDA is “encouraging and supporting the reform of the economic and social structures of the Mediterranean partners, notably in preparation for free trade with the European community”<sup>95</sup>, already the initial 1996 MEDA Regulation provided that “any [sic!] environmental consequences that might result from the economic development” shall be mitigated (Article 1 [1]) and *all* MEDA measures must pay “due regard” to environmental consideration” (Annex II, section VII.). With the amendment in 2000, MEDA II keeps to this

---

<sup>93</sup> Confer Euro-Med 1997: Conference Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment, Helsinki, 28 November 1997, Annex 1 section “Follow-up mechanism”.

<sup>94</sup> Terms of Reference for the SMAP Correspondents Network, SMAP web-site.

<sup>95</sup> European Council 1996: Council Decision of 6 December 1996 concerning the adoption of the guidelines for the indicative programmes concerning financial and technical measures to accompany the reform of economic and social structures in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, Annex Guidelines for MEDA Indicative Programmes.

stipulation, which may well be taken as a comprehensive ‘integration clause’. Support of economic and social development shall include the “protection and improvement of the environment” with “particular consideration being given to the precautionary and the preventive action principles”.<sup>96</sup>

While aiming at de-central funding, projected beneficiaries of MEDA are not only regions and states, but also local communities, public agencies and private operators, co-operatives, associations, foundations and non-governmental organisation.

The 1996 Council Decision on guidelines for the MEDA programmes<sup>97</sup> stipulates the integration of environmental aspects while planning and supervising MEDA activities; they also provide for the requirement to “consider carefully the issues of environmental equilibrium while setting up programmes for economic and social development” (section 6). For programme matters the Commission has to consult with the MED Committee, composed of representatives of the EU Member States, which allows them to advise the European Commission on implementing the MEDA Programme.

MEDA II has also changed the programming structure: while MEDA I operated on the basis of programming papers each looking at periods of three years, (referred to as *Three-year Indicative Programmes*), and of individual projects presented to the MED Committee each being assessed on its own merits but without taking into account a broader strategy, MEDA II provides for annual financing plans, one for each country that receives bilateral aid and one for regional aid, three-year Indicative National and Regional Programmes (NIPs and RIP) and an overarching long-term Strategy Paper (National and Regional).<sup>98</sup>

The Regional Strategy 2002-2006 identifies the following five MEDA Regional Support Priorities<sup>99</sup>:

|                                      |                                   |  |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Making the Free-Trade Zone a Reality | Develop regional infra-structures | Promoting sustainability of Euro-Med integration | Enhancing the rule of law and good governance | Bringing the Partnership closer to the people |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|

<sup>96</sup> European Council 1996: Council Regulation (EC) No 1488/96 of 23 July 1996 on financial and technical measures to accompany (MEDA) the reform of economic and social structures in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership; European Council 1998: Council Regulation (EC) No 780/98 of 7 April 1998 amending regulation (EC) No 1488/96 as regards the procedure for adopting the appropriate measures where an essential element for the continuation of support measures for a Mediterranean Partner is lacking; European Council 2000: Council Regulation (EC) No 2698/2000 of 27 November 2000 amending Regulation (EC) No 1488/96 on financial and technical measures to accompany (MEDA) the reform of economic and social structures in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership.

<sup>97</sup> European Council 1996: Council Decision of 6 December 1996 concerning the adoption of the guidelines for the indicative programmes concerning financial and technical measures to accompany the reform of economic and social structures in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership.

<sup>98</sup> Euro-Med 2001: From ‘MEDA I’ to ‘MEDA II’: What’s New?, p. 1.

<sup>99</sup> Euro-Med 2002: Regional Strategy Paper 2002-2006 and Regional Indicative Programme 2002-2004, European Commission, p. 18-21.

In the chapter concerning the 'free trade' priority, it is stressed that the mutual supportiveness of the establishment of the MFTZ and environmental protection needs to be ensured through the adoption of appropriate environmental policies. These were to be designed in the light of an MFTZ Sustainability Impact Assessment. The objective of the assessment was "to obtain independent recommendations on formulation of national and regional policies able to produce the optimal outcome in terms not only of liberalisation and economic growth but also of other components of sustainable development".<sup>100</sup> The chapter concerning 'promotion of sustainability' defines as a focus the promotion of strong legislative and regulatory frameworks at bilateral level. At the regional level the "adoption of the principles on access of information, participation in decision making and access to justice in relation to environmental concerns (Aarhus Convention)" shall be encouraged.<sup>101</sup>

For the accomplishment of 'promotion of sustainability', the RIP 2002-2004 identifies "specific objectives" largely rephrasing the 'supportive measures' for a 'link with the long term' of the SMAP<sup>102</sup>. Along these lines, the MEDA Country Strategy Papers and National Indicative Programmes are and have been jointly drawn up by the Commission and the respective Partner State.

Proposals for projects to be funded through MEDA are made to the Commission's Europe Aid Co-operation Office (AIDCO), set up on 1 January 2001 to implement the external aid instruments of the European Commission, which short-lists proposals according to the defined Strategies and Indicative Programs and submits short-lists to the SMAP Correspondents Meeting and the MEDA Committee. Upon endorsement, AIDCO establishes the annual financing plans and manages the projects up to the evaluation phase.

#### **4.2.4.2 The European Investment Bank**

MEDA funds are accompanied by substantial lending from the European Investment Bank (EIB): for 2000-2007, the EIB's Euro-Med II lending mandate is € 6.4 billion supplemented by a further € 1 billion from the Bank's own resources. Originally being the European Union's financing institution contributing towards integration and socio-economic cohesion of Member States, the EIB now also carries out the financial components of agreements concluded under European development aid and co-operation policies. Inside the EIB, Euro-Med is represented through the Article 14 Committee (referring to the respective Article of the MEDA Regulation), which consists of the representatives of the Member States.

As to Euro-Med, the EIB focuses on three priorities:

- encouraging partners to modernise and liberalise their economies with view to creating the free trade area with the EU by 2010;
- expansion of economic infrastructure (communications, energy);

---

<sup>100</sup>Euro-Med 2002: Regional Strategy Paper 2002-2006 and Regional Indicative Programme 2002-2004, European Commission, p. 19.

<sup>101</sup>Euro-Med 2002: Regional Strategy Paper 2002-2006 and Regional Indicative Programme 2002-2004, European Commission, p. 20.

<sup>102</sup>Euro-Med 2002: Regional Strategy Paper 2002-2006 and Regional Indicative Programme 2002-2004, European Commission, p.30.

- protecting the environment (combating environmental degradation and the management and distribution of drinking water resources).

For increased stimulation of the private sector development, the establishment of a reinforced 'Euro-Mediterranean Investment Facility' within the EIB has been decided upon at the conference of the EU Ministers of Trade and Finance (ECOFIN) in Barcelona on the 14 March 2002.

#### 4.2.4.3 Results and Analysis

In order to ensure an accurate response to the different needs of each partner, emphasis is given to national activities. Of the € 3,435 million allocated to MEDA in 1995-1999, 86% (MEDA I) were channelled bilaterally to the partners (Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey and the Palestinian Authority) as set out below, while only 12 % were devoted to regional activities<sup>103</sup>:

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>National Projects</b>  |      |
| Structural adjustment   | 15 % |
| Economic transition and private sector development                            | 30 % |
| “Classical development”:<br>education, health, environment, rural development | 41 % |
| <b>Regional projects</b>  |      |
| All areas (including technical assistance)                                    | 12 % |

However, according to the SMAP draft review, of the 41% of MEDA I “classical development” allocations that were channelled through *national* projects only 0.7% went to environmental projects. Environmental *Regional* Projects that were called for in 1998 represented 1.1 % of all MEDA regional allocations.

The € 7.4 billion advanced over the past six years (1996-2001) by the EIB can be broken down as follows<sup>104</sup>

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Private sector support                       | 27.6% |
| Harnessing and distributing energy resources | 26.4% |
| Communications                               | 21.5% |
| Safeguarding the environment                 | 24.6% |

In 2001, EIB funds for environmental projects even amounted to 34%.

Adding up national and regional allocations (projects and EIB activities), for MEDA I, according to the draft review, funding for the environment amounted to 6 % of total MEDA I funds.

<sup>103</sup>Euro-Med 2002: The MEDA Programme web-site.

<sup>104</sup>European Investment Bank 2002: web-site

For the period 2002-2004, environmental programmes provide for around 6% of national projects funding and 16% of regional projects funding, i.e. 9% of all MEDA II funds. The inclusion of regional projects in fields related to the environment – mostly research, energy and water/desertification – leads to a higher percentage of MEDA funding devoted to the environment.

As to programming, the SMAP Review draft claims that Regional and Country Strategies approved by the Commission so far could have reflected the concept of sustainable development “in a clearer way”. Already at their 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, SMAP Correspondents had expressed that “they would appreciate stimulation of environmental integration in NIPs and Association Agreements by the Commission, in an effort to assist the Ministries of Environment of the Non-EU Partners to play more efficiently their role”.<sup>105</sup>

Finally, disbursement of MEDA funds was rather low. At the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of MEDA, in 1999, only 26% of the total commitments had been paid out. Disbursement increased to 36% in 2000 and 53% in 2001. In the SMAP Review draft, delays were attributed to procedures at the beginning of MEDA still being in the process of implementation, the re-organisation of the Commission’s services and staff shortages that have been overcome only with the creation of AIDCO.

Looking beyond MEDA structures, in the SMAP Review draft, delays were also attributed to the quality of proposals requiring “long negotiations before eligible projects were of sufficient quality for signature of contracts”. The high percentage of rejected regional proposals reflected “difficulties in understanding the Calls for Proposals”. A “two-pronged approach aimed to improving performance and decreasing disappointment” is identified as being necessary.

Finally, in the draft it was recognised that few projects drew on a wide partnership bringing together stakeholders from different fields, in particular from civil society, although this had been intended in order to promote better understanding, consensus – and, albeit not even mentioned here, ownership. Regional projects required preparatory work and funds, which effectively put small applicants such as NGOs and municipalities at the risk of being excluded.

Beyond financial capacities, some potential applicants did not have access to sufficient information to participate. The draft report holds that “mobilisation and information at national level would be very useful for the generation of good proposals that correspond to national priorities and international commitments”.

### **4.3 Key Issues Requiring Action**

In conclusion to what has been set out in the preceding chapter, the following chapter will give a brief assessment of current activities and the problems encountered concerning the implementation of the EMP/SMAP agenda for environmental protection and sustainable development. Eight key issues are identified that require action. A focus will be placed on those fields as to which MAP might be able to deliver expertise or operational capacities.

---

<sup>105</sup>European Commission 2002: SMAP web-site.

### **4.3.1 Programmatic Outset and Activities at the Regional Level**

Regarding environmental and sustainability goals, the programmatic outset of the Euro-Med process as defined by the Barcelona and Helsinki Declaration leaves very little to wish for. The Barcelona triad of “reconciling”, “integrating” and “mitigating” establishes the right corner posts for environmental protection. The overall objective of the Economic and Financial Partnership – “sustainable and balanced economic and social development” – with sustainable development being spelled out in Helsinki as “including the protection of the environment and the improvement of health and living conditions” reflects the conception of sustainable development as had been shaped at the World Summit in Rio.

#### **Key Issue 1: Environmental and sustainable policy integration at regional level**

However, two “congenital defects” need to be recognised: the mere fact that the environmental framework programme has been adopted by the Ministers of the Environment, i.e. not by the “top steering level”, the Foreign Ministers, at a separate conference, might have undermined the objective of integration right from the beginning. The “reluctance” observed by SMAP Correspondents might well be attributed to actors perceiving the environmental issue well contained and taken care of in the SMAP, a separate programme not interfering with their own sector. In the future, therefore, goals of horizontal environmental integration should be proclaimed at the level which is competent for the cross sectoral steering of the whole process: the Foreign Ministers Conference.

Irritations might have been furthered by the wording of the Barcelona Declaration, for “sustainable and balanced economic and social development” seems to link sustainability to economic and social development only. However, with the Valencia Action Plan explicitly aiming at “sustainable development with a high degree of environmental protection”, these issues should have overcome by now.

Nevertheless, at the top political level, among Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers, political commitment to the environmental and sustainability agenda seems rather high, and has been underlined by calling the Ministers of the Environment to define a strategy for integrating environmental and sustainability aspects into all EMP policy sectors. However, the Ministers of the Environment can only *launch* a process that for effective integration necessitates to evolve in a *decentralised* way. The Foreign Ministers Conference, being the overall steering body of the EMP, needs to commit all policy sectors involved in the EMP process to set up their own ambitious integration strategy according to the recommendations made by the Ministers of the Environment. However, de-central strategies do not only need to be set up, but also be reviewed and re-defined on an ongoing basis. For this task, the Conference of the Ministers of the Environment, with the SMAP Correspondents Meeting as a preparatory body, would be a competent and – particularly with regard to the involvement of the Comité de Suivi – also credible body. However, an open external body discussing integration issues could enhance transparency, raise general awareness and provide input from the outside.

#### **Key Issue 2: A Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development**

For an overarching guiding policy framework for Euro-Mediterranean policy, the Partners should begin the establishment of a Strategy for Sustainable Development for the Mediterranean region or support such an undertaking outside its own institutions, and then

align its future policies according to this strategy. Crucial as it is for the further development of the whole region also beyond the EMP, with a view to enhanced credibility it seems preferable to have such a *framework strategy* developed outside EMP-institutions.

As a framework strategy, it would define, based on the agreed criteria of sustainability, how the Mediterranean region in its economic, social and environmental assets should look like in the long term. Future policy decisions in all fields would have to take into account the defined sustainability targets. Thus, the further development of the region would be effectively directed along sustainable lines.

The concept of sustainability as developed in Rio provides for an equilibrium of interests between the countries of the North and countries of the South, a divide which runs through the Mediterranean basin. The building of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership across this divide, in particular that of the MFTZ, requires in particular the application of what has been shaped in and since Rio. Albeit called for manyfold, a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development is still missing in the Euro-Med agenda. If the Euro-Mediterranean Partners strive for a “fair global system” as declared by Foreign Ministers in the aftermath of 11 September, they seem to be necessitated to recur to the concept which especially has been developed to reach this end.

### **Key Issue 3: Sustainability Indicators and MFTZ Sustainability Impact Assessment**

Both policy measures, the pursuit of a Strategy for Sustainable Development and the integration of environmental and sustainability goals, require monitoring. Effects of policies currently implemented need to be measured in order to assess if trends are not missing the defined environmental and sustainability goal, but rather require improved integration. The definition and observance of indicators makes the intangible concept of sustainable development operational in terms of policy decisions and, in the case of unsustainable trends, generates political pressure.

While indicators can contribute to trends being rectified, trends can be avoided from the beginning by prospective impact assessments. With regard to the vast impact of the MFTZ on all sectors of life and the environment in the Mediterranean region, a comprehensive MFTZ Impact Assessment has rightfully been called for. However, while the SMAP provides for an *Environmental* Impact Assessments in light of what has been laid out above regarding sustainability, the MEDA Regional Strategy 2002-2006 rightfully refers to a more comprehensive *Sustainability* Impact Assessment.

The establishment of “sustainable development indicators” and “environmental monitoring” has been projected as a SMAP-objective for a “link with the long term”. SMAP overall objectives include “to highlight trade and environment issues” right from the beginning of establishing the MFTZ. With view to what has been pointed out above as to the importance of sustainable development and the excessive impact of a MFTZ, there is a need to put in place both as soon as possible *sustainability* indicators – including economic, social and environmental indicators – and the MFTZ *Sustainability* Impact Assessment.



### **4.3.2 The National Levels**

While there seems to be some movement at the regional level concerning the undertakings that have been recommended here, the bottle neck for success of the environmental and sustainability agenda is apparently at the national level.

#### **Key Issue 4: Environmental and sustainable policy integration at central national levels**

The negotiations of the association agreements have almost been concluded. From an environmental point of view, results are rather insufficient. However, nobody will be ready to open up packages that have been tied up in a very lengthy process. Lessons can be only learned with regard to the outstanding Association Agreement with Syria.

The agreements made can and must be read according to the underlying Declarations. Although the chance has been given away to put the goals of the Barcelona and Helsinki Declarations into more concrete and tangible terms in the bilateral agreements, the requirements deriving from Barcelona and Helsinki will have to be taken into account now, during the process of implementing the bilateral agreements. Certainly, this needs to be done through comprehensive environmental and sustainable policy integration at national levels covering all fields of the national policies related to the Euro-Mediterranean Economic and Financial Partnership, similar to what has been pointed out for integration at regional level.

#### **Key Issue 5: Capacity and partnership building**

However, while integration at national levels certainly is a key issue, other problems might have to be addressed first. It seems that for the accomplishment of any SMAP objectives the process is in need of capacities in the Mediterranean Partner states: players that would be able to carry out the ambitious agenda both, at central national levels and at implementation level. Capacity building seems the foremost priority – for which three target groups can be identified.

##### **(1) CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES**

##### **(2) SUPPORTING ENVIRONMENTAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS**

##### **(3) EMPOWERING CIVIL SOCIETY IN A BROADER SENSE**

Ambitious national integration policies certainly require consolidated national environment agencies. While integration is ideally implemented in a decentralised approach by each agency in its own field of activities, in the Mediterranean Partner States consolidated environmental agencies providing input and integration advice to all other agencies seem to be of an utmost importance.

Beyond policy integration (at policy planning levels), according to the conception of the SMAP, its implementation shall be initiated by the Mediterranean Partners. This approach is foremost represented by the concept of MEDA relying on proposals that are submitted for funding (instead of the Commission calling for tenders for projects it has designed itself). This approach assumes that the best solutions can be found in a de-centralised approach with proposals being made close to the level where problems arise and action is taken. At the same time, proceeding in this way might be expected to ensure a high degree of ownership and commitment. Finally, the element of competition is added, ideally providing the funding organisation with different proposals, of which it can choose the best.

Albeit correct in its theoretic onset, the first years of the SMAP and MEDA have shown that only few project proposals of a sufficient quality were submitted. As a consequence, the percentage of MEDA funds spent on environment and sustainable development is very low. The national agencies of the Mediterranean partner states, it turned out, require support: capacity building.

Apart from national agencies, civil society, the other player projected to initiate activities in the partner states, faces additional financial constraints effectively impeding it from participating. The submission of proposal requires a certain financial scope. Without that, potential contributors will not be able to submit proposals and to channel their knowledge into the implementation of environmental and sustainability goals. Even a well consolidated institution such as the Blue Plan raises that it had to turn down the offer to prepare a proposal for MEDA Water because financial and staff limitations not allowing such an additional workload. Civil society, finally, encounters also informational constraints.

Even within the European Commission it is acknowledged that there are difficulties with pursuing the concept of “Calls for Proposals”.

Beyond policy-makers and tenders for projects, *sustainable* environmental protection and *sustainable* development in general requires a broad embedding of environmental goals and the idea of sustainable development in the societies East and South of the Mediterranean.

All of this – consolidation of national environmental agencies, strengthening organisations of civil society, and enhancing awareness and broad public support – has already been defined by the SMAP as objectives for a success in the “long term”. Also the Valencia Conference of Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers called the European Commission “to strengthen technical and institutional capacity in the region”. Even more precise, such undertaking shall be carried out “in synergy with other programmes such as the Mediterranean Action Plan”. The Commission, therefore, seems to be *obliged*, both to promote capacities in the region along these lines in order to allow for quality proposals to be submitted at a later stage and to take MAP institutions into consideration for support.

With the € 2.5 million that have been dedicated to support national institutions to assist SMAP Correspondents, the European Commission has been trying to approach the problem. The national institutions are expected to increase activities at national level as to information, contacts with other ministries and NGOs, mobilise potentially interested applicants and promote the preparation of projects of high quality and coherent and sustainable policies.<sup>106</sup> The approach seems appropriate, however efforts at building fundamental capacities need to be considerably enlarged and also targeted directly towards civil society: membership based NGOs, academic or scientific institutions and foundations need to be included.

For success in the long term, the SMAP also suggests the provision of training. However, beyond that, with finances being the major constraint for players to participate, particularly with regard to the submission of proposals, players that have been trained and have built up sufficient expertise, for instance, could be taken as eligible for financial support in the phases of drafting project proposals. Concurrently, access to relevant information needs to be ensured.

---

<sup>106</sup>European Commission 2002: SMAP web-site, 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of SMAP.

Therefore, where activities are truncated by finances, while

1. commitment of staff,
2. expertise and ideas concerning action to be taken,
3. efficient management, and
4. effectiveness of activities pursued

can be proven or at least expected, in other words, where a *potential for capacities* to be developed can be identified, the European Commission should consider approaching the implementation of the SMAP from a different angle, i.e. through building up capacities instead of relying on calls for proposals. Given the overall lack of capacity in the region, this applies not just to organisations of civil society, but to any potential partner institution – including MAP components.

Indeed, capacity building seems to be the linchpin for a lot: for successful national horizontal integration, for project and implementation capacities, for the sustainable success of environmental ideas and the concept of sustainable development in the broader civil society. Without addressing the problem of capacities – but adhere strictly to the “Calls for proposals” – the European Commission is likely to be faced with continued insufficient implementation of its environmental and sustainability goals.

### **4.3.3 SMAP Correspondents**

#### **Key Issue 6: Strengthening SMAP Correspondents**

SMAP Correspondents have been established for a follow-up of the implementation of the SMAP. As a link to the partner states where implementation takes place, they could feed back the practical results that have been achieved on the spot into Euro-Med political and planning processes. They are therefore an important tool for the monitoring of implementation activities. On the other hand, SMAP Correspondents could provide a contact for civil society and potential applicants for funds and thus contribute to capacity building. While, according to their own assessment, SMAP Correspondents are lacking the capacities to fulfil this twofold important role, they urgently need to be strengthened.

### **4.3.4 MEDA**

#### **Key Issue 7: Enhancing MEDA planning**

It needs to be stated that also very little has been undertaken and achieved in terms of classical environmental protection. This seems mainly due to the weaknesses of MEDA, which as pointed out in section 4.2.4.3, so far, has benefited environmental protection only to a very small percentage.

Like the Barcelona framework as a whole, MEDA regulation is ambitious to introduce environmental goals and sustainable development into funding. Also, the restructuring of MEDA planning seems well intended. However, current Regional and Country Strategies approved by the Commission are criticised for just not sufficiently reflecting the concept of sustainable development – although SMAP Correspondents at their 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting had already expressed the view that more structured programming could provide assistance to the

Mediterranean Partners. Indeed, what can a sophisticated planning system deliver if the sustainability chapter of the Six-Years-Regional-Strategy is limited to defining – in a very general way – legal instruments as tools to be spread? And what is the additional input of the Regional Three-Years Strategy if it is no more specific than the overall SMAP framework programme?

Currently, while having several layers of framework programmes, the environmental/sustainability process within Euro-Med is lacking step-by-step programmes, such as the MAP Strategic Action Programme for tackling pollution. Obviously, external input is needed to put in place a detailed planning matrix with different objectives at the different planning levels. With MEDA being the central instrument for the implementation of Euro-Med policies, enhanced environmental and sustainable policy integration within MEDA is of utmost importance.

**Key Issue 8: Limited options for policy implementation through “Calls for Proposals”**

Last but not least, another problem needs to be highlighted which arises from the proposal orientated approach of the Commission: If only a small number of proposals is submitted, any sort of planning is made redundant, no matter how ambitious and sophisticated it may be: For without a variety of proposals to choose from no program can be deliberately put into place. With the implementation of the SMAP relying on proposals being submitted under MEDA, under the present circumstances the competent EMP institutions surrender a closer guidance of the policy process and the deliberate pursuance of its ambitious agenda.

## 5 Sectoral Synergies – Options for Improvement

Having identified the objectives and capacities of MAP on the one hand, and the goals and problems (Key Issues) of Euro-Med on the other hand, the following chapter identifies options for matching what is available on the one side with what is needed on the other or a better co-ordination of parallel activities respectively. While analysing the policy sectors *trade and environment* (development towards an area of sustainable free trade), *information and strategies* (statistics, indicators, studies), *sustainable coastal zone management* (including land-based pollution sources, tourism and the preservation of Mediterranean biodiversity), *water management* and *pollution through marine activities*, nine options will be pointed out which may be expected to drive forward co-operation between MAP and Euro-Med and give way to synergies.

### 5.1 Trade and Environment: Towards an Area of Sustainable Free Trade

The establishment of a Mediterranean Free Trade Zone in accordance with the criteria of sustainability and environmental protection is an overall objective of the Barcelona process as defined by the Declarations of Barcelona and Helsinki. Despite some reluctance, the Euro-Med Foreign Ministers have stressed this linkage again and endorsed Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) – identified as key issue above – as an inevitable tool to be included into the policy process in particular with view to the establishment of the MFTA.

On behalf of MAP, with view to the Euro-Mediterranean project of establishing a free trade zone until 2010, the MSCD, supported by the Blue Plan, has been engaged in the issue of trade and environment with one of its working groups. The “Synthesis Report” of its findings, published by the Blue Plan and drawing on the Centre’s work over the last years, takes into account the different possible impacts of Mediterranean trade liberalisation, including both, environmental effects and aspects of socio-economic sustainability. While the Report is not an SIA of the MFTZ itself, since “data, analyses, and even the methods for assessing the impact of free trade are still largely missing”, it points out the different factors that needed to be included in such a study, and it gives an account of the problems such an undertaking would have to resolve.

The “Synthesis Report” also provides a compendium of possible institutional arrangements and policy measures that would provide for an improved integration of environmental and development concerns referring comprehensively to association agreements, economic, institutional, command and control instruments, and “horizontal” programs such as capacity and awareness building. Measures are differentiated according to the different levels of regional, national, and sectoral intervention.<sup>107</sup>

The report has been based on substantial groundwork: as a supporting Centre for the MSCD working group the Blue Plan has launched 19 studies, focussing on the following topics:

---

<sup>107</sup>Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001: The Free Trade and the Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context. First Synthesis Report for the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD).

- trends of trade flows between the Mediterranean countries and the rest of the world (particularly EU), and development of the multilateral trade/environment context;
- lessons drawn from other regional experiences: NAFTA, the integration of Spain, Greece and Portugal into the EU and the expected consequences of Poland's integration, South-East Asian experiences;
- prospective analysis of the regional level on industry and agriculture, with a particular focus on southern and eastern Mediterranean countries and on the possible impacts of free trade;
- national sectoral studies on consumption patterns and some industrial sub-sectors;
- environmental aspects of the association agreements.<sup>108</sup>

Currently, results are supplemented with a view to the impact of free trade on agriculture and fragile rural areas and on small and medium-sized enterprises in the textile sector.<sup>109</sup>

### **Option 1: MFTA Impact Assessment through the Blue Plan**

MSCD and the Blue Plan, over years, have jointly been building up work and activities in the field of trade and sustainability. The latter may, perhaps, be considered as *the* source of expertise, as to questions of sustainable development in the Mediterranean. The Centre's expertise in this field has been broadly acknowledged in the interviews. Although, with its "Synthesis Report", the Plan Bleu has not presented tangible results as to an SIA yet, the Synthesis Report proves considerable groundwork and a thorough understanding of the importance and the problems of such an undertaking, presumably to be acquired only over years. The Blue Plan, therefore, could be a partner for carrying out the envisaged SIA.

The prospective expertise that is accumulated at the Centre should certainly also benefit EMP and MEDA programming. Channelling the expertise of the different Centres into the Euro-Med process, however, will be dealt with as a cross-sectoral option (Option 10).

## **5.2 Information (Reports, Indicators and Statistics)**

To satisfy information requirements arising from the goals of the Barcelona Convention, Medstat, a statistical co-operation programme between the EU and the 12 Mediterranean Partners, was launched in 1996. Provided with considerable funds as one of MEDA's regional projects (€ 20 million until 2001, € 30 million for the next four years), organised by Eurostat, and monitored by DG Relex as to the adequacy with the objectives of the MFTA, the programme aims at promoting the exchange and comparability of statistical data, training and capacity building. Among the different activity fields, economic and environmental

---

<sup>108</sup>Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001: The Free Trade and the Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context. Draft report for the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) – Provisional Version, p. 10.

<sup>109</sup>Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001: The Free Trade and the Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context. Draft report for the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) – Provisional Version, section 53.

statistics became priorities.<sup>110</sup> The sub-project on the environment, focussing on water, soils and wastes, was entrusted to the Blue Plan as a contractual tender, a co-operation that on behalf of Medstat has been emphasised as “very fruitful”.

The general competence of MAP in the field of data, indicators and information related to the state of the environment was highlighted by the co-operation with the EEA concerning the report “State and pressures of the marine and coastal Mediterranean environment”, published in 1999.

In 1999, the Contracting Parties adopted a working programme, submitted by the MCSD's working group on indicators, involving

- the realisation of the common core set of indicators: environmental performance indicators and sustainable development indicators (SDIs) integrating social dimensions, the economy and the environment;
- the calculation and analysis of indicators in the countries;
- the reinforcement of capacities through the intermediary of the national environmental observatories and the mobilisation of the statistical institutes.

Over the past few years, the Blue Plan led numerous activities with support from the EU LIFE programme; with regard to environmental performance indicators, jointly with METAP, it brought together more than 300 specialists from the 20 Mediterranean countries and settled a consensus on 130 indicators. While their calculation was pursued by the countries involved with “enthusiasm”, countries are now “faced with a lack of personnel and time and a lack of expertise for the analysis”.<sup>111</sup> The Commission has now made the proposal to include SDIs as defined by the MSCD into their future work.

### **Option 2: Extension of co-operation in the field of indicators**

Including the MCSD-established SDIs into Medstat would provide the Mediterranean region with a credible scale for the development of the region. Environmental institutions in charge of the SDIs established under MAP and Medstat partner institutions being similar or complementary<sup>112</sup> an extended co-operation seems to be straight forward. The Blue Plan could be a partner also for this extended project.

## **5.3 Sustainable Coastal Zone Management (including Land-based Sources, Tourism and the Preserving of Mediterranean Biodiversity)**

Integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) including pollution from land-based and marine sources (the latter will be covered separately in chapter 5.5) and Mediterranean biodiversity, is one of the five SMAP priority fields of action. While the text of the Helsinki Declaration

---

<sup>110</sup> Confer Eurostat 1999: Medstat – Statistics cross the Mediterranean, p. 4-7.

<sup>111</sup> Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001: The System of 130 Indicators for the Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region. Record of the Workshop in Sophia Antipolis, 11-12 December 2000, p. 5-6 and 17.

<sup>112</sup> Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001: The System of 130 Indicators for the Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region. Record of the Workshop in Sophia Antipolis, 11-12 December 2000, p. 7.

itself, in general, only names the five SMAP priority fields of action (section 1.2.), for ICZM (and combating desertification) it also spells out a list of specific activities to be taken (chapter 2.2.), thus stressing the importance Euro-Mediterranean Ministers were attaching to ICZM:

- development of a comprehensive strategy, for instance by way of pilot projects;
- setting up of an information network on the state and changes of the coastal areas in order to provide reliable data for decision making;
- promotion of research and training in ICZM;
- establishment of protected areas and the promotion of land use policies for coastal zones;
- development of technical infrastructure for monitoring, preventing and combating pollution.

Further on, as valid techniques to be developed and implemented, Annex 1 to the Declaration (Priority Fields of Action – 4. Integrated Coastal Zone Management) enlists, inter alia:

- remote sensing and the Geographical Information System for more complete mapping of the situation;
- preparation of studies on carrying capacity for the major development projects;
- sustainable development and rehabilitation of tourism areas;
- pilot projects to protect coastal zones from erosion and degradation, for the promotion of sustainable agricultural and silvicultural practices and for the prevention, reduction and control of marine and coastal litter;
- elaboration of Good Practice Guidelines for Integrated Coastal Zones Management;
- support for strategies for action to prevent and combat pollution from marine and land-based sources and activities.

SMAP projects funded under MEDA include an ICZM project in the Eastern Mediterranean and the mandating of SPA/RAC to set up protected areas.

The catalogue set out in Helsinki is matched remarkably by the activities developed by the Priority Actions Centre. With the CAMPs, PAP/RAC has been concentrating on the ICZM, its tools and their practical application as sought for in the Helsinki Declaration. With the PAP/RAC “Guidelines for Integrated Coastal and Marine Areas Management”, at least the ground work for the “Good Practice Guidelines” envisaged by the Helsinki Declaration has been carried out. Sustainable tourism, sustainable development in urban and rural areas, and the protection of soils as further elements of the SMAP agenda for ICZM are focal areas of PAP/RAC activities.

In all these fields, the Blue Plan has provided support with regard to systemic and prospective analysis. The aspect of the protection of Mediterranean biodiversity is covered by the specialised SPA Regional Activity Centre. References in the SMAP catalogue to “remote sensing” is matched by the Environment Remote Sensing RAC. Support to “strategies for action to prevent and combat pollution” seems to directly refer to the MAP



Strategic Action Programme and the related activities by MEDPOL and the Clean Production RAC. After its revision, also the 100 HS Programme will contribute to the ICZM.

### **Option 3: Building up PAP/RAC into a capacitor for ICZM**

It has been pointed out above that for the implementation of the SMAP, the European Commission is lacking eligible proposals and partners in the region and therefore needs to consider building up capacity where “a kernel” of expertise and committed staff has been aggregated already. This relates to MAP institutions as much as to civil players in the Mediterranean region, for both are faced with insufficient funding. The PAP/RAC, embedded in the expertise of the other MAP Regional Activity Centres, appears as a potential addressee for such capacity and partnership building by the European Commission concerning the field of ICZM. The Centre’s performance has been emphasised in the 2001 evaluation. In particular, with the CAMPs, PAP/RAC, has managed to make ICZM operationable. The Mediterranean Partners in general appreciate CAMPs as a way to make ICZM tangible and to channel related expertise into national politics.

MAP, of course has to provide proof as to the preconditions that have been set out above (Key Issue 5) – commitment, expertise, proper management, effectiveness – preferably by having an external business management evaluation carried out. Then, negotiations need to be launched to identify, what support the Centre would need to make fuller use of and enhance operationalisation of its expertise. Support could be granted on a contractual basis, resulting in, for instance, an obligation to pay back funds if agreed activities have not been undertaken appropriately, for instance, with regard to proposals for ICZM projects to be funded under MEDA.

Beyond proposals for MEDA, for further enlarging capacity building in the region related to ICZM, PAP/RAC should be considered for being built up as a *capacitor* itself, offering workshops and seminars to potential players including governments, scientific institutes and civil society. Support funds could again be bound by contracts providing re-funding if seminars have been evaluated as badly targeted or not delivering know-how for which it had been put in place.

Finally, with its substantial expertise and experience concerning ICZM on the one hand and a similar hub of know-how elsewhere in the Mediterranean missing, PAP/RAC could also be built up to provide the direct assistance to Mediterranean governments as to “appropriate institutional policy and regulatory framework” which, as pointed out above, is missed, at present.

Thus, PAP/RAC, could be considered for being built up as a *regionwide capacitor for putting in place the ICZM chapter of the Helsinki Declaration* (i.e. chapter 2.2.) as has been laid out above not only through conducting CAMPs, but also by advising national governments and building up new players among governments and civil society.

### **Option 4: Considering and building up SPA/RAC’s capacities**

Similar steps should be considered with regard to SPA/RAC which could become a central player in the field of the protection of Mediterranean biodiversity. In particular with regard to the importance of ICZM among SMAP priority fields of action which the Helsinki Declaration attaches to it, the European Commission should examine whether the SPA/RAC might be a partner to be specifically entrusted with the ICZM element of protecting Mediterranean

biodiversity, “the establishment of protected areas in coastal zones (lagoons, sand dunes, estuaries, wetlands, etc.)” (Helsinki Declaration, section 2.2.6).

Concerning biodiversity, the SMAP Annex (in its ICZM chapter) enlists as further tasks

- “the development and implementation of plans for the conservation and management of Mediterranean biodiversity” including
- “the protection of threatened marine species” and
- “support to environmentally sound initiatives of Fisheries Ministers”.

As pointed out above (section 3.2.5.5.), SPA/RAC has conducted activities relating to all of these points: it is currently operating a MEDA project for the establishment of protected areas and developing national action plans for the protection of Mediterranean biodiversity under the GEF/SAP, it has developed action plans for endangered species. Implementation activities also target the sector of fisheries.

A first assessment as to the potential of SPA/RAC concerning such a role will be possible on grounds of the results of the MEDA project currently conducted by the Centre. The Centre therefore needs to make the current MEDA project a recommendation for the future, identify necessary steps for a follow up to the present project and build up its operational capacities accordingly. For substantial funding, however, the European Commission might require a comprehensive business evaluation along the four points that have been pointed out above. The terms of reference for the envisaged evaluation of the Centre, therefore, should ensure that they are covered.

#### **Option 5: Considering MEDPOL capacities and adopting the implementation of the SAP**

MEDPOL is one of the quite well reputed, strong points of MAP. The mere fact, that it has won potent institutions for substantial financing of groundwork relating to the Strategic Action Programme may be taken as a recommendation of the Centre’s capacities. However, with expertise and capacities as to data and statistics recognised, MEDPOL’s challenge apparently relates to an “old-fashioned culture” lacking the ability to channel acquired statistical knowledge and data into operational skills and concrete action.

However, again, given the general lack of expertise and of capable players in the region, the European Commission should enter into a dialogue with MEDPOL along the lines that have been set out in Option 3 in order to overcome this deficiency. The Commission should take on identifying what resources there are and inform MEDPOL what skills need to be developed such that MEDPOL could play a role in the implementation of the SMAP, for instance, by fostering the implementation of the SAP with support of the EMP. With MEDPOL, there is a respected regional institution. With the SAP there is also an ambitious and quite precise program that defines activities step by step for the next 25 years. Euro-Med/SMAP is lacking both completely. For creating synergies, the EMP should adopt and support the potential which is there.

### **Option 6: Drawing on MAP capacities in the field of tourism**

Concerning tourism, the Valencia Action Plan projects that partners shall be supported in taking account of the impact of tourism in other policy areas “so as to ensure the sustainable development of the sector”.

The MSCD with one of its working groups, the Blue Plan and PAP/RAC have been working on sustainable tourism. The MSCD has issued recommendations on “tourism and sustainable development”. The Blue Plan, drawing on a network of experts in this field, is currently working on a “white book” on sustainable tourism. Activities of PAP/RAC relating, inter alia, to conducting capacity assessments, have been evaluated as an effective demonstration of capacity building. Also the 100 Historic Sites Programme, currently being in the process of re-structuring, has carried out related work.

MAP should therefore concentrate the scattered activities in the field of tourism, either under the roof of the Blue Plan, PAP/RAC, the restructured 100 HS Programme, or the envisaged new Eco-Tourism RAC and enter into a dialogue with the European Commission with a view to what capacities need to be developed and which activities need to be launched.

## **5.4 Water Management**

The Barcelona Declaration had already recognised water supply and the management and development of its resources as a priority for the Partnership. Along the lines of the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Water Management held in Marseilles on 25-26 November 1996, the Helsinki Declaration established integrated water management as one of the five priorities of the SMAP, defining as the most urgent actions to be taken:

- evaluation and monitoring of water quality and quantity;
- establishment and implementation of programmes for the provision of safe drinking water and for waste water treatment systems;
- establishment and implementation of water conservation plans;
- identification and use of measures and techniques for improved collection, treatment disposal and re-use of waste water, prevention of salinisation and treatment of brackish water;
- establishment and implementation of programmes to tackle water losses;
- encouragement of decentralised authorities (river basin committees as local bodies for water management, etc.) tackling unsustainable water production and water use;
- reorganisation of the management of water resources.

With the Declaration of the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Local Water Management held in Turin on 18-19 October 1999, an action plan was adopted narrowing down priorities on the following six objectives<sup>113</sup>:

---

<sup>113</sup>Euro-Med 1999: Conference Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Local Water Management, Turin, 18-19 October 1999.

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Management of drinking water supply, sanitation and sewage services | Local water resources and water demand management (quantity and quality) | Prevention and mitigation of droughts and equitable management of water |
|---|--|---|

|                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Irrigation water management | Use of non-conventional water resources | Preparing scenarios for the period until 2025 allowing objectives to be set |
|-----------------------------|---|---|

For the implementation of the action plan the European Commission allocated € 40 million in 2001 and is currently calling for regional proposals. Additional € 15 million are channelled in water and desertification projects in the Middle East under the MEDA Peace Process initiative. Within the Commission it is acknowledged that two earlier MEDA projects related to water failed because of capacity deficits as pointed out in Key Issue 5.

Already the Marseilles Conference had agreed to set up a Euro-Mediterranean information system, SEMIDE, on “practical knowledge in the water management field, taking into account the operations and structures that already exist”.<sup>114</sup> SEMIDE was supported by the EU with € 1.9 million.

Under MAP, activities related to the sustainable management of water have primarily been developed by the Blue Plan. Beyond the activities that have been laid out in section 3.2.5.2, the Centre has assembled a large data bank on water resources and water use. The activities of the Blue Plan on Indicators of Sustainable Development certainly refer also to water. Besides, the Blue Plan has set up a network of Mediterranean experts. The Blue Plan was involved in preparatory works for both Euro-Mediterranean Conferences in Marseilles and in Turin and has supported the working group for water of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development resulting in recommendations calling Contracting Parties to foster awareness and responsibility among users and undertake practical demand control activities rather than rely on new resources.<sup>115</sup> Numerous publications have been published by the Blue Plan for promoting this approach. With view to the Turin action plan, the study “Water in the Mediterranean Basin” needs to be named which includes scenarios for the different Mediterranean countries as to water demand and water resources in 2025. A new “fascicule” (monograph) “Water” and a regional forum on progress and tools for water demand management are currently being prepared.

<sup>114</sup>Euro-Med 1996: Decisions of the Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Water Management, Marseilles, 25-26 November 1996.

<sup>115</sup>UNEP/MAP 1997: Report of the 10<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, Recommendations of the MSCSD concerning the Management of Water, App. V.

### **Option 7: Drawing on the Blue Plan's expertise as to the sustainable management of water**

The strength of the Blue Plan, as pointed out above, is rather in the domain of prospective studies and scenarios than in making know-how applicable. However, on behalf of Plan Bleu it is claimed that progress has been made concerning tangible solutions. Also, the Centre intends to raise awareness among Mediterranean states as to the importance of reducing the demand for water and the substantial financial benefits that will consequently accrue to the state. The Blue Plan, therefore, is likely to be able to make an eligible proposal as to the preparation of national and local scenarios for the period until 2025 as envisaged in the Turin action plan.

However, beyond this analytic undertaking, the Blue Plan represents an extraordinary amount of expertise in questions of sustainable development including the sustainable management of water, which the Euro-Med process should not neglect. Of course, given the lack of capable institutions in the region, it seems highly desirable, that the Centre would move towards a more operational agenda and submit eligible proposals for projects concerning the sustainable management of water. Having rejected to submit proposals with regard to MEDA Water once, apparently due to financial and staff constraints, also with view to the Blue Plan the European Commission needs to re-consider its strict adherence to the "Calls for proposals", and probably grant funds subject to narrow contractual provisions as has been suggested above.

## **5.5 Pollution from Marine Activities**

Already the Helsinki Declaration provides for "the setting up of Port Reception Facilities for treatment of liquid and solid waste, generated by ships". Under MEDA, as part of the Regional Maritime Transport Programme for Port Reception Facilities, € 560,365 have been approved with the long-term goal of attaining a complete picture of the situation as to collecting ship-generated garbage, bilge waters and oily residues from ships in the different Mediterranean ports and countries. The project will identify required capacities, include a study as to optimum solutions and prepare standard designs for port reception facilities and waste treatment plans. A project regarding port reception facilities in the Mediterranean was signed in December 2001 between IMO (on behalf of REMPEC) and the European Commission. Overall objective of the project is to implement the provisions of MARPOL 73/78 Convention. REMPEC/MAP/IMO will co-ordinate the project amounting to € 700,420 in total.<sup>116</sup> While the project is involving ten Southern and Eastern Mediterranean states, REMPEC is planning to undertake a similar study concerning the other Mediterranean countries. All results will be combined with work carried out in EU member states in order to obtain a complete picture.

In the framework of MAP, while activities of REMPEC had been largely limited to marine pollution through emergency accidents, with the adoption of the new Emergency Protocol on

---

<sup>116</sup>Taken from the SMAP Review draft.

26 January 2002, a major step in combating pollution from day-to-day marine operational activities has been made.

**Option 8: Jointly working towards a partnership in the field of pollution through marine activities**

Within the European Commission, it is conceded that it had little to offer in the field of emergency oil spills and, for instance, port reception facilities, a field, which therefore could be covered by MAP. The development and implementation of sub-regional and national contingency plans for emergencies and pollution incidents and programmes for the setting up of port reception facilities, therefore, is the *gap*, where MAP activities for putting in place the SMAP agenda would be welcome.

However, the Commission's baseline is here, too: sell your ideas, put yourself in the position to receive funds through eligible proposals. The MEDA project mentioned, seems to be a starting point. REMPEC, having been entrusted with this project, needs to take it as a chance to identify the necessary steps to be taken as a follow up to the present project and build up its operational capacities accordingly. Also with REMPEC, for a more pro-active role fostering capacities for the submission of eligible proposals, the European Commission should enter a dialogue with the Centre along the lines that have been pointed out above (Option 3) and possibly provide funds in a controlled way. For with the work REMPEC has carried out over the past years, the Commission might find it a valuable partner worth building up in the interest of EMP and the SMAP.

## **5.6 Outlook: Transport and Energy**

**Option 9: Building a co-operation on the MAP Strategic Action Programme**

Transport and Energy are issues that are both addressed within the economic and financial chapter of the Barcelona process. As such, the Barcelona triad of "reconciling economic development with environmental protection", "integrating environmental concerns" and "mitigating negative environmental effects" applies.

Under the MAP, SAP measures for integrating aspects of environmental protection and sustainable development into transport and energy policies have been envisaged. Proposals for regional and national activities have been made, including targets such as hazardous wastes resulting from energy production and means of transportation, emissions through traffic, industrial plants and energy production, or the promotion of renewable sources of energy, energy efficiency and energy saving. The European Commission should take this as a starting point and develop further activities together with MAP.

## 6 Cross-Sectoral Synergies – Options for Improvement

Euro-Med and MAP have one same corner post in common: *sustainable development*. For Euro-Med, it will deliver partnership and peace around the Mediterranean Sea, for MAP, it will provide protection for the environment. Although, within the concept of sustainable development, under the EMP emphasis is put on the latter – *development* –, primarily to be attained through increased trade –, it is recognised that *un-sustainable* development would compromise in the long run what it might more easily accomplish in the short or medium term.

On the contrary, MAP focuses on sustainability, particularly on the environmental pillar of this concept, while being aware of the need for social, economic and cultural development in the Mediterranean region. Thus, EMP and MAP share the goals that are flowing from their common objective: Both are acknowledging the need for socio-economic development. At the same time, on both sides it is recognised that economic development needs to be reconciled with environmental protection and that negative environmental consequences need to be mitigated. Both initiatives are aiming at a high level of environmental protection.

Not surprisingly, both sides also tackle environmental degradation along the same priorities. The Barcelona Convention Protocols, the activities of the MAP Regional Centres and MAP Programmes such as MEDPOL and the MAP SAP to combat pollution are matching in many areas the five SMAP “priority fields of action”. The plans for setting up a MAP Regional Activity Centre for sustainable tourism and the re-structuring of the 100 HS Programme will open up further areas for co-operation and synergies, given Euro-Med activities such as the regional MEDA project for prehistoric sites TEMPER.

MAP and Euro-Med even agree on the policy *tools*: environmental and sustainability integration into all policy fields; Sustainability Impact Assessment, and indicator and trend monitoring to follow-up if set objectives are met and to identify if new ones need to be defined. After the EU Council of Göteborg, also the EMP acknowledging the need for setting up an overarching Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development seems to be close. Both also emphasise the need for secure data, both endorse pilot projects as the way to implement objectives. Similarities, therefore, are abundant. However, co-operation so far has been very limited, while practical achievements in terms of environmental protection and sustainable development are very small on both sides.

### 6.1 Policy Planning at Central Political Level

#### **Option 10: Establishing a work process concerning the implementation of common goals**

In the preceding chapter, it has been pointed out how both sides could co-operate on certain issues in order to produce synergies. Beyond such co-operation in certain sectors, however, a comprehensive dialogue could be set up between MAP and Euro-Med, which would provide the EMP with the regional expertise and experience in the realm of environmental protection and sustainable development which MAP has been building up over 27 years. The EMP, being largely administered by the European Commission, an institution foremost of the

EU, may be also expected to benefit from the insight of a Mediterranean organisation, likely to be more intimate with the culture and specific problems of the Mediterranean region. Euro-Med institutions would also have the chance to learn about what MAP activities and capacities are. Given the lack of information among those who were interviewed in the European Commission, already from this point of view a continuous dialogue would be an important step forward.

On the other hand, MAP could learn, what the EMP would expect as suitable support. In order to prevent a duplication of work while resources are scarce anyway, work could be divided – certainly without compromising that Euro-Med institutions keep steering the overall EMP/SMAP process. Joint recommendations, that both sides have agreed upon, would benefit from the reputation of MAP as a credible Mediterranean – not a European – organisation – which, as pointed out above (chapter 3.3), seems an asset hardly to be overestimated with regard to the Partners East and South of the Mediterranean.

The objectives of this common working group should be, therefore,

- mutual information;
- identification of goals to be targeted and next steps to be taken, initiate step-by-step programmes;
- organising of capacities and competencies (“job sharing”) in order to avoid duplication of work.

The group should meet regularly, including the European Commission Directorates General involved in the process, i.e. foremost External Relations, Trade, Environment and AIDCO, if concerned also other institutions such as Eurostat, EEA, FEMISE. MAP should be represented by the Co-ordinator and staff of the competent Regional Centres. For EMP/SMAP policies remaining being steered by Euro-Med institutions, the common working group will necessarily be chaired by Euro-Med officials. However, with the outspoken regional expertise of MAP a work approach of *equal partners* jointly working together will be definitely most conducive to best results.

#### **Option 11: Awareness raising, transparency and guidance through the MCSD as an informed political forum**

As pointed out above (section 3.3.2), the establishment of a Mediterranean Sustainability Council similar to the CEC has been repeatedly called for. Not only NGOs, but also European Ministries of Environment wish for a watchdog, perhaps even more independent and powerful than the CEC, that looks at and makes recommendations concerning Euro-Med activities at the regional, national and MEDA levels.

As long as such a body is waiting for the political majorities that would put it in place, an open political *forum* to discuss issues of environmental protection and sustainable development in the Mediterranean seems to be of a fundamental importance for the Euro-Med process. Such a forum could be delivered by the MCSD, which with its working groups already has evolved as an accepted platform of discussion in the MAP context in the last years. Including such a forum into the EMP policy process and selecting the MCSD for this function would



1. raise awareness among those involved in the Euro-Med process,
2. put in place transparency concerning the EMP policy process that frequently has been called for and
3. provide guidance in the realm of environmental protection and sustainable development through both credible and expert recommendations.

As a body trusted as a credible adviser bringing together, like MAP in general, the countries bordering the Mediterranean on an “equal footing”, the MCSD seems particularly called upon to play such a role. Expert recommendations would be ensured by the MCSD drawing on the expertise of the different MAP institutions, in particular the Blue Plan. Having focussed on the sustainable development of the region, the MCSD and the Blue Plan will ensure a high level of informed discussion. However, it is not expert advice that the MCSD had to deliver in the first place, for what is suggested here is a *political* rather than a *scientific forum*. As such, the MCSD, enforced by the Centres’ expertise, could take on the role of an informed external critic discussing, commenting and making recommendations and thus enhancing awareness and transparency as to steps that are taken with view to cross-sectoral environmental and sustainability integration on all levels (the regional and central national levels and MEDA planning and implementation) of the Euro-Med process. However, as pointed out above (3.3.2.), the authority such a forum can possibly claim relies on its composition. The Contracting Parties, therefore, are called upon to designate high-ranking officials as representatives.

Involving the MCSD would require the European Commission to, firstly, share all related information, strategy proposals and decisions envisaged with the MCSD and, secondly, pay due regard to the communiqués of the MCSD in response. In exchange, decisions taken by the European Commission under such circumstances could claim more environmental credibility and ownership. To fulfil expectations resulting from such a role and in order to be capable of responding immediately to latest developments in the Euro-Med process, the MCSD will have to meet more frequently, perhaps twice a year and set up a more flexible subcommittee meeting even more frequently.

### **Option 12: Establishment of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development through the MCSD**

Albeit not explicitly raised as an objective in the Euro-Med framework yet, as set out as Key Issue 2, the establishing of an overall Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development should be launched as soon as possible.

On the side of MAP, already the MCSD Terms of Reference provide for the formulation of a “regional strategy for sustainable development”. A draft is expected for 2003-2004. With the work MAP and MAP institutions have carried out in the last years (as pointed out in chapter 5.1), the initiative has built up considerable expertise for this presumably very complicated task. Although the MCSD has been criticised for being too much focussed on environmental issues, the Synthesis Report on free trade and environment also includes socio-economic aspects. These might well be taken as a starting point for a further orientation of the MCSD towards ‘sustainability’ rather than ‘environment’.

With the preparation of a comprehensive “Report on Environment and Development”, the Blue Plan has launched another major undertaking building on the data that so far have been collected and will serve as an important basis for the formulation of a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development by the MCSD. The report will be less of an account of the current state of the Mediterranean environment, but rather a prospective study of its future built on the observance of sustainability indicators. While laying out the pressures of the Mediterranean environment, the report may be expected to indicate which developments a Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development as a political framework document for further action will have to address. Thus, the report shall provide a basis for the formulation of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development.

Although the MCSD has been criticised for its environmental bias, MAP and MSCD are generally respected in the region as credible advisers. As an entrusted UN institution, it is MAP that should be mandated to carry out the groundwork for the “fair” development that Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers have committed to in the aftermath of 11 September. A Strategy formulated by the MCSD is less at danger of being rejected as bound one-sidedly to interests of “the North”. Since the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development is essentially – albeit not exclusively – a framework document for future EMP policies, the EMP should consider financial contributions for related groundwork activities. This applies, again, in particular with regard to the rather limited financial scope of environmental and sustainability institutions in the Mediterranean region including MAP and MAP components.

## 6.2 Capacity Building at Central Levels

Finally, additional synergies relating to what has been identified as central issue, capacity building, could be gained by

### **Option 13: Merging SMAP Correspondents and MAP National Focal Points**

SMAP Correspondents, generally, belong to an environmental agency and therefore would benefit from the overall consolidation that has been pointed out above (Key Issue 5). However, beyond that, expertise of SMAP Correspondents could be strengthened if the functions of being a SMAP Correspondent and being a MAP Focal Point would be merged in the same person or institutional unit.<sup>117</sup> This, of course, can only apply to countries that are participating in both Mediterranean processes. It probably needs to be stressed that this is *not* a proposition to merge the *complete Networks* or even the meetings of SMAP Correspondents and MAP Focal Points: this is obviously excluded by the fact that a range of countries are only partners of the one process and not of the other.

The obvious benefit would be one of expertise and information: MAP Focal Points are regularly updated on latest findings and recommendations as to environmental protection and sustainable development, that have been established under the MAP. By simply appointing the same person or institutional unit, this knowledge would be fed into the EMP/SMAP process – not at central or regional levels, but at the national level – effectively

---

<sup>117</sup>According to the SMAP draft review, Israel, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey are already proceeding like this.

empowering particularly Non-EU partners with “external” advice and thus contributing to the capacity building identified as necessary.

Beyond that, the SMAP Correspondents Network would be regularly informed as to the latest results and new capacities developed under MAP, which Euro-Med might want to draw on in order to improve synergies.

This option would have to be put in place by a recommendation by the European Commission and the Meeting of the Contracting Parties respectively to the countries that are part of both processes to make appointments accordingly or even by changing the SMAP Correspondents and NFP regulations.

**Option 14: Cross-sectoral capacity building through MEDU as “Central Resources Centre” and building up MAP institutions as a think tank**

Finally, MAP through MEDU and the RACs could pursue and enhance the dissemination of information on environmental and sustainable development issues in the Mediterranean including the stimulation of exchanges of experience, providing examples of best practice etc. and thus animate policy learning and facilitate the environmental integration process. Such a role could particularly be played as a partner of the 12 national institutes to be funded through MEDA to support SMAP Correspondents.

Commission and MEDU should jointly develop a concept as to how national ministries’ capacities could be developed and expertise, that is available under MAP, could be channelled into these institutions. MEDU would thus play a central role as a “Central Resources Centre” being gateway and inquiry desk to the different MAP institutions. For a long-term goal, building up the entity of MAP institutions into a “think-tank for the Mediterranean” should be envisaged covering both, issues of environmental protection and sustainable development. Via MEDU, MAP expertise would be accessible for any Mediterranean civil organisation or government. As such it would also serve EMP goals concerning capacity building in the region. Therefore, the European Commission might consider the building up of the necessary infrastructure.

Although MAP would continue to pursue its own agenda, MAP components would be required, as pointed out before, to concentrate on developing ‘know how’ to be able to provide *practical assistance* to Mediterranean governments and institutions relating to the implementation of policies for environmental protection and sustainable development.

Through MEDU all incoming inquiries would be securely directed towards the different sources of know-how under MAP. Institutional structures at MEDU, certainly, needed to be built up accordingly. With MEDU being at the heart of this activity and of the MAP process in general, a comprehensive evaluation study of MEDU is required in particular. Different to what has been pointed out concerning the Centres, the question of management efficiency and management commitment as to putting in place the “new” MAP agenda, i.e. as to a *more operational MAP*, needed to be at the kernel of such a study, as it needed to be with regard to putting in place this option in general.

## 7 Conclusion

The way forward seems to be clear: both Mediterranean initiatives, albeit coming from quite different backgrounds, external relations and security the one, environmental protection the other, endorse the same corner post for their future policies and the future of the Mediterranean region - *sustainable development*.

Parallel structures in goals and activities seem to be abundant. Nevertheless, co-operation has been very limited until today, with both sides looking at trends of *unsustainable* development being established throughout the region.

Concentrating forces by combining capacities and thus improving synergies, therefore, seems to be the way to go. The structure of such a co-operation has been indicated by options for sectoral and cross-sectoral solutions: Euro-Med as the more comprehensive and powerful process, both with regard to political commitment and with regard to funds that are made available to it, would certainly continue to steer the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership including the environmental agenda as defined with the SMAP.

The role to be played by MAP in this process would be marked by the Options that have been pointed out, which evolve in two different fields:

1. Contribution of capacities for policy implementation and monitoring (Options 2, 3 to 8, 13, 14);
2. Contribution of regional expertise for policy panning and being instrumental to the integration of environmental and sustainable policies into the Euro-Mediterranean process (Options 1, 10, 11, 12).

Regarding the contribution of capacities for implementation and monitoring, MAP would contribute capacities to implement common policy goals from case to case, either as a *selected partner* which is commissioned to carry out a certain task for Euro-Med, *or as a competing tender* submitting proposals under the mechanisms of MEDA.

MAP, therefore, cannot all the way rely on being conceded a prime access to environmental and sustainability policies of the Partnership. Its capacities will always be in a *competition* with the operational skills of other players also capable to contribute to the process. The general onset of the European Commission, to select the best of what the “environmental market” has to offer, is not to be compromised. Therefore, it cannot be emphasised enough that MAP institutions – i.e. the Contracting Parties in their 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting as the MAP steering body, MEDU as the operative body managing day to day business, and the Centres representing MAP expertise – need to accommodate to the fact that co-operation will only take place if MAP *offers at a superior quality* what the Euro-Med process requires. Capacities that do not meet the requirements of the Partnership and that have not been upgraded to sufficiently match expectations in terms of quality and operational usefulness may not be expected to be included into a co-operation by Euro-Med institutions. MAP needs to be able to offer well functioning projects, tangible results and clear-cut, “user-friendly”, *applicable* advice.

However, Options 3 to 8 and 14 illustrate also activities that should be taken on by EMP institutions with a view to capacity building in the region which, at present, appears to be the key constraint to putting in place the SMAP. The EMP institutions need to:

1. identify all capacities existing around the Mediterranean,
2. explore their potential, and
3. identify guidance and funds required in order to turn a potential player into a competent partner or tender with regard to either the collection of data, the implementation of projects, or the provision of assistance and know-how concerning the implementation of policies.

Such considerations certainly need to include MAP institutions, which have been carrying out work in the realm of environmental protection and sustainable development over years, in a region which otherwise has little such capacities to offer. As pointed out in Options 3 to 8, the European Commission needs to enter into a dialogue with the Centres – as with other potential players in the region – aimed at building up necessary capacities. A basis for entering such negotiations would be laid at best if MAP would produce the lacking independent evaluation studies as to what has been set out in Key Issue 5: commitment, expertise and efficient business administration of its institutions and effectiveness of its activities.

For capacity building at central levels, SMAP Correspondents and MAP National Focal Points would be merged. Finally, MEDU would be built up as a “Central Resources Centre” of a think-tank formed by the entity of MAP institutions which have been developed towards providing both, information and data, expert advice and practical guidance for policy implementation.

Concerning co-operation in policy planning, MAP and Euro-Med institutions would set up a common working group and a dialogue – chaired by the EMP – with fixed structures to exchange information, jointly define policy goals, and organise competencies to avoid duplication of work. The MSCD, as an informed and entrusted Mediterranean body would be mandated with the formulation of a comprehensive Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, and, beyond, take the role of an open political forum to critically discuss integration policies in the region and thus enhance awareness, transparency, and provide guidance with view to environmental and sustainability goals.

## 8 Bibliography

### 8.1 UN and MAP Documents

**Blue Plan 2002:** What is the Blue Plan, <http://www.planbleu.org/vanglaise/1-1a.htm> (30/05/02).

**Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001:** The Free Trade and the Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context. First Synthesis Report for the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) – Draft, UNEP/MAP/BP, Sophia Antipolis 2001.

**Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001:** The Free Trade and the Environment in the Euro-Mediterranean Context. Draft report for the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD) – Provisional Version, UNEP/MAP/BP, Sophia Antipolis 2001.

**Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre 2001:** The System of 130 Indicators for the Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region. Record of the Workshop in Sophia Antipolis, 11-12 December 2000, UNEP/MAP/BP, Sophia Antipolis.

**Cleaner Production Regional Activity Centre / CEMA web-site,** <http://www.gencat.es/mediamb/cema/cemasaing.html>.

**Environment Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre/ CTM web-site:** <http://151.39.65.202/>.

**Holland, Alexandra and Nesrin Algan 2001:** External Evaluation study of the Priority Action Centres Programme, Regional Activity Centre, UNEP, Athens.

**Prats, Michèle and Jellal Abdelkafi 2001:** 100 Historic Sites Programme. Evaluation Report, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(DEC)/MEDWG.190/10.

**Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre web-site,** <http://www.rempec.org/index.html>.

**The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development 2001:** Strategic Review for Sustainable Development in the Mediterranean Region, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(DEC)/MED IG.13/Inf.6.

**Smets, Henri and Nesrin Algan 2001:** Evaluation of the Blue Plan Regional Activities Centre, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(DEC)/MED IG.13/Inf.7.

**UNEP/MAP (w/o):** MEDPOL – Programme for the Assessment and Control of Marine Pollution in the Mediterranean, UNEP/MAP-Brochure, Athens.

**UNEP/MAP 2002:** Progress Report by the Secretariat on activities carried out since the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (November 2001-February 2002), UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP/BUR/58/3.

**UNEP/MAP 2002:** Report of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(DEC)/MED 188/4.

- UNEP/MAP 2001:** Protection of the Mediterranean from land-based pollution, UNEP/MAP, Athens.
- UNEP/MAP 2001:** Report by the Co-ordinator on Activities during the 2000-2001 Biennium and Recommendations and Programme Budget for 2002-2003 – Proposal by the Secretariat, UNEP/MAP, Athens 2001, UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.190/3.
- UNEP/MAP 2001:** Report by the Secretariat on Programme, Recommendations and Budget for the 2002-2003 Biennium, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(DEC)/MED IG.13/3.
- UNEP/MAP 2001:** Report of the Meeting of the National Focal Points, UNEP/MAP, Athens 2001, UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.190/12.
- UNEP/MAP 2001:** Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(DEC)/MED IG.13/8.
- UNEP/MAP 1998:** “Rules of Procedure”, “Terms of Reference” and “Composition”, Constitutive Documents of the Mediterranean Commission on sustainable Development, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(OCA)/MED WG.140/Inf.4.
- UNEP/MAP 1997:** Report of the 10<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution and its Protocols, UNEP/MAP, Athens, UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.11/10.
- UNO 1972:** Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-6 June 1972, UNO, A/CONF.48/8 7.

## 8.2 *EU and Euro-Med Documents*

- Euro-Med 2002:** The Meda Programme, European Commission, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/euromed/meda.htm#3](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/meda.htm#3) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 2002:** Presidency Conclusions, 5<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Valencia, 22-23 April 2002, Euromed Report, No. 42.
- Euro-Med 2002:** Presidency Conclusions, Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Industry, Malaga, 9-10 April 2002, Euromed Report, No. 40.
- Euro-Med 2002:** Resolution on the Commission communication to the Council and European Parliament to prepare the Meeting of Euro-Mediterranean Foreign Ministers, Valencia, 22-23 April 2002, Euromed report, No 41.
- Euro-Med 2002:** Conclusions of the Presidency, Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Trade, Toledo, 19 March 2002, Euromed Report, No. 38.
- Euro-Med 2002:** Regional Strategy Paper 2002-2006 and Regional Indicative Programme 2002-2004, European Commission, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/euromed/rsp/rsp02\\_06.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/rsp/rsp02_06.pdf) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 2001:** From ‘MEDA I’ to ‘MEDA II’: What’s New?, Euromed Special Feature, No. 21, 3 May 2001.

- Euro-Med 2001:** Presidency Conclusions, Euro-Mediterranean Meeting on Trade, Brussels, 29 May 2001, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/euromed/conf/sect/trade.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/conf/sect/trade.htm) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 2001:** Conclusions of the Presidency, Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Brussels, 5-6 November 2001, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/euromed/conf/bxl/conc\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/conf/bxl/conc_en.htm) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 2000:** The Marseille Declaration of Environmental Organisations, Euro-Med Civil Forum, Marseilles, 10-12 November 2000, [http://www.eeb.org/publication/Marseille-decl\\_en.pdf](http://www.eeb.org/publication/Marseille-decl_en.pdf) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 2000:** Presidency's Formal Conclusions, 4<sup>th</sup> Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Minister, Marseille, 15-16 November 2000, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/euromed/conf/marseilles/conclusions\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/conf/marseilles/conclusions_en.pdf) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 1999:** The NGO Declaration to the Euro-Mediterranean Ministers of Foreign affairs, Environmental Civil Forum, Stuttgart, 13-15 April 1999, [http://www.euromed.net/activities/conferences/stuttgart/civil\\_forum\\_declaration\\_environment\\_\\_en.htm](http://www.euromed.net/activities/conferences/stuttgart/civil_forum_declaration_environment__en.htm) (30/05/02).
- Euro-Med 1996:** Decisions of the Euro-Mediterranean Conference on Water Management, Marseilles, 25-26 November 1996, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/euromed/conf/sect/water.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/conf/sect/water.htm) (30/05/02).
- European Commission 2002:** SMAP web-site, European Commission, <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/smap/home.htm> (30/05/02).
- European Council 2002:** Conclusions of the Presidency, The European Council, Barcelona, 15-16 March 2002, <http://ue.eu.int/newsroom/up.asp?MAX=&BID=76&DID=69871&File=/pressData/en/ec/69871.pdf&LANG=1> (30/05/02).
- European Environment Agency 1999:** State and pressures of the marine and coastal Mediterranean environment, European Communities, Luxembourg.
- European Environment Agency 1998:** Data Collected within the Framework of the Regional European Sea Conventions, EEA, Copenhagen, <http://reportsectioneea.eu.int/TEC03/en/tech03.pdf>.
- European Investment Bank 2002:** 2001 - A record year for EIB lending in Mediterranean Partner Countries : EUR 1.5 billion, press release 2002/005, <http://www.eib.org/pub/press/2002/2002-005.htm> (30/05/02).
- Eurostat 1999:** Medstat – Statistics cross the Mediterranean, Sigma, No. 2/99.

### 8.3 Literature

- Biermann, Frank 2000:** Regionalismus oder Globalismus in der Meeresumweltpolitik?, Zeitschrift für Umweltpolitik und Umweltrecht, No. 1/2000, p. 99-117.



**Euro-Med Civil Forum 2002:** Position paper of the environmental NGOs on the occasion of the 5th Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Ministers at Valencia, 22-23 April 2002, <http://www.fcevalencia2002.org/> (30/05/02).

**Friends of the Earth – Mednet (w/o):** Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Zone. Can It Be Sustainable?; Friends of the Earth Middle East, Brochure.

**Katz, David 1999:** The Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Zone and the Environment – Issues and Evidence: Lessons from other Trade Agreements, in: **Katz, David (Ed.) 1999:** Environmental Impacts of a Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Zone: Case Studies and Assessments Friends of the Earth Middle East.

**Katz, David 1997:** The Mediterranean Free Trade Zone: Lessons from NAFTA, Friends of the Earth Middle East.

**Liberty, Dan and Ariela Zarbiv 1999:** Legal Environmental Gaps within the Euro-Med Partnership and their Potential Effect on the Environment under a Free Trade Zone: Comparative Law Analysis and a Proposal for a Draft Protocol on Investment and Environmental Civil Liability, in: **Katz, David (Ed.) 1999:** Environmental Impacts of a Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Zone: Case Studies and Assessments, Friends of the Earth Middle East.

**Skjaerseth, Jon Birger 1996:** The 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Mediterranean Action Plan: Reason to Celebrate?, in: **Green Globe Yearbook 1996**, Oxford University Press.

### ***Annex: Status of Ratification of the amended Barcelona Convention and the new/amended Protocols as of 28 February 2001***

1995 Barcelona Convention: Ten Contracting Parties (Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, the European Union, France, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Spain and Tunisia) have ratified the protocol (sixteen required).

1994 Offshore Protocol: Three Parties (Cyprus, Morocco and Tunisia) have ratified the protocol (six required).

1995 Dumping Protocol: Ten Contracting Parties (Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, the European Union, France, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Spain and Tunisia) have ratified the protocol (sixteen required).

1995 Specially Protected Areas and Biodiversity Protocol entered into force in December 1999. Nine Parties (Cyprus, Egypt, the European Union, France, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Spain and Tunisia) have ratified the protocol.

1996 Land-based Sources Protocol: Nine Contracting Parties (Cyprus, the European Union, France, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Spain and Tunisia) have ratified the protocol (sixteen required).

1996 Hazardous Wastes Protocol: Three Contracting Parties (Malta, Morocco and Tunisia) have ratified the protocol (six required).

2002 Prevention and Emergency Protocol: No country has so far ratified the protocol (six required).

After all, on the twelfth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties in November 2001, five Contracting Parties declared that their governments were moving towards ratification (Algeria, Greece, Israel, Slovenia and Syria).<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup>UNEP/MAP 2001: Report by the Secretariat on Programme, Recommendations and Budget for the 2002-2003 Biennium, p. 4; UNEP/MAP 2002: Progress Report by the Secretariat on activities carried out since the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention, p. 1.; UNEP/MAP 2001: Report of the 12<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution and its Protocols, section 35.